

Conquering the World

The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered

BRIAN SCHULTZ

BRILL

Conquering the World

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate Editors

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 76

Conquering the World

The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered

By

Brian Schultz



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Schultz, Brian Marc, 1968-

Conquering the world : the War Scroll (1QM) reconsidered / by Brian Schultz.

p. cm. — (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah, ISSN 0169-9962 ; v. 76)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-16820-6 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness. I. Title. II. Series.

BM488.W3S38 2009

296.1'55—dc22

2008052345

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 978 90 04 16820 6

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations and Sigla</i>	ix
<i>List of Tables and Plates</i>	x
Introduction	1
1. The <i>War Scroll</i> and the Need for Continued Research	1
2. The Scope of the Present Study	4
3. Some Technical Matters	9
Chapter One The War Texts: Discovery and Identification	10
1. Description of the <i>War Scroll</i> from Cave 1	11
2. War Texts from Caves 4 and 11	16
3. Dating of the War Texts	31
4. Provenance of the War Texts and Possible Implications	39
5. Summary and Initial Observations	41
Chapter Two Outlining the <i>War Scroll</i>	42
1. Sense Division in the <i>War Scroll</i>	43
2. Sense Division in the Cave 4 War Texts	60
3. Conclusion on Sense Division in the <i>War Scroll</i>	71
4. Outlining the <i>War Scroll</i>	72
Chapter Three The War in Column 1	86
1. The Problem: an Apparent Lack of Coherence in the <i>War</i> <i>Scroll</i>	86
2. The Problem of Reconstructing 1QM 1:3–6	88
3. The Historical Setting of the War: a Dependence upon Daniel 11:40–12:3	91
4. The Participants in the War	102
5. The Kittim	127
6. The Geography of the War	159
7. Summary	169

Chapter Four	The War in Column 2	170
1.	Column 2 Overview	170
2.	The Chronology of the War in Column 2	171
3.	The Enemies in Column 2	183
4.	The Sons of Light in Column 2	204
5.	The Relationship Between Columns 1 and 2 and its Implications	236
Chapter Five	The War in Columns 3-19	240
1.	Columns 15-19	241
2.	Columns 3-9	245
3.	Columns 10-14	255
4.	Additional Matters Pertaining to Columns 3-19	305
5.	Two Stages but Three Traditions	323
Chapter Six	The <i>War Scroll</i> and the <i>Rule of the Congregation</i>	327
1.	Basic Similarities	328
2.	The Importance of Licht's Insights	333
3.	The Complementarity of the <i>War Scroll</i> with its Two Stages in the Eschatological War	336
4.	The War against the Kittim: the Harbinger of the Messianic Age	339
5.	Of Priests and Levites	340
6.	Sectarian Usage of the Term "Congregation" (עדה)	353
7.	Israel's Leadership during the Eschaton	365
Chapter Seven	The Cave 4 War Texts	366
1.	The Evidence from the Cave 4 Material	368
2.	Conclusions	383
3.	Historical Considerations	385
	Summary and Synthesis	391
	<i>Bibliography</i>	403
	<i>General Index</i>	422
	<i>Index of Ancient Sources</i>	434
	<i>Index of Modern Authors</i>	452

PREFACE

This monograph is a revised edition of my doctoral dissertation written under the guidance of Prof. Hanan Eshel at Bar Ilan University in Ramat Gan, Israel. As such, it marks the culmination of that stage in my life, one during which I am particularly grateful for Prof. Eshel's willingness to take me on as a young graduate student and become both mentor and friend. May this work be a worthy tribute to the many ways in which he has honored me by investing time, energy, and resources into my life.

The 'adventure' began many years prior when several, including Dr. Dietrich Schmoll and Paul Unger, planted the seed in me to study in Israel. What was supposed to be a one year stint eventually became two graduate degrees. Much credit is also due to Dr. Sidney DeWaal, then president of Jerusalem University College, who warded off my early return back to Canada by finding ways to make it possible for me to finish the MA degree I had started. Without such an intervention, there is no doubt my life would have taken a very different turn, and the present volume not seen the light of day.

Most of the research was done in the Judaica Reading Room at the Jewish National and University Library on the Givat Ram campus of the Hebrew University. It is a most stimulating place to conduct research and its staff only make the experience all the more pleasant. I also benefited from being invited by Notre Dame University to be a visiting research scholar in the spring of 2005. Much thanks is due to Dr. Dan Machiela and Prof. James VanderKam who made such an opportunity possible. The welcome my wife and I received as newly weds was second to none, and we continue to cherish the many new friendships we developed there, especially those in Sibley House. Likewise, the collegiality and friendliness I experienced as a foreign student in the Land of Israel Studies and Archaeology department at Bar Ilan University, whether from faculty, staff, or students, always made me feel most welcomed.

While I benefited from the input of many scholars, I wish to thank Prof. Martin Abegg in particular for his very careful read of the dissertation and his many pertinent comments which helped improve the present work considerably. I am grateful further to Prof. Florentino García Martínez who not only accepted to have this work published in the *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* series, but who also offered some final helpful suggestions. On the technical side of getting the manuscript camera-ready, I benefited from the generous help of Steven Siebert at Nota Bene as well as from Brill's production team. Thanks is also due to the faculty and administration of Fresno Pacific University for their encouragement and assistance as I worked to get the manuscript ready for publication.

Finally, I am most grateful for the many friends and family members who have blessed me with their unwavering support, encouragement, and friendship throughout: to my parents for their constant prayers, to Floyd Plemmons for the use of his apartment for so many years; to Dr. Randall Buth and his wife Margret, my parents-in-law, who lovingly opened their home to us as a young family so that we could have the means to push through to the end of my doctorate; to my dear friends and colleagues of the Tel es-Safi archaeological project; to the wonderful community at Narkis Street Baptist Congregation. Most of all, I am thankful for my wife Rachel, who was courageous enough to marry a grad student in the middle of his dissertation and begin raising a family. Her constant interest in and commitment to my scholarship while fostering a warm and loving home environment is a most invaluable gift with which she blesses me.

Fresno, October 2008
Brian Schultz

ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

The abbreviations for journals, series, ancient literature, and other texts follow the style recommended in Alexander, Patrick H., et al., *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999). In addition, the following conventions and sigla are used in the transcription of the Hebrew texts:

[]	Lacuna caused by physical damage to the document
< >	A modern correction
()	Addition of text for the purpose of clarity
[כיל]	Reconstructed text
◌ [◊]	Undecipherable letter
◌ [⋈]	Seriously damaged letter; possible but uncertain reading
◌ [⋉]	Damaged letter; relatively certain reading
<i>vacat</i>	Uninscribed section of the document

LIST OF TABLES AND PLATES

Table 1:	1QM Fragment Identification and Location	14
Table 2:	1QM Parallels in 4Q War Texts	18
Table 3:	4Q491 Fragments	21
Table 4:	Dating of War Text Manuscripts	32
Table 5:	Sense Division in 1QM	58
Table 6:	Sense Division in 4Q War Texts	62
Table 7:	1QM Outline	74
Table 8:	Comparison of 1QM Outlines	83
Table 9:	Chronology of 1QM 2	179
Table 10:	Temple Ritual According to 1QM 2	218
Table 11:	Parallel of 1QM 10–14 and 1QM 15–19	256
Table 12:	Synopsis of 1QM 7–9 and 1QM 15–19	Insert
Plate 1:	Map of the World according to <i>Jubilees</i> and the <i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	187

INTRODUCTION

1. THE *WAR SCROLL* AND THE NEED FOR CONTINUED RESEARCH

After an initial flurry of work on the *War Scroll* (1QM; M) just after its discovery in 1947, interest in this unique scroll seemed to wane, and much of scholarship merely reiterated the results of prior studies. It has mainly been based on the work of such scholars as Yigael Yadin¹ and Jean Carmignac² who preferred to read the text as a unified composition, and who wrote commentaries which sought to highlight the text's overall thrust. For others, the focus was slightly different, as they sought to understand the text's compositional history, with Philip Davies' monograph being the most thorough and careful treatise on the matter.³ While the work done then was most commendable, it did not have the advantage of access to the materials from Caves 4 and 11,⁴ both of which contained texts akin to M, thought to be either copies of the Cave 1 manuscript, or different recensions of the same composition. At first, and rightly so, much of the focus was on the differences these manuscripts preserved from the Cave 1 text. Even so, it took about a decade after the Cave 4 material was published before a critical edition of M was

¹ Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. Batya and Chaim Rabin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

² Jean Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres*, *Autour de la Bible* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958).

³ Philip R. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*, *BibOr* 32 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977).

⁴ Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4. III.*, *DJD VII* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 12–72; Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, “14. 11QSefer Ha-Milhamah,” in *Qumran Cave 11 II*, *DJD XXIII* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 243–51; Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, “285. 4QSefer Ha-Milhamah,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, Stephen J. Pfann, et al., *DJD XXXVI* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 228–46.

published,⁵ the basis from which one could attempt to better evaluate both the text's overall message and its assumed compositional history. Yet even with this new tool in hand, surprisingly little effort has been put into re-examining M in light of the material from Caves 4 and 11. This is not to deny the many articles dealing with this or that particular aspect, but hardly has M been reexamined in its entirety to see if the additional material affects our understanding of its overall message, or if it provides clues about the text's metamorphosis over time.

Recently, a most useful summary of scholarship on M has been published by Jean Duhaime.⁶ Its purpose was not so much to break new ground in the matter, but rather to provide a comprehensive survey of the issues that have been examined about the composition since its discovery. While it is a most welcomed and useful addition to the corpus of literature on M, it also highlights how many questions still remain, and points out the absence of any new attempt to synthesize all the material. Thus, for example, Duhaime's conclusion about matters pertaining to the composition and genre of M:

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 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 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.⁷

⁵ Jean Duhaime, "War Scroll," in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), 80–203.

⁶ Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*, CQS 6 (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

⁷ Duhaime, *War Texts*, 60.

After stating some of the as of yet unresolved tensions in the document, Duhaime singles out two authors who have sought to resolve them: Peter von der Osten-Sacken,⁸ and Davies⁹ whom I just mentioned. What is striking about this is that both did their work prior to the publication of the materials from Caves 4 and 11, and yet Duhaime could not point to anyone who followed their lead, taking the matter further by incorporating the extra evidence now available. The present study is an initial step in attempting to fill this void.¹⁰

There is a second matter which, in my opinion, has unfortunately done harm to the study of M: the apparent neglect of some foundational investigations of it. I am thinking most particularly of the works of Jacob Licht¹¹ and David Flusser,¹² both of which were never translated from Hebrew into any other language, and which have subsequently been often overlooked.¹³ This oversight is understandable, because neither of these scholars ever made M a major focus of their research, so that while their writings are well known in the broader field of Dead Sea Scrolls studies, their works are never thought of as foundational for M in particular. If I am highlighting

⁸ Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*, SUNT 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 29–115.

⁹ Davies, *IQM*.

¹⁰ Another work that has recently attempted to do the same, and with much success, is Rony Yshai, “מהדורה ופירוש) 4Q496–4Q491 כתבי היד בקומראן: ספרות המלחמה בקומראן: כתבי היד 4Q496–4Q491 (מהדורה ופירוש) (1QM) “והשוואתם למגילת המלחמה (Ph.D. diss., University of Haifa, 2006). It is a most thorough investigation into the Cave 4 documents (see below). However, her approach is quite different than mine, so that there is only little overlap between the two. In my opinion, our two works are quite complementary.

¹¹ Jacob Licht, “משעת עולם ועם פדות אל,” in *ספר זכרון לאליעזר*: מחקרים במלילות הגנוזות: ספר זכרון לאליעזר, ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (Jerusalem: Hekhal Ha-Sefer, 1961), 49–75; Jacob Licht, סרך, סרך היחד, סרך העדה, סרך, ed. Yigael Yadin (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965).

¹² David Flusser, “היסודות האפוקליפטיים של מגילת המלחמה,” in *פרקים בתולדות ירושלים*, ed. A. Oppenheimer, U. Rappaport, and M. Stern (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi / Ministry of Defense, 1980), 434–52.

¹³ As I was about to submit this manuscript for publication, a first volume of a collection of David Flusser’s Hebrew articles translated into English was published so that his article mentioned above is finally now available to English readers (“Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll,” in *Qumran and Apocalypticism*, vol. 1 of *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*, trans. Azzan Yadin [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 140–58).

these two scholars, it is not to suggest that with respect to M, they have done more work, or that they are more important, than others in the field. Rather, it is because their research broke new ground in understanding M, and that their contributions have unfortunately been for the most part overlooked.¹⁴ Had their work been assimilated by subsequent research, some matters still thought to be unclear would not be as problematic as often assumed. If some will conclude that I have erred in giving them too prominent of a place in my own research, it is my hope that it will, at the very least, have the merit of stimulating renewed interest in their research as it pertains to M.

2. THE SCOPE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

From the onset, it is necessary to stress that the present work is not a new commentary on M.¹⁵ There are already many such available, by various scholars from several countries and in different languages. Yadin's work, first published in Hebrew,¹⁶ and eventually updated and translated into English,¹⁷ remains a mandatory starting point. Another classic is Carmignac's French commentary.¹⁸ Bastiaan Jongeling's volume has the advantage of summarizing many of the

¹⁴ For the sake of illustration, in Duhaime's survey of scholarship on the *War Scroll (War Texts)*, Flusser's article, although mentioned in the bibliography, is never dealt with anywhere in the book. Licht's work is not even included in the bibliography. The same can be said about the most recent commentary on the *War Scroll* by Giovanni Ibba (*Il "Rotolo della Guerra" Edizione critica* [Turin: Silvio Samorani, 1998]). I cite only these two monographs as example of what is just as characteristic for articles dealing with the *War Scroll*.

¹⁵ Nor have I sought to re-read and transcribe all the manuscripts anew. A most important work which does this for 4Q491–4Q496 is Rony Yshai's PhD dissertation ("ספרות המלחמה בקומראן").

¹⁶ Yigael Yadin, מגילת מלחמת בני אור בבני חושך ממגילות מדבר יהודה, (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1955).

¹⁷ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*. It should be noted, however, that the translators took the freedom to shorten many of the lengthier footnotes, so that at times some of Yadin's arguments are only fleshed out in the Hebrew edition.

¹⁸ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*.

ideas put forward up until that time.¹⁹ Yet all of these predate the publication of the Cave 4 War Texts. Thankfully, a new commentary by Giovanni Ibba does take the extra evidence into consideration.²⁰ Even more recently, Rony Yshai's unpublished Ph.D. dissertation contains the most thorough and detailed commentary to date on the Cave 4 material.²¹ Although not a commentary strictly speaking, Duhaime's book on M is a most valuable "companion," exactly as the series in which it is published claims, to anyone researching M.²² As it outlines much of previous research, it has relieved the present study from getting bogged down in similar summaries of earlier scholarship.

The present work is an attempt to take a fresh look at M in its final form as it has reached us today, and to examine it anew in light of its related material from Caves 4 and 11. It is done from the perspective of the majority view concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls, Khirbet Qumran, and the sect which resided there.²³ My reexamination of M is with an eye to better understanding its compositional history. While initially I had thought that the bulk of my study would be on this last matter, it soon became apparent that it was the former that required the most attention. In the course of research, my own understanding of M ended up differing from what had been proposed before me. If correct, my reading of M has significant implications for understanding its compositional history. Thus, I could not outline some theory as to M's evolution, without first thoroughly explaining why I feel it necessary to exegete the text slightly differently than my predecessors.

In doing so, my goal is not to systematically discuss every issue alluded to in the composition, but to focus on those aspects which

¹⁹ Bastiaan Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre des manuscrits de Qumrân*, SSN 4 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962).

²⁰ Ibba, *Rotolo della Guerra*.

²¹ Yshai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן."

²² Duhaime, *War Texts*.

²³ For a comprehensive overview of this position, see the recently updated work of Frank M. Cross, *The Ancient Library at Qumran*, 3rd ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995). Here is not the place to argue its merit over the alternative scenarios that have been put forward, but simply to state that in my opinion the traditional perspective remains the most comprehensive and likely theory to date.

affect the understanding of the document as a whole, first of all independently of the other copies and recensions, and subsequently in light of them. My desire is to ascertain as best as possible the overall message of M. An obvious impediment to this task is that the bottom part of the scroll is missing, yet regardless of how much of the composition may be missing, it remains nonetheless our most complete witness upon which all research must be based.

Having done this, I then shift to the second matter, that of making some initial conclusions concerning the text's compositional history, based upon both my own reading of the Cave 1 text and that which can be gathered from the Cave 4 documents. With respect to the latter, I sought to look beyond the minutia of the comparative work done so far on isolated portions of War Material from the various caves, in an effort to see if any overarching conclusions can be made about the text's diachronic development as a whole. My goal is not so much to put forward a plausible scenario, but to see if certain conclusions warrant themselves, or at a minimum, prove to be most probable, conclusions for which any theory of M's compositional history must account.

My read of M results in a chronology for the final eschatological war slightly different than anything hitherto suggested, comprising of two distinct stages. It has, in my opinion, the advantage of removing some of the apparent contradictions scholars have noted in the composition, especially in the way cols. 1 and 2 relate to each other, but also as to how these columns relate to the rest of the document. While initially the rest of M material from the other caves did not provide any direct help in understanding the war's chronology, they too reflect the same two stages, with the same distinct characteristics, as in the Cave 1 text. That these two stages are found in several of the War Texts suggests that they are not just the result of a harmonizing process of various sources with differing perspectives on the eschatological war.²⁴ In fact, there may even be evidence that the final redactor of M sought to gloss over the two stages which he had inherited from his sources.

²⁴ Or, in the very least, that the two stages were devised long before M reached its present state.

Most important, however, is that this interpretation of M provides a reasonable explanation for some of which has traditionally been understood as problematic or contradictory in the text. The tendency as of late has been to resolve these matters in light of an assumed compositional history. Where they can now be understood as integral to the composition, they can no longer be used as arguments in support of a theory of the text's evolution. Obviously, this is where the Cave 4 fragments have proven the most useful, as in dealing with the second focus of the present research. My conclusion is that the document was originally composed to describe warfare as it was expected to be carried out during the messianic age, but that eventually it was modified so as to include a description of the battle that would bring about the expected messianic age. Probably this happened because, as with the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa, Sa), the pre-messianic age was expected to mirror as accurately as possible that which was to come.²⁵ At the same time, it must be stressed that the extra M material has not provided positive proof for any one scenario of the composition's evolution. My proposal simply has the merit of seeking to incorporate all the manuscript evidence into a single all-encompassing theory, something which to date has not been attempted. Although the material can be used best in refuting certain conjectures, it may nonetheless point in an alternate, albeit still tentative, direction. Thus, while I conclude with my own construct of how the text may have undergone diachronic transformation, I wish to emphasize that it remains only that: a theory. Its validity, like of those put forward before this one, will bear itself out either with new discoveries, or in its usefulness in enabling increased understanding of this enigmatic composition.

In the end, however, the main thrust of the present research has been to understand better M in its final form. Ultimately, because of the fragmentary nature of the rest of the War Texts, we will never attain such a high level of understanding as with the Cave 1 document, and we will always be forced to examine the Cave 4 and 11 fragments in light of the more complete framework of the Cave 1

²⁵ With respect to Sa, see Lawrence Schiffman's treatment of this phenomenon in *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, SBLMS 38 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).

text. For this reason it remained the main focus of the present study. At times, however, understanding M better has led me to new conclusions impacting the broader scope of Second Temple Period studies, so that these too have been included.

The first chapter provides a brief survey of M material from all the caves. I have not sought to exhaust all the details about the various texts, but rather to provide the reader with a general overview of the material considered, with an emphasis on highlighting those aspects which will prove significant later on in the study. As I mentioned above, a similar account, albeit from a slightly different perspective, can be found in Duhaime's *War Texts*. As any investigation of M material must begin with the Cave 1 manuscript, the next four chapters focus on it. The first examines the way M's scribe divided his texts into units, and the implication this has for outlining the document. With respect to content, the first two columns provide an introductory framework to the rest of the scroll, and are therefore foundational for a correct reading of the scroll. Consequently, I have devoted an entire chapter to each of these columns, as it is most important to understand both the differences between them, but also how they are nonetheless complimentary. In short, it is these two columns which 'define' the two stages expected in the eschatological war. The subsequent chapter then works out this framework throughout the rest of the composition, showing how M strictly respects the distinction between the two stages.

The next two chapters take the conclusions reached thus far and examines them in light of additional texts. The first focuses primarily on M's intimate relationship with Sa. This connection was first noticed and extensively worked out by Licht.²⁶ Building on his ground breaking work, I slightly modify his conclusions to fit the two stages of the eschatological war better, and point out some of the consequences emanating from his observations. The second of the two takes a closer look at the material from Caves 4 and 11, and suggests a possible scenario with which to understand M's development, even if only tentatively.

²⁶ See especially Licht, מגילת הסרטים.

3. SOME TECHNICAL MATTERS

Before launching into the study proper, a few technical matters need to be pointed out. Unless mentioned otherwise, transcriptions of M and its related documents from Caves 4 and 11 come from Duhaime's critical text.²⁷ Like his edition, reconstructions have been kept to a minimum. Because the probability of a reconstruction varies from case to case, I feel it is important to differentiate between preserved text and a scholar's reconstruction, as reasonable as it may seem. The translations, when not footnoted, are mine, and are often more literal and rigid than in the published versions. This has been done purposefully for the sake of consistency, so as to reflect best the original wording, especially where I felt it necessary to highlight certain nuances otherwise not reflected in Duhaime's excellent translation. When referring to the Cave 4 manuscripts, I will use their number sigla (4Q491, 4Q492, etc.), rather than their alternate abbreviations (4QM^a, 4QM^b, etc.). Finally, all searches of the Dead Sea Scrolls were done with BibleWorks 6, an electronic version of Martin Abegg's concordance published for the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series.²⁸

²⁷ Duhaime, "War Scroll," 80–203.

²⁸ Martin G. Abegg, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

CHAPTER ONE

THE WAR TEXTS: DISCOVERY AND IDENTIFICATION

The scroll of “The War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness,”¹ or more simply, the *War Scroll*—1QM(*ilhamah*)—is one of the first seven scrolls discovered in 1947 by some Bedouin in a cave on the northwestern shores of the Dead Sea near the ruins of Khirbet Qumran.² This scroll, which describes an ultimate eschatological war between the forces of good—the Sons of Light, and the forces of evil—the Sons of Darkness, for the final undoing of evil in the world, is unique. Outside of the Qumran Scrolls, no other parallels are known in the entire corpus of Second Temple Period literature.³ It describes a series of battles, complete with chronological

¹ This is the name given to the scroll by Prof. Eleazar Sukenik who first deciphered it [מגילות גנוזות מתוך גניזה קדומה שנמצאה במדבר יהודה. סקירה ראשונה] (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1948), 17).

² The account of the discovery has taken on almost mythical dimensions, with several versions circulating. For Sukenik’s personal rendition of the events, see *מגילות גנוזות מתוך גניזה קדומה שנמצאה במדבר יהודה. סקירה שניה* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1950), 12–19; and *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות שבידי האוניברסיטה העברית* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1954), 13–15. An English translation of his version can be found in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, trans. D. A. Fineman (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955), 13–19. All references to Sukenik’s work will be from this English translation. Additional details of the discovery are provided by his son in Yigael Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1957), 15–52. A slightly different but meticulous account is given by John Trever in “The Discovery of the Scrolls,” *BA* 11, no. 3 (1948): 46–57; and in *The Untold Story of Qumran* (Westwood, N.J.: Flemming H. Revel, 1965).

³ For this reason, scholars have been in a quandary to know what kind of literary genre to call M. Henri Michaud called it a new apocalypse; see “Une apocalypse nouvelle,” *Positions Luthériennes* 3 (1955): 64–76. Jean Carmignac called it a liturgy for the holy war; see “Qu’est ce que l’apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumrân,” *RevQ* 10 (1979): 26. Yadin chose to call it a military manual; see *The Scroll of the War*, 4. For a most thorough survey about the various proposals concerning M’s literary genre, see Søren Holst, “Verbs and War Scroll: Studies in the

considerations, divisions of the army, tactical issues, types of weaponry, even instructions for priests together with necessary ritual practices, all for the purpose of insuring victory to the Sons of Light.

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE *WAR SCROLL* FROM CAVE 1

1.1. *The main scroll*

As is well known, Prof. Eleazar Sukenik of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem was able to purchase this scroll from an antiquities dealer in Bethlehem on November 29th, 1947.⁴ It was surprisingly well preserved, although its fragile light-brown leather had decomposed somewhat in places, with damage done primarily along its bottom and through several of the outer sheets.⁵ Since the scroll had been rolled up from left to right after it had been read, the first inner columns are better preserved than the last outer ones, and as one nears the end of the scroll, the damage increases substantially. The scroll is comprised of four parchment sheets sewn together, for a total length of 2.90 m and an average preserved height of 16 cm. Eighteen columns of text are unequally divided among the four sheets.⁶ Each column varies between 10.5 and 16.0 cm in width and contains anywhere from 16 to 19 lines of text, written in a clean script ‘hanging’ under ruled lines.⁷ Margins between the columns measure about two centimeters while the upper margin measures almost three centimeters. At the right edge of the parchment is a five

Hebrew Verbal System and the Qumran War Scroll” (Ph.D. diss., Copenhagen University, 2004), 14–17.

⁴ See note 2. In addition to M, Sukenik also purchased an Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^b) and the *Thanksgiving Scroll*, also known as the *Hodayot* (1QH^a, H). The other four scrolls were purchased by the Syrian Metropolitan Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel: a second Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a), *Peshet Habakkuk* (1QpHab), the *Rule of the Community* or *Serekh haYahad* (1QS, S) and the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen ar).

⁵ Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35, figs. 11–12.

⁶ Specific measurements of each parchment sheet and the number of columns they contain are listed in Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 44.

⁷ Paleographical dating will be dealt with below after all the relevant texts will have been introduced so as to facilitate comparing them chronologically.

centimeters wide margin, indicating that it is the beginning of the document. Since the bottom of the scroll is badly eaten away, not only is the bottom margin never extant, but several lines at the end of all the columns are missing. While it is impossible to determine how many, scholars generally agree that originally there must have been in the vicinity of 20 to 23 lines per column.⁸ After col. 18 at the end of the fourth parchment sheet, there are the remains of a suture line,⁹ indicating that there was at least a fifth sheet to the document. Indeed, remains of a small sheet, badly decomposed, was found rolled together with, or partially wrapped around the scroll, *inside* the 35 cm long piece of smooth leather used to cover the scroll.¹⁰ It preserves portions of an upper margin followed by 14 incomplete lines of texts, the longest being nine centimeters long. Neither the beginning nor the end of any of these lines are extant. Today, this text is referred to as col. 19, though it may be possible that it belongs

⁸ As originally suggested by Sukenik (*Dead Sea Scrolls*, 34). Exceptions to this accepted average are Jean Carmignac (“Les Kittim dans la « Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres »,” *NRT* 77 [1955]: 738; *Règle de la Guerre*, 60–61) and Leonhard Rost (“Zum ‘Buch der Kriege der Söhne des Lichtes gegen die Söhne des Finsternist,” *TLZ* 80 [1955]: 205), both of whom suggest there might have been as many as thirty lines.

⁹ Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, Pl. 33.

¹⁰ Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 34. See also I מגילות גנוזות, pl. VI. In this photograph of M before its unrolling, on the right hand side of the scroll, one notices that the two outer rolls or sheets have their edges eroded away. The inner one is clearly the right hand edge of the sheet containing col. 18 (compare with Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, pl. 33). The outer right-hand edge of the external sheet does not correspond to any known right hand edge of parchment with text on it (see Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, pls. 16–34) and must therefore be the scroll’s protective cover. The fragmentary sheet containing the extra text was found inside this cover, as can be seen in Fig. 13 of *Dead Sea Scrolls*. In this picture taken at the very beginning of attempting to unroll the scroll, it is possible to see at least one loose fragment inside the scroll to the left, and it can be identified as one of the fragments constituting this extra text (the end of lines 3–5). Note that Fig. 11 shows the scroll after it has been partially unrolled (not “before” as the subtitle claims), since the visible sheets correspond to cols. 13 and 14.

to a different column.¹¹ What is clear, however, is that we do not know how long the text originally was.

1.2. *Fragments from the main scroll*

1.2.1. *Purchased fragments*

To this must be added a few fragments purchased along with the scroll and others which broke off from the main scroll when it was unrolled.¹² In Fig. 13 of the original publication, Sukenik shows how in the unrolling of the scroll, some fragments did break off of the main scroll. Eleven fragments are seen lying to the right of the scroll, in addition to at least one inside its outer sheet on the left hand side.¹³ In addition, Plate 47 of the same publication shows ten fragments, six of which can be identified from Fig. 13. The locations of all these fragments within M have been identified (see Table 1).¹⁴

¹¹ Carmignac suggested it belongs to col. 20 (*Règle de la Guerre*, 259). Hanan and Esther Eshel, for their part, suggested that it may be from a different composition altogether (“Recensions in the War Scroll,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery*, ed. Lawrence Harvey Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000], 354), and idea with which Yshai concurs (“ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 221, 317). However, because it was found inside the scroll’s protective over, I find this suggestion unlikely.

¹² Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35.

¹³ See note 10.

¹⁴ Two fragments pictured in Fig. 13 do not have a single decipherable letter on them. The one in the bottom right hand corner apparently broke while being handled subsequently to the photograph. Originally containing portions of three lines, only the letters עפ of the bottom one is visible in Plate 33, where Sukenik placed it. The upper portion of the fragment with the top two lines is missing, and Sukenik fails to include them in his transcription of col. 18. Consequently, determining if and where this fragment had been incorporated into M proved somewhat challenging. In checking to see if the location of the fragment had already been determined, I had noted that the עפ combination clearly visible on the bottom line could only fit the עפ succession at the end of 18:7, since it was the only place in 1QM where an עפ combination could allow for the upper portion of the fragment with its reading. However, the absence of the upper part of the fragment in Sukenik’s Plate 33 led me to believe that the עפ seen in Plate 33 was not that of the fragment from Fig. 13. I wish to thank Esther Eshel for helping me realize that it nevertheless is, and that the upper two lines had simply broken off prior to the fragment being inserted into the manuscript. Interestingly, the text at the end of 18:5–6 was nevertheless properly

TABLE 1: IQM FRAGMENT IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION				
Fragments	Sukenik	Yadin	Milik	Carmignac
	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i>	<i>Scroll of the War</i> ,	"Review of Sukenik,"	<i>Règle de la Guerre</i> ,
	Fig. 27;	35233	598	224
	Pls. 30, 34.			
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 1	15:11-16	15:11-16		
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 2 (= Fig. 13, fig. 11)	19:1-2	19:1-2		
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 3 (= Fig. 13, fig. 8)				
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 4			17:6-7	
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 5			18:12-14	
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 6 (= Fig. 13, fig. 9)			18:11-12	
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 7 (= Fig. 13, fig. 4)				
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 8				
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : II, Pl. 47, fig. 9 (= fig. 13, fig. 1)	15:16-19	19:9-11	19:8-11	18:15-17
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Plate 47, fig. 10 (= Fig. 13, fig. 2)		15: 16-18		
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Fig. 13, fig. 3		No decipherable letters	14:05	
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : fig. 13, fig. 5 (see Pl. 33)	18:3-4	No decipherable letters		
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Fig. 13, fig. 6				
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : fig. 13, fig. 7 (see Pl. 33)	18:7-8			
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Fig. 13, fig. 10	18:5-7			
Sukenik, <i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i> : Fig. 13, fig. 12 (left side)	19:4-6			
Barthélemy and Milik, <i>Qumran Cave I</i> : Plate XXXI, fig.1 (= IQ33)		18:7-10	18:7-12	
Barthélemy and Milik, <i>Qumran Cave I</i> : Plate XXXI, fig. 2 (= IQ33)		19:6-10	19:6-10	

1.2.2. *Fragments from the excavations in Cave 1*

Very soon, however, M material was not limited to that which had been purchased by Sukenik. Early in 1949, as soon as the exact location of the cave in which the first seven scrolls were discovered was identified (and subsequently named 1Q), excavations were undertaken to recover anything overlooked by the Bedouin.¹⁵ From these excavations, two more fragments (1Q33) belonging to M were found, the first preserving a portion of col. 18 and the second a portion of col. 19 (see Table 1).¹⁶ Also significant is that the latter fragment provides evidence of yet an additional column.¹⁷

reconstructed from very early on, as is evidenced in André Dupont-Sommer, “« Règlements de la guerre des fils de lumière »: Traduction et notes,” *RHR* 148 (1955): 177 and Jean van der Ploeg, “La règle de la guerre: traductions et notes,” *VT* 5 (1955): 419. The reconstruction of the lacunae at the end of 18:5 was ׀[לוי]ם and at the end of 18:6 was ׀[אלי]א. These reconstructions were accepted by Yadin, although he records some uncertainty about the one at the end of 18:6 (*The Scroll of the War*, 345). Today, these reconstructions have been unanimously accepted and can be found in all transcriptions of the text. However, they are still recorded only as reconstructions, and not as actual readings. It was not until the publication of the study edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls that the transcriptions were corrected to reflect the fact the 1955 reconstructions were indeed correct, based on the reading of this ‘lost half-fragment’ (see Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *1Q1–4Q273*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* [Leiden: Brill, 2000], 142–43). Note, however, that the Dead Sea Scroll Reader did not incorporate this small correction (see Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *Texts Concerned with Religious Law*, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, Part 1 [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 238–39).

¹⁵ These took place under the leadership of G. Lankester Harding of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan and the Father Roland de Vaux of the Ecole Biblique et Archéologique de Jérusalem, between February 15 and March 5, 1949. The report of the excavations were published in Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, DJD I (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 3–40.

¹⁶ Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, 135–36, Pl. XXI.

¹⁷ Jozef T. Milik, “Review of E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*,” *RB* 62 (1955): 597–601.

2. WAR TEXTS FROM CAVES 4 AND 11

2.1. *Discovery and identification*

In 1952, more caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran containing written materials were discovered and subsequently excavated, the most sensational being Cave 4a (4Q) with over 15,000 fragments comprising more than 600 documents. First discovered by the Bedouin, scholars were nonetheless able to locate it before all of its contents had been removed. Excavations were carried out from September 22 to 29, 1952.¹⁸ The search for caves culminated in February 1956 with the discovery, again by the Bedouin, of Cave 11 (11Q), the last cave to date in which texts from the Second Temple Period have been discovered. Although most of the scrolls had already been removed, it too was promptly excavated that same month to make sure that nothing was missed, and indeed a few fragments were found.¹⁹

From Cave 4, over 90 parchment fragments and more than 360 papyrus fragments were identified as relating to M, either as actual copies of the scroll or containing material closely related to it.²⁰ A first collection of some of these fragments was entrusted to Claus-Hunno Hunzinger for publication. He identified four different manuscripts into which he grouped the fragments: 4QM^{a-d}. Yet by 1957, Hunzinger had only published two fragments of 4QM^a.²¹ Meanwhile, other fragments assigned to various scholars were being identified as also relating to M. For the purpose of systematic and

¹⁸ Roland de Vaux, "Archéologie," in *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân*, ed. Maurice Baillet and Josef Tadeusz Milik, DJD III (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 3–4; Roland de Vaux, "Archéologie," in *Qumrân Grotte 4. II*, ed. Roland de Vaux and Jozef Tadeusz Milik, DJD VI (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 3–22.

¹⁹ Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport Préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e, et 5e Campagnes," *RB* 63 (1956): 533–34.

²⁰ John Allegro may have been the first to reveal the fact that there were more copies of M in Cave 4 ("Some Archaeological Sites and the Old Testament: Qumrân," *ExpTim* 66 [1955]: 262).

²¹ Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 67; "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran," *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51; "Replik," *ZAW* 70 (1958): 258–59.

consistent publication of the material, it proved necessary to reassign them to a single scholar. This was formally done in 1971, when Maurice Baillet added to his collection of M fragments from Cave 4 those of his colleagues. The lot was finally published in 1982.²²

2.2. Description of the manuscripts

2.2.1. 4Q491 (4QM^a/4QM1)

This is a group of 70 parchment fragments.²³ The script, also written hanging from ruled lines, though in this case they have since disappeared, is much smaller and more compact than M, leading to the suggestion that this may have been a private copy.²⁴ Hunzinger and Baillet located and reconstructed a number of joins, thereby reducing the number of fragments down to 37. The first 16 fragments were numbered as such based on sequential parallels with M, while the others which do not have any direct correspondence with M were grouped according to theme.²⁵ One particularity of the proposed reconstruction of frgs. 1–3 is that it implies a column width of over 130 characters, longer than any other scroll from the Qumran corpus.²⁶ However, owing to the very fragmentary nature of this

²² Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 12–72, pls. V–VIII, X, XII, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XXIV, XXVI. For his initial survey of the material and a history of the assignment of the fragments to various scholars, see “Les manuscrits de la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 79 (1972): 217–26 and “Le volume VII de ‘ Discoveries in the Judaean Desert ’: Présentation,” in *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. Mathias Delcor, BETL 46 (Paris: Duculot, 1978), 75–89. A summary can also be found in Duhaime, *War Texts*, 6–7.

²³ Hunzinger, “Fragmente,” 131–51; Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 12–44, Pls. V–VI; Martin G. Abegg, “The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4: A Critical Edition” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew Union College, 1992), 1–62; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 81–82; Duhaime, *War Texts*, 6–7, 24–30; Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה,” 25–191.

²⁴ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 12.

²⁵ Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 81.

²⁶ Abegg, “War Scroll,” 35–36. The joining of the three fragments is accepted by Qimron who offers a slightly different reconstruction (“תקנת המהדורות של מגילות” [ב] מדבר יהודה [ב] *Meghillot* 2 [2004]: 79–89), but rejected by Yshai (“ספרות המלחמה” [ב] *בקרואן*, 27–28, 303). Because of its uniqueness, Yshai’s perspective on the Cave 4 material will be dealt with separately (see below, beginning on page 34).

TABLE 2: IQM PARALLELS IN 4Q WAR TEXTS (Part 1)									
IQM Reference	Copies of IQM			Possible recessions of IQM					
	4Q492	4Q494	4Q495	4Q496	4Q491A	4Q491B	4Q493	4Q496	4Q471
1:4-9				fig. 3			fig. 3		
1:11-E				fig. 2+1			fig. 2+1		
[1:E]		1-3							fig. 1:1-2, ?
[1:E]									fig. 1:3-5
2:1-2*			4-6						fig. 1:6
2:3-4									
2:5-6				fig. 7					
2:9-10**				fig. 4 ?					fig. 7
2:9-12**				figs. 6+5					fig. 4 ?
2:10**									figs. 6+5
2:13-14				fig. 13					figs. 13
2:17									fig. 9 ?
2:E - 3:2									fig. 8
3:6-7									fig. 12
3:9-11									fig. 11
3:11-15									fig. 10
3:E - 4:2									fig. 16
4:6-7									fig. 35
5:16-17									
[6:E]									figs. 1-3:11-12
7:3-7									fig. 4 ?
7:10-11									figs. 1-3:6b-10
7:17									figs. 1-3:18
9:5-9									figs. 1-3:19
9:7-8									
9:17-E									fig. 15
[9:E]									
									4-6
									figs. 1-3:12
									figs. 1-3:12b-13

IQM PARALLELS IN 4Q WAR TEXTS (Part 2)						
IQM Reference	Copies of IQM		Possible recessions of IQM			
	4Q492	4Q494 4Q495 fig. 1	4Q496	4Q491A	4Q491B	4Q493 4Q496 4Q471
10:9-10						
12:1						
12:8-16***	fig. 1:1-8					fig. 97?
12:14-16***						
13:8-9						
13:9-12		fig. 2			fig. 7	
14:4-E						
[14:E]						
15:2-7 & 16:8-15				figs. 8-10 i:1-15 figs. 8-10 i:15-16 fig. 10 ii:7-14		
16:3 - 17:14				fig. 11 ii fig. 13:3-6 fig. 13:3-7		
16:3-7						
17:10-13						
[18:E]	fig. 2?					
19:1-14****	fig. 1:1-13					
19:7****						fig. 97:3?
[19:E]	fig. 2?					

Notes:

- Based on Duhaime, *War Scroll*, 82; *War Texts*, Tables 2-3

- *italics* - text in one composition reflecting different IQM passages:

* One word (עשרים) overlap between the three

** One word (מזלקות) overlap between all four; and one other word (מלזמה) between 4Q471 and 4Q496 (fig. 4:3)

*** The orthography of נזרים in 4Q496 fig. 97:1 (only word preserved in that line) only fits IQM 12:14, while the same word in 4Q492 only fits with IQM 19; while there are parallels with IQM 12, it seems as though 4Q492 reflects IQM 19, and not IQM 12. But note that there is no letter in line 1, not a single clear letter in line 2, and only two or three identifiable letters in line 3

**** Might share remnants of בנות עמי המנוה בקול in all three, with only 4Q492 having a vacat before it. Note that only two or three letters are readable in 4Q496 fig. 97.

text, no conclusions can be made with respect to the original appearance of the scroll.²⁷ It contains a collection of various rules for war, liturgical sections, and battle narratives, much like in M. Yet what is immediately visible with this arrangement of 4Q491 fragments is that it cannot be a straight copy of M: frgs. 17–37 preserve material non extant in M, and while frgs. 1–16 parallel M in content, the sequence is different. For example, Baillet’s frgs. 1–3:6–10 correspond roughly to 1QM 7:3–7 while his line 11 corresponds to 1QM 5:16–17 (see Table 2). At the very least, we are dealing here with a different version or recension of M. It is in an attempt to understand better the relationship between 4Q491 and M that Elisha Qimron has recently suggested a new reconstruction of frgs. 1–3 and 6–14.²⁸

One must also remember, however, that while Baillet’s publication of these fragments is generally accepted as standard, it is not certain. Martin Abegg was the first to suggest that Baillet ignored paleographical differences between the fragments.²⁹ Consequently, Abegg divided 4Q491 according to a rougher and a neater script, which he called Groups A and B. In addition, he noted that there were also orthographic differences between the two groups. Finally, difference in letter heights warranted a subdivision of Group B into B and C. The outcome of Abegg’s division of the material is that Group A has major parallels with M, especially cols. 14–17. Group B has no parallels longer than just a few words, suggesting it may be a different text, although still related to M.³⁰ He therefore named it “Formations for War.” Group C is devoid of any parallels, which led Abegg to the conclusion that it is a different work altogether. Abegg’s tripartite division of 4Q491 necessitated him to break down the 37 fragments into their original smaller units, although he ends up with 66, rather than the original 70 (See Table 3). Esther Eshel

²⁷ Abegg, “War Scroll,” 2, n. 22.

²⁸ Qimron, “לתקנת המהדורות (ב),” 79–84.

²⁹ Abegg, “War Scroll,” 61–73; Martin G. Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Craig Evans, A. and Peter W. Flint, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 61–73.

³⁰ See also Jean Duhaime, “Étude comparative de 4QM^a fgg. 1–3 et 1QM,” *RevQ* 14 (1991): 459–72.

TABLE 3: 4Q491 FRAGMENTS	
Abegg, <i>War Scroll</i>	Baillet, <i>Qumran Grotte 4</i>
A: frg. 1	frg. 8
A: frgs. 2-9	frg. 9
A: frg. 10, col. i	frg. 10, col. i
A: frg. 10, col. ii + frg. 11	frg. 10, col. ii
A: frg. 12	frg. 11, col. ii
A: frg. 13	frg. 22
A: frgs. 14-19	frg. 11, col. ii
A: frg. 20	frg. 13
A: frg. 21:1-6	frg. 14:5-10
A: frg. 22	frg. 15
A: frg. 23	frg. 18
A: frgs. 24-25	frg. 24
A: frg. 26	frg. 25
A: frg. 27	frg. 26
A: frg. 28	frg. 27
A: frg. 29	frg. 28
A: frg. 30	frg. 31
A: frg. 31	frg. 32
A: frg. 32	frg. 33
A: frg. 33	frg. 35
B: frgs. 1-5	frg. 1
B: frg. 6	frg. 3
B: frgs. 7-13	frg. 2
B: frgs. 14-15	frg. 4
B: frg. 16	frg. 5
B: frg. 17	frg. 6
B: frg. 18	frg. 7
B: frg. 19	frg. 16
B: frg. 20	frg. 17
B: frg. 21	frg. 19
B: frg. 22	frg. 20
B: frg. 23	frg. 21
B: frg. 24	frg. 23
C: frgs. 1-8	frg. 11, col. i
C: frg. 9	frg. 12

strengthened Abegg's conclusion by pointing out that some of the special orthography and phrases found in 4Q491C are characteristic of 4Q491C alone.³¹ In due fairness to Baillet, he had already noted the unique character of 4Q491 frgs. 11 and 12, which he had named "Cantique de Michel et cantique des justes" and "Cantique de Michel (?)" respectively.³² Today, it is assumed that both are from the same hymn, referred to as *Self-Glorification Hymn^b* (4Q491C).³³ Unfortunately, Abegg's division of the rest of 4Q491's fragments into two separate compositions (4Q491A and 4Q491B) both of which relate to M is not always noted, so that often only the sigla 4Q491 is used.³⁴

2.2.2. 4Q492 (4QM^b/4QM2)

4Q492 (4QM^b/4QM2) is comprised of three fragments written in a very similar, if not the same hand as M. Here, the ruled lines were deeply incised, often causing the parchment to fracture along them. From what can be discerned, its content parallels 1QM 19:1–14 almost exactly,³⁵ and considering that it may be a copy of M, it may

³¹ Esther Eshel, "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 176.

³² Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 26, 29.

³³ See also Duhaime, *War Texts*, 35–36, and below, note 67.

³⁴ For example, the division of 4Q491 was accepted by Duhaime (*War Texts*, 24–30), but not taken into consideration by Yshai, as the paleographical differences were not discernible in the photographs off of which she based her work ("ספרות בקומראן, המלחמה בקומראן," 24–25). It is obvious, therefore, that without consulting the physical fragments anew, it is impossible to double check Abegg's conclusion. However, the thoroughness with which he carried out his work suggests the division is not artificial. Indeed, it is what enabled him to identify 4Q491C as a different composition altogether, something which is now universally accepted. Ironically, Florentino García Martínez who to my knowledge is the lone dissenter on this matter, nevertheless accepts Abegg's division of 4Q491 into compositions A and B ("Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The 'I' of Two Qumran Hymns," *ETL* [2002]: 321–39; *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*, ed. Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *STDJ* 63 [Leiden: Brill, 2007], 105–25). Furthermore, this division into 4Q491A and B is consistent with the conclusions of the present study (see the discussion beginning on page 374.)

³⁵ See page 282, note 117.

even be preserving text which either preceded or followed what is extant of 1QM 19.³⁶

2.2.3. 4Q493 (4QM^c/4QM3)

4Q493 (4QM^c/4QM3) does not have the usual ruled lines, and its irregular lines slope slightly downward to the left. It is composed of two parchment fragments with a clear join between them, preserving both an upper and a lower margin. With the left hand margin intact, it is unfortunate that the right edge is eroded, without which the entire column width would have been preserved. 4Q493 does not reveal any exact parallels with M, though thematically it relates very closely to the contents of 1QM 7:9–9:9, especially 9:7–8.³⁷

2.2.4. 4Q494 (4QM^d/4QM4)

4Q494 (4QM^d/4QM4) is a single parchment fragment containing the beginning of six lines of texts, paralleling 1QM 1:E(nd)–2:3. Like 4Q493, it does not have the usual ruled lines, though the script is more carefully written. With 1QM 2:1–3 as a guide, it is possible to suggest a complete reconstruction of lines 2–6 which may not have a single variant from what is preserved in M.³⁸ Should it therefore be

³⁶ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 45–49, Pl. VII; Abegg, “War Scroll,” 63–65; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 81, 168–71; Duhaime, *War Texts*, 20–21; Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 192–223.

³⁷ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 49–53; Abegg, “War Scroll,” 73–76; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 81, 172–73; Duhaime, *War Texts*, 30; Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 224–54. Abegg’s arguments suggesting that 4Q493 should not be considered as part of the M corpus, but rather as part of “a priestly handbook” together with *Tohorot B^a* (4Q276), are unconvincing. While the two documents may share the same script and relate to priestly roles, they are discussing two very different contexts. Furthermore, the parallels between 4Q493 and M are too significant to be dismissed, especially when no such parallels exist between 4Q493 and 4Q276 (see also Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 254, 319–20).

³⁸ This depends on whether or not one chooses to reconstruct a *vacat* at the end of line 5. For a discussion of possible reconstructions and their implications, see the discussion below, beginning on page 221.

a copy of M, it is highly likely that 4Q494:1–2 provide us with portions of the missing text from the very bottom of 1QM 1.³⁹

2.2.5. 4Q495 (4QM^e/4QM5)

4Q495 (4QM^e/4QM5) is comprised of two parchment fragments which cannot be joined. Both margins and lines are ruled and the script is clean. The parallel of frg. 1 with 1QM 10:9–10 is reasonable, although it could be challenged.⁴⁰ The equating of frg. 2 with 1QM 13:9–12, however, seems certain.⁴¹ A reconstruction based on M suggests that it differed only slightly, and should therefore be considered a copy of the same recension as M.⁴²

2.2.6. 4Q496 (4QM^f/4QM6)

4Q496 is one of at least four texts found on a single papyrus document that was retrieved from Cave 4 in no less than 313 fragments. On the front side is a collection of liturgical prayers, all of which are written in the same hand.⁴³ Sometime later, 4Q496 was written on

³⁹ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 53–54, Pl. VIII; Abegg, “War Scroll,” 77–78; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 82, 174–75; Duhaime, *War Texts*, 21; Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה,” 255–71.

⁴⁰ Abegg questions whether we are even dealing with the same scribe as in frg. 2, and points out that the available letters could also fit with CD 19:11–13 or 1QS 5:8–9 (“War Scroll,” 80). To this list can be added 4Q387 (Jer C^b) frg. 3:5–6. Abegg’s equivocation of 4Q495 to S depends on seeing remnants of a letter prefixing the word ברית of line 2. Should there be such, then this would be a variant from 1QM 9:10, and one could also add 1QS 5:1–2, 1QSa 1:6–7, 1QDM (ApocrMoses^a?) frg. 1 i:7–8 and 4Q387 frg. 3:7–8 to the list of possible parallels. Plate VIII in DJD VII is unclear, but seems to suggest that there was no such letter. Whatever the case, whether or not one chooses to assign 4Q495 frg. 1 to the War Texts, it makes no difference, as nothing is gained or lost.

⁴¹ Milik, “Review of Sukenik,” 599; Jozef T. Milik, “Milki-šedeq et Milkî-rešac dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 139–42; Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 54–56, Pl. VIII; Abegg, “War Scroll,” 79–80; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 176–77; *War Texts*, 21–22; Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 272–83.

⁴² For a discussion of the differences, see page 372.

⁴³ The collection is known as 4Q509 (papPrFêtes^c), the earliest of three copies from Cave 4 of a composition known as *Festival Prayers*. See Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 57, 185–215 and James H. Charlesworth and Dennis. T. Olson, “Prayers for Festivals,” in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*, vol. 4A

the back side. It is preserved on 123 of the 313 fragments, although only 23 of them have recognizable words on them.⁴⁴ Later, yet another text was added to the back side of this scroll: 4Q506 (pap-DibHam^c or *Words of the Luminaries*^c).⁴⁵ Why these different texts ended up on the same scroll, either purposefully or circumstantially, remains a mystery. To complicate matters, the papyrus fragments themselves were not in good shape, and the ink was often no longer visible. In Baillet's words: "L'édition s'est heurté à de telles difficultés que, dans la majorité des cas, on a trouvé plus prudent de ne pas combler les lacunes de part et d'autre des fragments."⁴⁶ Still, the remains of columns can be identified and there is no doubt that there is a very close connection with 1QM 1–3. Jean Duhaime's suggestion that it should be considered as a copy of the same recension as M,⁴⁷ however, is probably too optimistic.⁴⁸ Reconstructing 4Q496

of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1997), 46–49, 62–105. On the same side is also 4Q505 (papDibHam^b) or *Words of the Luminaries*^b, the second of three such texts from Cave 4. See Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 57, 168–70 and Dennis. T. Olson, "Words of the Lights," in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*, vol. 4A of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1997), 107–9, 144–45, and the bibliography listed there.

⁴⁴ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 12–44, Pls. X, XII, XIV, XVI, XVIII, XXIV; Abegg, "War Scroll," 81–97; Duhaime, "War Scroll," 81, 178–79; *War Texts*, 22–23; Yshai, "ספרות המלהמה בקומראן," 284–301.

⁴⁵ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 170–75 and Olson, "Words of the Lights," 107–9, 146–53 and the bibliography listed there.

⁴⁶ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 58.

⁴⁷ Duhaime, *War Texts*, 22–23.

⁴⁸ Of course, this depends on how one defines the point at which the variants have become too significant in a copy of a text to continue calling it the same recension. Here is not the place to debate the matter, but simply to point out the rational behind my choice. Duhaime's assessment is understandable when comparing 4Q496 to 4Q491 or 4Q493, 4Q496 being much more similar to M than the other two. However, when comparing 4Q496 to 4Q492, 4Q494, or 4Q495, its variance from M is much more significant than in these others, albeit possibly only because it preserves more extant text than the other three. Nevertheless, in my classification of M material, I have chosen to highlight the gap between those texts which are nearly identical to M and those that have a significant increase in deviation from it. Abegg also divides the M material in this way ("War Scroll," v).

on the basis of M reveals that there must have been several changes to the text, even where it seems to follow M quite faithfully (frgs. 1–7, 13). For the rest of the text (frgs. 8–12, 15ff), even when it can be tentatively correlated to M, it is even more problematic, as the results of such an exercise do not yield any consistent line lengths within the individual columns. The changes necessary to rectify this are too significant to allow for 4Q496 to be considered of the same recension as M. Finally, of those fragments which could not be placed in M's text (frgs. 17–122), several of them have the remains of five to six lines, and it would seem too coincidental that their non-identification is due to the fact that they all preserve non-extant text from the bottom of M's columns. When noting that several of these deal with banners, trumpets, and the inscriptions on them, the same topics being dealt with in frgs. 8–12 and 15–17, it seems that Abegg's assessment is to be preferred: "we must conclude that 4Q496 represents a work whose remains consist of a similar introduction, specifying the preparations for battle (4Q496 f1–7, 13), with a variant or more extensive section detailing the naming of the trumpets and banners (4Q496 f8, 10–12, 16, 35)."⁴⁹ While the document as a whole cannot be considered as an identical recension of 1QM, it nevertheless seems reasonable to consider fragments 1–7, 13 as an additional witness of its text (1QM 1:4–2:14).⁵⁰

2.2.7. 4Q497 (4QM^s/4QM7)

4Q497 is another text written on the back of an already-used papyrus scroll consisting of 54 fragments.⁵¹ The recto preserves 4Q499 which Baillet thought to be some kind of hymn or prayer,⁵² but it

⁴⁹ Abegg, "War Scroll," 82.

⁵⁰ Had only these fragments been found, undoubtedly 4Q496 would have been classified as a copy of M. Conversely, it is impossible to know whether any or all of 4Q492, 4Q494, and 4Q495 were part of longer texts which also deviated from M, just as 4Q496 does.

⁵¹ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 69–72, Pl. XXVI; Duhaime, "War Scroll," 81, 198–203; Duhaime, *War Texts*, 31.

⁵² Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 74–77.

happens to be a copy of the “Prayer of Enosh.”⁵³ As with 4Q496, it is not known why these different texts were written on the same papyrus document. The fragments of 4Q497 and their preserved text are in very bad condition. To make matters worse, no fragment preserves more than a single complete word per line, and there are never more than two words which are complete per fragment. Baillet was not even sure if all the fragments should even be assigned to the same papyrus document. Nevertheless, he still named it “Texte ayant quelques rapports avec la règle de la guerre,” today commonly referred to as *papWar Scroll-Like Text A*. For obvious reasons, any suggested parallels to M must remain extremely tentative, if not to be rejected altogether. Indeed, Abegg suggests that on the basis of the 16 preserved words of 4Q497, as many lexical parallels can be found with the *Damascus Document* (CD; D) as with M.⁵⁴

2.2.8. 4Q285 and 11Q14

Other documents from Caves 4 and 11, although not assigned to Baillet, were also found to relate to M. All these texts, except for one (11Q14), were published a decade or more later than Baillet’s material. Although 11Q14 was already published in 1968 by Adam van der Woude, it was not originally recognized as relating specifically to M, and was consequently first named 11QBer(*aḳot*).⁵⁵ It is an ensemble of eight parchment pieces, the largest of which is very well preserved. It joins with three of the others, and the location of a fourth has been tentatively reconstructed, leaving only four fragments. 11Q14 preserves portions of two columns which the final editors, Florentino García Martínez, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Adam van der Woude, have determined to be portions of the third and second last columns of the original scroll.⁵⁶ While the sheet was ruled,

⁵³ Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “4Q499 48+47 (par 4Q369 1 II): A Forgotten Identification,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 303–6.

⁵⁴ Abegg, “War Scroll,” 135–39.

⁵⁵ Adam S. van der Woude, “Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran (11 Q Ber),” in *Bible und Qumran* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 253–58.

⁵⁶ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QSefer Hamilhamah,” 243–51, Pl. XXVIII, and the bibliography listed there. See also Duhaime, *War Texts*, 33–35. On the identification of 11Q14’s scribe as being from

the scribe was not too careful in respecting these guides. That the content related to M was confirmed by the publication of 4Q285, a second copy of the same text. 4Q285 is comprised of twenty fragments, though sufficient joins were determinable so that it has been reduced down to ten.⁵⁷ No signs of ruling were preserved on the parchment fragments, and irregularity between the fragments allowed for some doubt as to whether or not all the fragments were indeed from the same text.⁵⁸ Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes who were responsible for its publication suggested that the fragments are preserving the remains of six consecutive columns, each containing about 13 lines of text of about 50 to 55 letter-spaces per line.⁵⁹ Reconstruction of the text was facilitated by 11Q14, especially since no differences between the two copies were noted, except for a possible variant in 4Q285 1:9.⁶⁰ While it is clear that the content relates to M, the preserved text of 4Q285/11Q14 does not overlap at all with M. Jozef Milik originally suggested that this text preserved a non-extant portion of the end of M.⁶¹ Abegg has sought to bolster this conclusion by examining 4Q285's "specialized vocabulary" and its lexical overlaps with M.⁶² Even so, the relationship between the two cannot be confirmed, and most scholars have preferred leaving the matter unresolved. It does seem that 4Q285/11Q14 deals with a later phase of the eschatological war than what is described in M, since

Qumran, see Eugene Ulrich, "Identification of a Scribe Active at Qumran: 1QPsb-4QIsa^c-11QM," *Meghillot* 5-6 (2007): *201-10.

⁵⁷ Alexander and Vermes, "4QSefer Ha-Milhamah," 228-46, Pl. XII-XIII, and the bibliography listed there. See also Duhaime, *War Texts*, 31-33.

⁵⁸ Abegg casts doubt particularly on frg. 9, due to the larger size of its script ("War Scroll," 98).

⁵⁹ Independently, Abegg also suggested a line length of 50 to 55 letter spaces ("War Scroll," 99).

⁶⁰ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, "11QSefer Ha-Milhamah," 244. For a reconstructed text assimilating both 4Q285 and 11Q14, see Alexander and Vermes, "4QSefer Ha-Milhamah," 241-43, as well as Bilhah Nitzan, "Benedictions and Instructions for the Eschatological Community (11QBer; 4Q285)," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 77-90, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Working with Few Data: The Relationship Between 4Q285 and 11Q14," *DSD* 7 (2000): 49-56.

⁶¹ Milik, "Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša'," 143.

⁶² Martin G. Abegg, "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment," *JBL* 113 (1994): 81-91.

4Q285 mentions the capture and putting to death of the wicked leader, events not recorded in what is extant in M. Even so, it remains only a possibility.⁶³ Thus, in order to avoid confusion with M, this composition has been named *Sefer haMilhamah*.⁶⁴

2.2.9. 4Q471

4Q471 was originally the designation for a group of ten fragments all apparently belonging to the same manuscript as the first of these fragments. However, these have since been recognized as preserving four different texts, based either on varying scripts or content differences. Frgs. 4 and 5 are now identified as *Prayer Concerning God and Israel* (4Q471c),⁶⁵ frg. 6 is called *Polemical Text* (4Q471a),⁶⁶ and frgs. 7–10 are known as *Self-Glorification Hymn*^a (4Q471b).⁶⁷ Only the first three fragments are believed to emanate

⁶³ See page 352 and following for additional evidence as to why 4Q285 and 11Q14 are not copies of M, but represent a different composition altogether.

⁶⁴ Other titles proposed were *4QEschatological War*, *4QApocalyptic War*, *4QSerekh ha-Milhamah*, and *4QBerakhot-Milhamah* (4QBM). See Alexander and Vermes, “4QSefer Ha-Milhamah,” 232, n. 1.

⁶⁵ Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “471. 4QWar Scroll-Like Text B,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, Stephen J. Pfann, et al., DJD XXXVI (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 439.

⁶⁶ Esther Eshel and Menahem Kister, “A Polemical Qumran Fragment,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 277–81; Esther Eshel and Menahem Kister, “471a. 4QPolemical Text,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, Stephen J. Pfann, et al., DJD XXXVI (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 446–49, Pl. XXXI.

⁶⁷ Esther Eshel, “4Q471B,” 175–203. Later, it was suggested that 4Q471b is actually part of H, and therefore published as 4Q431. See Eileen Schuller, “431. 4QHodayot^e,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XX - Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, Esther Chazon, et al., DJD XXIX (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 199–208. It is interesting to note that two texts once thought to be related to M, 4Q491 frgs. 11–12 (4Q491C) and 4Q471 frgs. 7–10 (4Q471b), happen to preserve the same composition *Self-Glorification Hymn*. However, it should not have any influence on our understanding of M for, in addition to content differences, these compositions were separated from their respective M materials based on paleographical differences, precluding this hymn from having once been part of the larger corpus of M. García Martínez, who rejects the suggestion that 4Q491C is a different composition than 4Q491B, consequently believes that both 4Q471b and 4Q491B do in fact relate to M (“The ‘I’ of Two Qumran Hymns,” 321–39; *Qumran Minora I*, 105–25). Yet even he concedes that the Hymn in question does not attribute to its protagonist any “military function” (*Qumran Minora I*, 121), and that it was “inserted in the context

from the same scroll as frg. 1 which has clear connections to M. No joins exist between the three fragments, so that each fragment stands independently: frg. 1 preserves parts of nine lines along with a portion of the left margin, frg. 2 has the remains of 11 lines, and only portions of five words over four lines are visible on frg. 3. However, while frg. 1 has some clear overlaps with M, frgs. 2 and 3 do not. Nevertheless, certain shared phrases with M confirm the relationship between the two documents. 4Q471 has therefore been called *War Scroll-Like Text B*.⁶⁸

of materials related to the eschatological war” (p. 122; italics mine). Should García Martínez’s assumption be correct, it must also be pointed out that the Hymn was then duly removed from such a war context very soon thereafter. It is nowhere to be found in M’s extant text, nor is it likely that it was once part of the end which has been lost: 4Q491B (to which García Martínez associates 4Q491C) and 4Q471 (if one even agrees that it is related to the eschatological war; see below, page 231) relate to cols 2–13 of M (see the discussion below, beginning on page 371), and not the last section of M which begins at col. 15. Thus, while García Martínez may well be right in that this *Self-Glorification Hymn* (4Q471b and 4Q491C) is not related to H as is currently thought, its relationship to M, if there ever was any, would have been short lived. (One possible scenario as to how such a development may have happened is tentatively suggested below, note 39 on page 379.) Furthermore, even the Hymn’s contents are out of character with the rest of M Material. García Martínez suggests that it is a prayer of victory to be said by a kind of “heavenly messiah” (p. 124), “the head of the heavenly army who opposed the army of darkness” (p. 122). If so, the Hymn is all the more an anomaly in M because all the texts on the eschatological war never do anything more than taking the existence of such an angelic being for granted. Nowhere are any of the specifics of his role during the eschatological war described; we only know that he is ‘there’ and that because of his involvement, whatever it may be, the war will be won. Why then would a scribe isolate this one aspect of the angelic being’s role and insert it into a body of literature which details the responsibilities of mortals only (see also note 26 on page 375)? For all these reasons, I prefer leaving this *Self-Glorification Hymn* outside of the M Material. This is not to deny what appears to be a close relationship between the two compositions, but that is an issue which transcends the scope of the present study. For a survey of the matter, see Duhaime, *War Texts*, 35–40.

⁶⁸ Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “4QWar Scroll-Like Text B,” 439–45, Pl. XXX; Duhaime, *War Texts*, 23–24. Note that Abegg does not agree with the link between 4Q471 frg. 1 and 1QM 2; instead he has suggested linking it to the *Temple Scroll* (“4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity,” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen, JSOTSup 184 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994], 136–47). Even so, the text is useful for our investigation of M.

3. DATING OF THE WAR TEXTS

Paleographically, all of the above texts are to be dated somewhere between the beginning of the first century BCE and the first quarter of the first century CE (see Table 4). Sukenik himself only ventured to say that M was copied before the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE.⁶⁹ However, there is almost complete unanimity among scholars that M was copied in the second half of the first century BCE.⁷⁰ 4Q493 is believed to be the earliest manuscript of the lot, dating to the first half of the first century BCE. 4Q496, 4Q497, and 4Q471 have been dated to the middle of the first century BCE, around 50 BCE, with 4Q496 possibly being a little earlier than 4Q497. These four texts all predate M which is written in early Herodian script, during the second half of the first century BCE.⁷¹ Contemporaneous with it are

⁶⁹ Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 36.

⁷⁰ Yadin suggested the scroll was copied between 50 BCE and 50 CE (*The Scroll of the War*, 243). William F. Albright placed it between 30 BCE and “the first decades of the Christian era (“Some Books Reviewed by the Editor,” *BASOR* 143 [1956]: 34). Frank M. Cross suggested it was from the last third of the first century BCE (“The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, W. F. Albright Festschrift, ed. George Ernest Wright [New York: Doubleday, 1961], 138). Salomon Birnbaum put it in the third quarter of the first century BCE (*The Hebrew Script* [Leiden: Brill, 1971], 150). Baillet placed it more in the middle of the first century BCE (*Qumrân Grotte 4*, 45), as does Ada Yardeni (“247. 4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks: Paleography and Date,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, Stephen J. Pfann, et al., DJD XXXVI [Oxford: Clarendon, 2000], 188). Note the difference between Baillet and Cross’ dating of M. Because of this, Baillet’s absolute dating as given in DJD VII must be adjusted to fall in line with Cross’ dates which are considered the standard. Two attempts of doing so are shown in Table 4. First comes Baillet’s absolute dating. Second is a way of taking Baillet’s relative chronology and realigning it with Cross’ dates. Third is what has been published in DJD XXIX. However, this last one ignores Baillet’s relative chronology. I follow the dates in the second bloc, while being mindful that they may in fact be a bit earlier and closer to Baillet’s absolute dating.

⁷¹ There is some lack of clarity with 4Q471, as on the one hand the Eshels classify it as having a “Herodian Script” (Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “4QWar Scroll-Like Text B,” 439), which according to Cross can go from as early as 50 BCE to as late as 50 CE (“Jewish Scripts,” 175–76). Abegg, for example, associates it with 4Q494, the latest of all the Cave 4 War Texts (“War Scroll,” 77). Yet the Eshels also specifically state that 4Q471 is contemporaneous with 4Q496 and 4Q497 (“Recensions,” 352).

4Q492, 4Q495, and 4Q285. Slightly later is 4Q491, though still predating the turn of the era.⁷² The latest copies are 4Q494 and 11Q14, dated to the first decades of the first century CE.⁷³

3.1. *The common view*

In summary, there are as many as 11 documents which relate to M, either as copies of it, or as compositions dealing with subject matters very similar to it.⁷⁴ Traditionally, it is held that four of them, 4Q491 (excluding frgs. 11 i & 12), 4Q492, 4Q494, and 4Q495, should be considered as copies of a recension similar to M, even though there are obvious variants, while 4Q493, 4Q496, and 4Q471 (frgs. 1–2 only) contain differences so significant that although they have abundant parallels with M, thematic as well as textual, they are not thought to be copies of M. Finally, while it has been suggested that 4Q285 and 11Q14 may preserve non-extant material from M, it is also just as possible that this text may be a different composition altogether, albeit very much related to the eschatological war described in M.⁷⁵

⁷² Abegg, however, classifies 4Q491's paleographical dating to the late Hasmonean or early Herodian period ("War Scroll," 12, 35), thus more or less contemporaneous with 4Q493.

⁷³ For a discussion of the paleographical dating of the various texts other than M, see Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 12–72 (4Q491-7), Duhaime, "War Scroll," 81–84 (1QM, 4Q491-7), Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "Recensions," 352 (1QM, 4Q491-7), Alexander and Vermes, "4QSefer Ha-Milhamah," 232 (4Q285), Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "4QWar Scroll-Like Text B," 439 (4Q471), and García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, "11QSefer Ha-Milhamah," 244 (11Q14). Note as well the summary in Brian Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert - Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, ed. Emanuel Tov, DJD XXXIX (Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 351–446, though it is less precise.

⁷⁴ This total is arrived at if one accepts Abegg's division of 4Q491 into three documents, two of which relate to M. However, in the rest of this study, I do not take 4Q497 into consideration, since its extreme fragmentary nature precludes it from having any significance.

⁷⁵ At least according to the reference works on the War Texts published by Duhaime (Duhaime, "War Scroll," 82; *War Texts*, 12–44). See also below, page 352.

3.2. *Yshai's view*

Rony Yshai's Ph.D. dissertation had the purpose of re-examining the Cave 4 materials (4Q491–4Q496) in order to understand better their relationship to M.⁷⁶ It is by far the most extensive commentary on those texts that exists to date. Her conclusion about their relationship to M contradicts what has been hitherto assumed. In her opinion, none of the Cave 4 documents are copies of M, and it is even impossible to know whether or not they may be different recensions of M or completely different compositions altogether.⁷⁷ In her opinion, the similarities between all the fragments can be explained by a body of shared literature about the eschatological war that was used by all the authors, editors, or compilers of these various texts.⁷⁸ She even doubts that M could have been a standardized text that was given more authority than the other war literature found at Qumran, and parallels this situation with the results of recent research concerning those texts which recounts the sectarians' history (D), rules (S), and liturgy (H).⁷⁹

Ultimately, Yshai's new evaluation of the Cave 4 material has only limited impact on the present study, as for the present purposes it matters little how one categorizes the various texts and their relationship to M. The important point is that they are all related. Personally, I think that Yshai has tended to be too conservative in her own judgment of the situation, though she has rightfully alerted us to the possibility that none of the texts from Cave 4 need be copies of M. But the same skepticism which has led her to such a conclusion can also be used against it. Finding a lack of positive evidence that none of the Cave 4 texts are indeed exact copies of M, she has concluded that they are not. However, she has failed to consider that at times it is equally as impossible to find positive evidence that they are not copies of M.

⁷⁶ Yshai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן."

⁷⁷ Yshai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 323; Rony Yshai, "הדגם של תיאור מלחמת הקץ," בספרות קומראן *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 125; Rony Yshai, "התפילות בספרות מהלחמה," *Meghillot* 5–6 (2007): 129–47.

⁷⁸ Yshai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 323–27.

⁷⁹ Yshai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 327–28.

Probably the clearest example of this is 4Q494. This text is particularly important because it is outside of most of the arguments she uses to demonstrate that the Cave 4 texts are not necessarily copies of M. Indeed, Yshai has noted that almost all of the similarities between the War Texts can be attributed to independent literary units, such as set prayers which are seldom edited if at all, or literary models for the description of the war and the speech of encouragement to the soldiers, both of which are also hardly ever edited much. These she believes came from a previous literary tradition about the eschatological war, and were used as building blocks by the various authors, editors, or compilers, each one in his own way, as they shaped the various compositions on the eschatological war.⁸⁰ In her opinion, it is the common use of these independent literary units that accounts for most if not all the similarities between the War Texts, and not some other kind of interdependence. However, 4Q494 does not have any one of these ‘standardized’ literary units and can therefore not be discounted as a copy of M because of its possible dependence on such elements that may have existed prior to M’s composition or compilation. Yshai does not refute that its lines 4–6 are very similar to 1QM 2:1–2, if not identical. She nevertheless rejects it as being a possible copy, on the basis that lines 1–3 of 4Q494 are not paralleled in 1QM 2, nor do they appear to be the continuation of the discussion of what is extant at the end of col. 1.⁸¹ What is not known, however, is how many lines there may have originally been in col. 1, or if its subject matter could have changed immediately after what is preserved at the bottom, leaving enough space for the author to start a new subject which could have included everything preserved in lines 1–3 of 4Q494. Her conclusion, therefore, is based on the assumption that this was not the case. Since it cannot be proven, however, such a possibility nonetheless remains.

A second difficulty with Yshai’s approach is that she assumes that since the texts are not entirely similar, and that it is impossible to tell if one is based on another, that consequently they must all be relying on a shared body of literature about the eschatological war, rather

⁸⁰ Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 310, 325.

⁸¹ Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 270.

than on each other.⁸² Thus, while her proposal for the literary relationship of the various War Texts is possible, it ignores an alternate possibility: could it be that the similarities in these ‘standardized’ units (prayers, literary model for the description of the war, literary model for the description of the speech of encouragement) were originally developed within one of the war compositions, only to be imitated by other writings on the war? Accordingly, the similarities would not be due to their common reliance upon a shared body of war literature no longer extant as suggested by Yshai, but because of their interdependence. Again, it may not be possible to find positive proof for such a scenario in the development of the compositions about the eschatological war, but neither does it negate it. An example is 4Q493. It is the earliest of all our War Texts, and it preserves the simplest and shortest descriptions of a number of topics found in M, though not necessarily in the same order.⁸³ While Yshai allows for the possibility that it may have been a source for M,⁸⁴ she fails to consider that it may have been a primitive text which over time developed into the more elaborate texts such as M and 4Q491.⁸⁵

In light of such issues, her conclusion, while ultimately possible, is not the only conceivable scenario for understanding the relationship of all the War Texts. This caveat notwithstanding, her work is an important contribution to our understanding of the relationship between the Cave 4 war texts and M, and the observations she has made must be taken into account, especially about the ‘standardized’ units she has identified, and how they are reflected in the various war compositions. In addition, she has suggested several places where the accepted combination and/or order of the fragments within 4Q491 ought to be revised. I list them here briefly, without expounding on all of her reasons, since it is not central to the present

⁸² Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 310, 324–25.

⁸³ Duhaime, *War Texts*, 30; Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 252–53.

⁸⁴ Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 253.

⁸⁵ Her reason for not doing so is because she contends that 4Q493 has a different perspective on the war than M. According to her, 4Q493 is intended exclusively for priests, while M is from the perspective of the soldiers and the entire congregation (“ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 253, 319). However, M is not from the perspective of the soldiers nor the entire congregation, but of the priests only, just as in 4Q493 (see the discussion below, beginning on page 348).

study. They are important nonetheless, as they affect the way one considers 4Q491's content. First, she rejects that frgs. 1–3 of 4Q491 should be joined together, and that a fragment called 3a should be joined to frg. 2 rather than to frg. 3. Second, she denies that 4Q491 frg. 9 should be connected to frg. 10 i. Third, she rightly suggests that fragments 10 ii, 13, 14+15, 18 and 22 should be ordered in the following sequence: 22, 18, 10 ii, 13, 14+15, as it then accurately reflects the proper battle sequence as described in all the War Texts.⁸⁶

3.3. *Classification of the War Texts adopted in this study*

In conclusion, while I concur with Yshai that it cannot be proven that the Cave 4 texts are copies of M or its possible recensions, neither do I agree that one should discount such a possibility. Consequently, I am choosing to adopt the more common approach to the classification of these texts. Of the 11 documents of War Texts, therefore, there may be both copies of a recension similar to M as well as several copies of different recensions, although one should remember that they could also be different compositions altogether, or that some of the texts may have been sources used in the composition or redaction of the Cave 1 manuscript, or even of other Cave 4 compositions.⁸⁷ Three texts are classified as possible copies of the same recension as M. Two of them, 4Q492 and 4Q495, date to the second half of the first century BCE and are contemporaneous to M, while the last, 4Q494, dates to the first decades of the first century CE. Noteworthy is the fact that no extant copies of what could be the same recension as M predate it.⁸⁸ However, we have seen that it is reasonable to use the first part of 4Q496 (frgs. 1–7, 13) as if it were a

⁸⁶ Yshai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 26–28, 79–80, 303–5. For the details of this battle sequence, see the discussion below on trumpet use (beginning on page 305) and on the battle narratives (beginning on page 312).

⁸⁷ Yshai denies that there is any overlap between the Cave 4 texts, yet at the same time she admits that both 4Q491 and 4Q493 contain battle narratives ("ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 305, 309). As mentioned above, there is no reason 4Q491 could not be a literary development based on 4Q493.

⁸⁸ However, see above, note 50.

copy of M. Being from the first half of the first century BCE, it predates M and provides us with a window into the earliest extant stages of M's transmission. Nevertheless, apart from 4Q492, the texts are very small and fragmentary, and they offer only limited help in furthering our understanding of M, either in its content or in its literary development.

Another four texts may be a collection of various compositions all relating to the eschatological war, possibly used as sources for M, or simply different recensions of M.⁸⁹ The earliest of these manuscripts, 4Q493, followed shortly thereafter by 4Q496 and 4Q471, are from the first half of the first century BCE. All predate M. 4Q491,⁹⁰ however, may slightly postdate M, but still precedes the turn of the era. Based on textual overlaps, they could not all be preserving the same recension: there would be at least two, but possibly as many as four, additional ones (see Table 2).⁹¹ Whether or not any one of these potential recensions was copied more than once in an attempt to standardize the text is impossible to determine. The extant evidence points to the possibility that it was the case with M's recension only. Additionally, it may be that these additional texts are preserving a certain progression or development in the composition of M material over almost an entire century. Could it be that this evolution came to an end as the M recension was being standardized and copied?

⁸⁹ While it cannot be established that these texts are indeed different recensions of M rather than independent compositions on the eschatological war, I have nevertheless chosen to follow Duhaime's terminology and call them recensions (*War Texts*, 23).

⁹⁰ On the reasons for not considering 4Q491 as a copy of the same recension as M, see my arguments above in the discussion of the document, page 20.

⁹¹ The only overlaps between the different Cave 4 texts are: 4Q471 frg. 1:3–5 and 4Q494:4–6 both parallel the text of 1QM 2:1–2, although only one word is common to all three; 4Q471 frg. 1:8–9 and 4Q496 frgs. 4–6 parallel 1QM 2:9–10, once again with only one word common to all three texts; 4Q493:4–6 and 4Q496 frg. 15 reflect the subject matter of 1QM 9:5–9, but they do not overlap with each other; finally, it has been tentatively suggested that 4Q496 frg. 97 is another copy, together with 4Q492 frg. 1, of the prayer preserved in 1QM 12:8–16 and 1QM 19:1–8. While it is certain that 4Q492 reflects 1QM 19 and not 1QM 12, this is not so easily determinable with 4Q496 frg. 97.

Finally, while it remains theoretically possible that 4Q285 and 11Q14 may preserve a portion of the non-extant end of M, it is just as likely that this text is a different composition altogether, albeit very much related to the eschatological war described in M. The first copy (4Q285) is dated to the second half of the first century BCE, and is therefore more or less contemporaneous to M, 4Q491, 4Q492, and 4Q495. 11Q14 is from the first decades just after the turn of the era, slightly later than 4Q494, the latest copy of a recension similar to M. Since there are few variants between the two texts, it would appear that this composition did not undergo much evolution.

4. PROVENANCE OF THE WAR TEXTS AND POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS

One final observation needs to be highlighted. Except for 11Q14, all of the War texts comes from Caves 1 and 4. Recently, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra studied the dates of the manuscripts found in the various Qumran caves and came to the conclusion that these two caves are to be considered separately from all the others.⁹² He suggests that Caves 1 and 4 reflect an earlier collection of scrolls from the Qumran community, most likely to be dated before about 4 BCE (Period Ib), at which point the community center suffered a violent fire that ruined much of the structures. The other caves apparently reflect the sect's subsequent scroll collection (Period II).⁹³ Stökl Ben Ezra also noted that Caves 1 and 4 are not entirely similar either. In Cave 4, a few documents copied in I CE were added to the generally older collection, but not in Cave 1. With respect to M, this accounts for the presence in Cave 4 of the latest copy of M, 4Q494, which dates to the first century CE.

⁹² Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–33.

⁹³ For the view that all of the scrolls were deposited in the first century BCE, see Gregory L. Doudna, "The Legacy of an Error in Archaeological Interpretation: The Dating of the Qumran Cave Scroll Deposits," in *Qumran - the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates*, ed. Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg, *STDJ* 57 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 147–57.

It would appear, therefore, that Cave 4 was used as a place to safeguard the community's scroll collection, either as a working library, or possibly to protect it from being destroyed in the event of the community buildings catching on fire; alternatively it could have been used as a *geniza*.⁹⁴ Apparently, soon after the beginning of Period II the cave became full, and it was necessary to find additional storage space in which to place the expanding collection (such as Cave 5 nearby). With the rise of Roman threat, the sectarians then took a limited collection of their most valuable scrolls out of their library and divided it up among several caves in the area for safekeeping. Since the vast majority of the collection in Cave 4 predated Period II, one such assemblage happened to contain mainly scrolls from Period Ib: Cave 1.⁹⁵

The above considerations raise two observations. First, it is important to note that with respect to the War Texts, both *Serekh haMilhamah* (4Q494) and *Sefer haMilhamah* (11Q14) were copied into the first century CE, suggesting this body of literature remained important to the sectarian community throughout its entire history. Second, it may be that the documents found in the limestone caves, such as Caves 1 and 11, enjoyed a special or elevated status. As an aside, it is probably not simply circumstantial that the collection of texts in Cave 1 represent an almost complete cross-section of the foundational texts for the Qumran community, as if selected for that very purpose.⁹⁶ Whatever the case may be, one must nevertheless note that both compositions, *Serekh haMilhamah* and *Sefer haMilhamah*, were dear enough to the sectarians to be selected for safekeeping in the limestone caves.

⁹⁴ Stökl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves," 327, 329, 331 n. 66.

⁹⁵ Hanan Eshel, personal communication concerning Stökl Ben Ezra's findings. This scenario has the advantage of answering the questions raised by Stökl Ben Ezra ("Old Caves and Young Caves," 331 n. 66).

⁹⁶ For this reason, it should be considered providential that this cave was discovered first, as it gave scholars an immediate and relatively complete understanding of the community to whom the scrolls belonged, and was a sound foundation upon which the rest of Dead Sea Scroll studies was able to be built.

5. SUMMARY AND INITIAL OBSERVATIONS

From the meager data available to us, the following conclusions can be made about the War Texts preserved at Qumran: one or several texts dealing with the eschatological war were common and possibly in flux until shortly before the turn of the era (4Q493, 4Q496, 4Q471, 4Q491); in contrast, from the middle of the first century BCE into the first decades of the first century CE, two texts belonging to the literature describing the eschatological war were sufficiently crystallized so as to be faithfully copied without undergoing significant revisions: *Serekh haMilḥamah* (1QM, 4Q492, 4Q494, 4Q495) and *Sefer haMilḥamah* (4Q285, 11Q14), with *Serekh haMilḥamah* apparently being the most important of the two.⁹⁷

⁹⁷ Consequently, I use the expression ‘M Material’ for the works reflecting M and all its possible recensions (4Q491–496, 4Q471), and ‘War Texts’ for all M Material plus *Sefer haMilḥamah* (4Q285 and 11Q14).

CHAPTER TWO

OUTLINING THE *WAR SCROLL*

Whatever the relationship of these various manuscripts may be to one another, even the broader relationship between the two compositions *Serekh haMilhamah* and *Sefer haMilhamah*, all of them are dependent upon the longest and most complete of the above compositions: M. In light of the fact that this text from Cave 1 is the lynch pin for a proper understanding of all War Texts, it is crucial to begin with it.

Any attempt to understand the content, structure, and history of this composition must begin with a proper examination of the text as it has reached us. Like many ancient compositions, it is not one long continuous text. Rather, the author/editor of M divided it into sections, a practice coined today as “sense division” or “unit delimitation.”¹ From the very beginning of the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, these kinds of divisions were noted.² However, while most scholars acknowledge them, even comment upon them, the importance they give to these divisions varies, so that the matter needs to be examined anew.

Sense division or unit delimitation is the technique by which an author, editor, or scribe, divided his text into units of meaning. In recent years, there has been an increased emphasis on the study of these divisions and their significance for understanding a text. Most of the research has focused on the biblical material, owing principally to the sudden increase in manuscripts from the various dis-

¹ It is obviously impossible to know who is responsible for the sense divisions in M, the author himself or some editor after him, or a combination of both. As a reminder of this fact, I use the term “author/editor” throughout this chapter.

² Already Sukenik noted these division markers and offered some initial thoughts (I מגילות גנוזות, 12).

coveries in the Judean Wilderness.³ It is believed that these delimiters were an integral part of the composition and transmission of a text,⁴ and must therefore be taken into consideration when exegeting the text. As John Olley pointed out, delimiters “provide clues not merely to the *form* of the text, but also to *understanding* and *use* of the text,” so that when they are ignored, the reader “sometimes overlooks or actively criticizes traditional divisions.”⁵ While originally the practice of utilizing and preserving unit delimiters was believed to be characteristic of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible only, it is now evident that it was used for other texts, both sacred and non-sacred, even in different languages.⁶ Thus the importance of taking a close look at these sense divisions in M.

1. SENSE DIVISION IN THE WAR SCROLL

Already in the first column does one notice a method by which the author/editor of M divided his text into paragraphs: at line 7, after just a couple words, he left the rest of the line blank, and started the

³ It has been suggested to call this field “delimitation criticism.” For a brief history of research, see Marjo C. A. Korpel, “Introduction to the Series Pericope,” in *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship*, ed. Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch, Pericope 1 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000), 1–50. For a bibliography of work done on unit delimitations in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see her note 10 on page 4. However, it must be pointed out that very little research has focused on the non-biblical material.

⁴ Josef M. Oesch, *Petucha und Setuma: Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des Alten Testament*, OBO 27 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 335–38; Korpel, “Introduction,” 5; Emanuel Tov, “The Background of Sense Divisions in the Biblical Texts,” in *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship*, ed. Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch, Pericope 1 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000), 312–13, 334–35; Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 143, 155–57.

⁵ John W. Olley, “Texts Have Paragraphs Too: A Plea for Inclusion in Critical Edition,” *Text* 19 (1998): 113–14 (italics in the original).

⁶ Tov, “Background of Sense Divisions,” 312; Eugene Ulrich, “Impressions and Intuition: Sense Division in Ancient Manuscripts of Isaiah,” in *Unit Delimitation in Biblical Hebrew and Northwest Semitic Literature*, ed. Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch, Pericope 4 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003), 280; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 143.

new sentence at the beginning of the next line. In biblical texts, this is commonly called an “open section” or *petuḥah* (פתוחה). In M, this kind of division of the text is attested at the end of 1:7, 1:15, 4:5, 4:14, 5:2, 9:9, 9:16, 11:12, 12:16, 13:3, 13:6, 14:1, 14:15, 15:3, 16:14, 17:3, 17:9, and 19:8. There may have been other instances, unfortunately no longer extant, at the end of all the columns where the last few lines are not preserved. A potentially different kind of division can be seen in col. 3. There the author/editor, after leaving the end of line 11 empty, skipped an additional line before starting his new sentence, leaving a blank line between the two sections. Skipped lines are attested at 3:12, 5:15, 6:7, 7:8, 12:6, 16:2, 16:10, and 18:9. Here again, more skipped lines may have existed in the non extant portions at the bottom of the scroll. In a few instances, because of damage suffered by the scroll, it is impossible to determine whether just the end of a line, or all of it, was left blank. Such cases exist at 2:15, 6:18, and 13:17. In an additional case, at 4:17, erosion has destroyed both the beginning and the end of the line, so that only the middle section of text is preserved. At the very end of the line, where the parchment picks up again, no text is visible, suggesting that here too, the end of the line was left blank. Some ambiguity remains, however, as complete lines do not necessarily always fully reach the left margin as drawn by the scribe. Two such examples are 14:9 and 15:10–11.⁷ Finally, there are a few instances where the author left a blank space of a few letter spaces within a line. They are located at 1:10, 3:10, 8:13, 10:9, 11:7, 12:14, 13:5, 13:12, 14:4, 14:12, 14:13, and 17:6. While this is a known unit delimiter as well,⁸ in M it is clear that the scribe was merely skipping over portions of the parchment which were defective.⁹ The one at

⁷ But see page 53 where I show that 4:8 is the end of a unit: since 4:17 is almost as short 4:8, it is highly likely that it too is the end of a unit.

⁸ Examples in non-biblical Qumran Scrolls include 1QapGen ar, 4QEn^a ar (4Q201), 11QT^a (11Q19), to name a few.

⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 249, fig. 18A; Malachi Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Bibliothèque Du Muséon 44–45 (Leiden: Publications Universitaires, 1958), 119, n. 46. Jozef Milik compared M to 4QEn^c ar (4Q204) and suggested that such blank spaces may be due both to faults in the parchment as well as to the scribe’s desire to mark sense divisions. However, he failed to list which were what, and his observations reflected 4QEn^c ar more than M (*The*

10:9 stands out, for instead of leaving the space blank, the scribe drew a horizontal line. Tov suggests that this was an effort to cancel an ‘open section’ that was mistakenly put in.¹⁰

Initially there appears to be two distinct methods of delimiting units (skipping an entire line; leaving the end of a line blank), yet some ambiguity remains. For example, a blank line follows 16:9. However, line 9 of col. 16 not only reaches the left margin line, it even extends slightly beyond it. Leaving the rest of the line blank as a way to mark the end of a unit was not an option. If the new sentence would have begun on the next line, there would have been no evidence that line 9 was the end of one unit and line 10 the beginning of another. If for the author/editor leaving the rest of a line blank was a different kind of unit delimitation than skipping a line, one method he could have used to resolve the confusion would have been to begin the next line with a *vacat* of a few letter spaces. In biblical manuscripts, this is commonly known as a *ziah* (זיא). However, this practice, which is known from other non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls,¹¹ is not attested in M.¹² Another known method would have been to insert some kind of scribal mark,¹³ but this too is not found in M. The question therefore remains: were the two methods described above really distinct, or are they necessary variations of a single type of unit delimitation?

Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4 [Oxford: Clarendon, 1976], 179). Contrary to Milik, Tov does not think that the spaces in M were ever intended to mark sense division (“Sense Divisions in the Qumran Texts, the Masoretic Text, and Ancient Translations of the Bible,” in *The International Symposium in Slovenia HG - RâH. UÛRYHF -62 76XS 289* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 124, n. 4).

¹⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 187.

¹¹ For examples in non-biblical Qumran Scrolls, see, among others, 1QH^a, 4QInstruction^b (4Q418), and 4QBarkhi Nafshi^a (4Q434).

¹² There is one instance at 13:5. However, as I have just pointed out, most scholars believe this *vacat* at the beginning of the line to be due to a fault in the parchment, all the more so because it is in the middle of a sentence.

¹³ As in S, 4QTest (4Q175), or even 4Q496 frg. 10; see Emanuel Tov, “Scribal Markings in the Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 44–53; *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 179–87.

1.1. *Three approaches to the War Scroll*

1.1.1. *Yadin: a single tier of sense division*

Yadin, in his seminal commentary on M, claimed that the two methods really only reflected one type of unit delimitation. He suggested that if the last line of a section was longer than half of the column width, the author/editor would then skip a line.¹⁴ However, even he noted two exceptions to this rule: both 4:5 and 17:9 extend past the middle of the column width, yet the next section is begun on the very next line. To these could be added 12:16 and possibly 15:3.¹⁵ Obviously for Yadin, these exceptions were not reason enough to invalidate his opinion. As he pointed out, Maimonides testifies that such a rule eventually became standard scribal practice.¹⁶ Furthermore, there are no extant instances where the author/editor of M finished a section by a line less than half of a column width followed by an entirely blank line. Consequently, Yadin divided M into 31 sections, treating all unit dividers as having equal value.¹⁷ He also grouped these units into four larger sections which he called “Series,”¹⁸ though admittedly these were his own divisions based on his understanding of the themes developed in the text.

1.1.2. *Martin: a two-tiered system of sense division*

Malachi Martin, who studied the scribal practices as witnessed in the six main scrolls from Cave 1, disagreed with Yadin and was the first to suggest that in the scrolls there were indeed two different kinds of unit divisions, one major, which he called “sectional separation” and

¹⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 248.

¹⁵ Jean van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, STDJ 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1959), 5.

¹⁶ *Code*, Hilkhoth Sefer Torah viii, I. However, Rabbinic literature is not extensive in covering scribal practices (See Emanuel Tov, “Scribal Practices Reflected in the Documents from the Judean Desert and in the Rabbinic Literature: A Comparative Study,” in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*, ed. Michael V. Fox, et al. [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996], 402).

¹⁷ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 7–13.

¹⁸ These were the War Series (1:1–2:14), the Battle Serekh Series (2:16–9:16), the Ritual Serekh Series (9:17–14:15), and the Kittim Series (14:16–End). See Table 8.

which is marked by leaving an entire line blank, and one minor, which he termed “paragraphing” and which is marked by merely leaving the end of the line blank. Thus for Martin, M contains 10 section dividers and an additional 18 paragraph dividers. However, he was uncertain as to the meaning or purpose of the larger sections, whether they may have been liturgical or based on the possible sources used by the author/editor.¹⁹ Martin’s idea was taken further by Carmignac. Agreeing with him that there are indeed two levels of unit delimitation in M, he concluded that they reflect divisions into chapters which are in turn divided into paragraphs. This paradigm was foundational for Carmignac’s outlining of M (see Table 8).²⁰

1.1.3. *Van der Ploeg: sense division inconsequential*

A third approach to the problem is reflected in the work of Jean van der Ploeg. While he recognized that the author/editor of M did divide it into sections, he denied that these divisions were necessarily based on content. Consequently, in his outlining of the text, he arbitrarily choose to accept or to reject scribal divisions (see Table 8). For example, failing to see any reason based on content for the unit divisions at 11:12, 12:5, 17:3 and 18:8, he simply dismissed them. Similarly, in his subdividing of his Section Eleven (15:1–19:End), he even began a new subsection in the middle of a line (15:6), where clearly there is no unit divider.²¹ In brief, unit delimiters seem to be mere suggestions for van der Ploeg, of little value to the exegete of the text.

¹⁹ Martin, *Scribal Character*, 118–19, 142–43. For Martin’s outline of M, see Table 8. Note that Charles Perrot thought that there could be some connection between sense division and liturgical reading (see “Petuḥot et setumot: Étude sur les alinéas du Pentateuque,” *RB* 76 [1969]: 84–89); Oesch, however, rejected this idea (see *Petucha und Setuma*, 335–38).

²⁰ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*; “La Règle de la Guerre,” in *Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*, vol. 1, Jean Carmignac and P. Guilbert, Autour de la Bible (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961), 81–125.

²¹ van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 5–6.

1.1.4. *Which approach is correct?*

The above survey illustrates the three main ways scholars have approached unit delimiters in M: a one-layered division into paragraphs, a two-layered division into broader units which are themselves subdivided into paragraphs, or divisions which may be both circumstantial and purposeful. This latter approach, however, seems contrary to a perceived intent of the author/editor to delineate his text and the various units therein, leaving us with only the first two approaches as potentially valid. The challenge, therefore, is to determine if the author/editor of M intended to have two levels of unit demarcation.

1.2. *Sense division in ancient texts*

1.2.1. *Open and closed sections in the Bible*

Traditionally, it has been held that the division of the Biblical text into ‘open sections’ (פתוחות) and ‘closed sections’ (סתומות) is hierarchical. ‘Closed sections’ were thought to be “thematically related to what immediately precedes it,” while ‘open sections’ were “thematically distinct from the section which immediately precedes it.”²² This is now being questioned, as there seems to be a fair amount of interchangeability between the two types from manuscript to manuscript.²³ In the case of M, only the latter of the two is found, combined with the practice of skipping an entire line. Could it be that this is a parallel system to that found in the biblical manuscripts: an ‘open section’ in M would be equivalent to a ‘closed section’ in

²² Jonathan P. Siegel, “The Scribes of Qumran: Studies in the Early History of Jewish Scribal Customs, with Special Reference to Qumran Biblical Scrolls and to the Tannaitic Traditions of Massekhet Soferim” (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1971), 73. See also Perrot, “Petuhot et setumot,” 50–91; Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd. rev. ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 50–53.

²³ Tov calls all sense division “subjective and impressionistic” (see his discussion in “Background of Sense Divisions,” 322–32 and in *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 149–50). Eugene Ulrich says that “we must accept that we are dealing with impressions left by the scribes, assessed by our intuitions” (“Impressions,” 289).

scribal tradition for biblical manuscripts, and the skipped line equivalent to the 'open section'?

1.2.2. *Sense division in the texts from the Judean Desert*

The most comprehensive study of scribal practices as witnessed by all the manuscripts discovered in the Judean Desert, biblical as well as non-biblical, is that of Emanuel Tov.²⁴ He determined that for sense division, four systems of spacing were used: 1) "a space in the middle of the line"; 2) "a space extending from the last word in the line to the end of the line"; 3) "a space extending from the last word in the line to the end of the line followed by a completely empty line"; and 4) "an open space at the end of the line followed by an indentation at the beginning of the next line." Furthermore, he suggested that in his second method, if the text happened to reach near the end of the column so that not enough of the line could be left blank so as to mark the end of the unit, two alternative options were available: a) "an indentation at the beginning of the [next] line"; and b) "a completely empty line." He also ranked these systems hierarchically: type 1 he called a "subdivision" of type 2, type 2 is a "major sense division," types 3 and 4 were the "greatest subdivision" or "major subdivision," meaning that they are higher than types 1 and 2.²⁵

²⁴ Tov, "Comparative Study," 383–403; "Scribal Markings," 41–77; "Scribal Practices and Physical Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Bible as Book - the Manuscript Tradition*, ed. John L. Sharpe III and Kimberley van Kampen (London: The British Press, 1998), 9–33; "Scribal Practices Reflected in the Texts from the Judean Desert," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 1, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 403–29; "Sense Divisions," 121–46; "Background of Sense Divisions," 312–50; "Scribal Notations in the Texts from the Judean Desert," in *The Texts from the Judean Desert - Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series*, ed. Emanuel Tov, DJD XXXIX (Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 323–49; *Scribal Practices and Approaches*. A more exhaustive list of Tov's articles on all aspects of scribal practices can be found in *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, xx–xxi. While Tov also deals with non-biblical scrolls, most studies by other scholars tend to focus solely on biblical texts, if not on a particular biblical text only.

²⁵ Tov, "Background of Sense Divisions," 315–21; *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 145–49.

One assumption made by Tov's system is that a scribe never reached the end of a line while still needing to make a type 1 division. However, this problem is not relevant to M, since this type of division is not preserved in it. As described above, only methods 2 and 2b are represented, apparently supporting Yadin's view that it has only one level of sense division. As already noted, even type 4 is not found. Nevertheless, Tov himself affirms that these scribal practices were not universal and varied from scribe to scribe. The possibility remains, therefore, that the author/editor of M did use a two-tiered system, albeit different from what could be anticipated from Tov's survey.

Similar to the situation with open and closed sections, there is also a debate with other methods of sense division as to whether or not they were intended to be hierarchical, something akin to the present-day outline. What is not debated is the existence of paragraph divisions, nor even the existence of divisions into 'large' and 'small' sense units. Rather, the issue is whether or not there was any attempt at dividing larger units into smaller sub-units. Currently there are two schools of thought which I represent here by the works of Tov on the one hand, and of Marjo Korpel on the other. Tov argues that while larger and smaller unit delimiters did exist, it is "unclear whether this hierarchical relation should always be assumed," and suggests that the idea may be Western. For him, "it is probably closer to the truth to assume that scribes directed their attention to the type of relation between the unit they had just copied and the unit they were about to copy, without forming an opinion on the adjacent units."²⁶ Thus, while some hierarchy is reflected in the different types of sense division, it is not systematic, and one should expect some overlap between the different levels. Korpel, on the other hand, argues that the division of larger units of text into smaller units was indeed common practice already in the Ancient Near East.²⁷ Her research focused mainly on poetical passages within the biblical corpus. She concluded that owing to the great variance in the types

²⁶ Tov, "Background of Sense Divisions," 313–14. Ulrich also reached the same conclusion as Tov (see "Impressions," 301–4), although his work focuses only on biblical texts.

²⁷ Korpel, "Introduction," 10, 43–48.

and the placement of sense dividers in the various copies of a single ancient text, “the validity of ancient unit delimitation must be checked by all means available to the modern researcher.”²⁸ She suggests that this is done primarily by examining both thematic unity and disjunction between the various units, and this formed the basis for her proposed methodology in delimitation criticism.²⁹

1.2.3. *Summary of the evidence*

Several points can now be made, which may allow formulating a conclusion, even if only tentative. Scholars are not generally calling into question whether or not there were ‘larger’ and ‘smaller’ units; several types of dividers did indeed exist. But even for those scholars who doubt that larger units were ever purposefully divided into smaller units by the ancient scribes, they still agree that the different types of unit delimiters reflected qualitatively different types of sense division. Consequently, it remains imperative to note the ‘quality’ of the sense delimiters, even though these may not be reflecting any overall systematic hierarchical division of the text. While it may not be possible to ascertain that the units between two larger unit delimiters are all of the same theme, a large unit delimiter does indicate that there is a greater shift in theme and content between the two units than what had been previously encountered when there was only a small unit delimiter. Ignoring these shifts as marked by the author/editor can lead to a misunderstanding of the progression of thought inherent in a text. Thus, if they exist in M, as in any text, they must be taken into consideration.

1.3. *Evaluating the War Scroll’s sense divisions*

But the question still remains: did the author/editor of M intend to have two levels of sense division or not? I have already pointed out that in M we do not have the end of a unit finishing with a line less than half of the column width followed by a totally blank line (Tov’s

²⁸ Korpel, “Introduction,” 24.

²⁹ Korpel, “Introduction,” 33–48.

type 3). Neither do we have any beginning of line indented as a way of marking the beginning of a unit (Tov's types 2a and 4). Either of these, in addition to the unit delimiters which are testified in M, would have unequivocally supported the view that two levels of sense division are indeed present in M. But their absence seems to be a strong argument in favor of Yadin's position, in spite of the exceptions noted above. Could it be that the standard was a third of the line left blank, and not half as Yadin suggested? In such a case, the exceptions noted above would no longer be exceptions, and the system of sense division in M, as understood by Yadin, would be totally consistent.

1.3.1. *Determining if the War Scroll has a single or a double tiered system of sense division*

But their absence may also be circumstantial. I suggest there are two ways by which this can be tested. The first is by checking for the presence of a potentially new unit after an almost full line, where one or more words of the following line could have been written at the end of the line, although the scribe chose not to. Such an instance would show that a) it is highly likely that we are indeed dealing with a new unit, since the author/editor could have begun his new sentence at the end of the line rather than on a new line; b) the author/editor did not have a strict rule that if the last line of a unit went past half (or two thirds) of the column width, he needed to skip the next line in order to begin a new section; and c) the skipping of a line was reserved for delimiting larger sense divisions. The second method is to weigh the content and thematic shift before and after the various unit delimiters, in an attempt to see if they reflect the same kind of two-tiered sense division as the quality of the unit delimiters seem to suggest. If only one type of sense division was utilized in M, one could expect major thematic changes to happen where there are both small and large unit delimiters. Similarly, smaller shifts in theme and content would take place after both types of unit delimiters. However, if two types of sense division were used, one would anticipate seeing a difference in the kind of thematic and content shift these dividers denote.

1.3.2. *Test #1: Possible new unit after only a short vacat at the end of a line*

1.3.2.1. 1QM 4:8

With respect to the first test, at least one such occasion does indeed exist. In col. 4, line 8 is the shortest. It is five to ten letter spaces shorter than the other lines in that column, and about seven letter spaces short of the left margin line. Line 9 begins with the clause “Rule of the banners of the congregation when they go out to war” (סרך אותות העדה בצאתם למלחמה). Clearly, at least the first word, if not the first two words, could have been included at the end of line 8.³⁰ Even with the two extra words, it would not have been any longer than lines 1, 9, and 11 presently are.³¹ Yet another detail further supports the idea that line 9 is indeed the beginning of a new unit. There are three other instances in M where a sentence or clause begins with the term “rule” (סרך): 3:13, 5:3, and 9:10. All three are at the start of a line right after a unit delimiter. A similar instance is 16:3 where although the word “rule” is not the first word of the sentence on that line, it is the head noun of the clause at the beginning of the line that comes immediately after a unit delimiter. It is also important to note that at Qumran, when “rule” is either the first word or part of the first noun clause of a sentence, it is almost always right after a unit delimiter.³² Furthermore at Qumran, only in M Material does a sentence or a clause begin with the word “rule” (סרך), rather than with the usual “and this is the rule” (וזה הסרך) as do all the other rules

³⁰ There are times in M where the scribe extended past the left margin line by as many as four letters; see for example col. 16, lines 3 and 11.

³¹ In his study of the text, Jean Duhaime noted a *vacat* after line 8 on the page with the Hebrew transcription of col. 4, but not on the corresponding page with the English translation (see “War Scroll,” 104–5). The *vacat* is also noted in the *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (see Parry and Tov, *Religious Law*, 216–17).

³² The only exception is 4QAgnes of Creation (4Q180 frg. 1:4). There are two more exceptions in D, but they are in portions not extant at Qumran. The first is 13:7 where “and this is the rule” (וזה הסרך) does not come after a unit delimiter, and the second is 14:3 which begins a new unit with “and the rule of settlement (for) all the camps” (וסרך המושב כל המהנה) rather than the expected “and this is the rule.” Finally, there are two other possible exceptions in 4QD^a (4Q266): frg. 9 ii:5 and frg. 10 i:5. When reconstructed on the basis of D (12:19 and 14:12 respectively), there is no room to include the *vacats* of the sense divisions.

(see 1QS 5:1; 6:8; 1QSa 1:1,6; 4QD^a [4Q266] frg. 5 ii:14; 4QD^e [4Q270] frg. 6 iv:15). The only exception is 4Q491 frgs. 1–3:6. However, 4Q491 is a different recension than M. In light of this, it is all the more likely that 1QM 4:9 was meant to be the beginning of a new unit, and that the author/editor felt that the small *vacat* at the end of line 8 was sufficient enough of a unit delimiter.³³

1.3.2.2. 1QM 4:17

There are a few more instances, although less obvious, where the author/editor may have begun a new unit without leaving much of the previous line blank or skipping a line. The first and most obvious is 4:17. Since it is almost as short as 4:8, it is highly likely that it too marks the end of a unit. Indeed, some scholars have recorded a *vacat* there in their transcription of the text.³⁴

1.3.2.3. 1QM 2:9

Another example is 2:9. It is the second shortest line in that column, although the shortest is line 14 which ends a unit. Still, the first word of line 10 could have been added to line 9 without making it any longer than line 10 presently is. Furthermore, 2:10 introduces a new topic, that of the “War of the Divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות), an elaboration of what was mentioned in lines 6–7, now to be detailed in lines 10–14.³⁵ Thus, based on the spacing of the text as well as on the shift in content, it seems likely that a unit delimiter could have been intended here.

1.3.2.4. 1QM 3:9

The final possible example is found at 3:9, the shortest line of col. 3. However, there is no way the scribe could have added the first word of 3:10 to it. Nevertheless, there is a minor shift in content from 3:9 to 3:10. Both sections before and after deal with trumpets and their

³³ Because of the logical progression of ideas, as well as the presence of the word “rule” (סרן) fronting the line, Carmignac also concluded that 4:9 was the beginning of a new unit (*Règle de la Guerre*, 69).

³⁴ Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 106–7; Parry and Tov, *Religious Law*, 216–17.

³⁵ That a new section can begin with a *waw* followed by a noun is testified elsewhere, such as at 1:8 and 6:8.

inscriptions. Trumpets were introduced in the non-extant portion at the bottom of col. 2. After listing the various types of trumpets (2:E–3:2a), the author/editor then lists their respective inscriptions (3:2b–11). From 3:2b–9, he systematically uses the formula “and on the trumpets of... they shall write...” (ועל הצוצרות... יכתובו...). In 3:10, however, this pattern is broken, and the new trumpet inscriptions are introduced with “and when they return from the war” (ובשובם מן המלחמה), followed by inscriptions for two trumpets used in the withdrawal. That same phrase appears in 4:9 and 13, in both cases not following a sense division. While this seems to argue in favor of not seeing a break at 3:9, the phrase at 3:10 remains unique in that it breaks the flow of the text, unlike at 4:9 and 13 where it continues the same structure as immediately before it. Thus, while it remains possible that a unit delimiter was intended here, it is not as obvious as in the two previous examples, owing to the similarity in content before and after the supposed unit delimiter, as well as the shortness of the subsequent unit, being only two lines long.³⁶

1.3.2.5. Conclusion of Test #1

Even without a possible unit delimiter after 3:9, it seems most probable that one was intended after 4:8 and 2:9.³⁷ That the author/editor did not skip a line in those two instances seems to support the idea that he was restricting his usage of skipped lines exclusively for those times when there really was a ‘large sense division’.

Alternatively, if as Tov and Ulrich claim, sense division was more “impressionistic” than anything else, it would have led to some overlap between the two types of delimiters.³⁸ When operating under such a paradigm, the primary concern of the author/editor, upon reaching the end of a unit, was not so much to rigidly apply a systematic system of sense division, as it was to appropriately communicate the ‘weight’ or ‘quality’ of the shift from one unit to the next. Thus, in the two (or possibly three) cases listed above, the

³⁶ Although a unit of only two lines plus a couple words on a third can be seen in col. 13 (lines 4–6), and another unit of two and a half lines is in col. 4 (lines 15–17).

³⁷ I am not including 4:17 here because unlike the other two examples one cannot compare the content before and after the *vacat*.

³⁸ As Ulrich concluded with respect to 1QIsa^a (“Impressions,” 289–90).

author/editor concluded that even though the unit ended at the end of the line, the shift in content did not warrant skipping a line. Should this understanding be correct, even though it cannot confirm the *systematic* use of a two-tiered unit delimitation, it affirms the *existence* of different types of unit delimitation. The very fact that the author/editor refused to skip a line in the examples above shows that he wanted to preserve his option of skipping a line for a type of sense division different, or greater, than the ones he encountered in those cases. Thus the potential overlap in his usage of unit delimiters: a more consequential shift between the two units than what is witnessed in the examples above, with the first unit ending at the end of the line, may have motivated him to skip a line before beginning his next unit. However, had the first unit ended on a line which had only a few words, he would have simply begun his new section at the beginning of the next line.³⁹ Similarly, the converse may also be true: in an instance where a unit finished on a line with only one or two words, the author/editor may not have felt the need to skip an additional line, the visual impact of the unit delimiter being already obvious enough. But if the last line of his unit had been a bit longer, he maybe would have then chosen to skip a line. This “impressionistic” view of sense division, which does not rely on a strict systematic approach, stresses the need for the second test listed above, that of weighing the content and thematic shift before and after unit delimiters.

1.3.2.6. Test #2: Evaluating content and thematic shifts

Attempting to evaluate the ‘weight’ of the shift between units is far from an objective task. Nevertheless, in spite of the possible overlap which may exist between two types of unit delimiters, general trends should be identifiable. As mentioned above, such a general trend would help confirm the presence of a two-tiered system, while the absence of such a trend would preclude it. The approach used here is

³⁹ This is exactly what Tov noted in 1QpHab: “If the scribe wanted to indicate the beginning of the *peshet* at the very end of the line, where there was no room for such an indication, he either indented the next line (VIII, 16; XI, 4) or left no space at all (IV, 4, 14; VI, 5; IX, 8; XII, 1).” See “Background of Sense Divisions,” 328 (*italics in the original*).

to begin by assuming that all lines which ended before the full width of the column were small sense delimiters, while all skipped lines denote a large sense delimiter. One must then check to see if such a reading of the text is possible, and if so, if it is also generally consistent, allowing for a logical progression of ideas. If both of these questions can be answered affirmatively, this would be additional evidence for a two-tiered approach to sense division within M.

1.3.2.7. Survey of the *War Scroll* evidence

Wherever there are several smaller sense divisions between two larger sense divisions (as witnessed in the extant manuscript), they can be summarized as follows (see Table 5).⁴⁰ Between the beginning of the scroll to 2:15, the first instance when the author/editor skipped a line, all the units describe the war in broad sweeps. Between the two consecutive blank lines at 2:15 and 3:12, all the units deal with trumpets. Between 3:12 and the end of col. 4, all the units deal with banners.⁴¹ Between the two successive blank lines at 5:15 and 6:7, all the units deal with infantry formation and weaponry. The rest of col. 6 deals with the cavalry.⁴² From 7:9 to the end of col. 9, all the units deal with various deployment tactics when facing the enemy. All units between the beginning of col. 10 and the blank line at 12:6 deal with prayers and speeches. More prayers and speeches are found between 12:6 and 16:2. Between the blank lines at 16:2 and 18:9, all the units deal with the course of the

⁴⁰ Owing to the fact that several lines of text were not preserved at the bottom of all the columns, one cannot be sure if the unit at the end of one column was continued at the top of the next column. For the present purposes, it is not profitable to attempt to reconstruct what might have been included at the end of each column, although major changes in content are noted.

⁴¹ The beginning of col. 5 describes the weaponry of the “battalions of war” (דגלי (ה)המלחמה), a subject very different than at the end of col. 4. A minor sense division is visible at the end of 4:17 and after 5:2. Even with the little data we have from two extant lines, it seems as though they are dealing with a topic different than in col. 4 or the second part of col. 5. How they related to the units immediately before and after, however, is impossible to determine.

⁴² A *vacat* is visible at 6:18, though it is impossible to know if it was for the entire line or just part of it. As a result, one is forced to look at the the last unit of col. 6 as well as at first seven lines of col. 7 as an independent unit.

TABLE 5: SENSE DIVISION IN IQM (Part 1)			
Skipped lines	Paragraphs	Possible delimiters	Content
	1:1-7 1:8-15 1:15-E		General sketch of the war General sketch of the war ?
	2:1-9/15 2:1-9 2:10-15	2:9	Leadership, conscription, war chronology Leadership, conscription War chronology
	2:16-E	2:15	?
	3:1-9/11 3:1-9 3:10-11	3:9?	Trumpets and their inscriptions Trumpets of attack and inscriptions Trumpets of withdrawal and inscriptions
3:12	3:13-E		Banners for the entire congregation and their inscriptions
	4:1-5 4:6-14 4:6-8 4:9-14 4:15-17/E 4:15-17 4:18-E	4:8 4:17?	Priestly banners and their inscriptions Banners for attack and their inscriptions Banners for attack and their inscriptions Banners for the congregation Length of the banners of entire congregation Length of the banners of entire congregation ?
	5:1-2 5:3-14		Other inscription? Weaponry of fighting battalions
5:15	5:16-E		Formations of fighting battalions?
	6:1-6		Formation and weaponry of skirmishers
6:7	6:8-17/18		Cavalry and its weaponry
	6:19-E	6:18	?
	7:1-7		Qualifications for army personnel
7:8	7:9-E		Army deployment and tactics; role of priests
	8:1-E		Army deployment and tactics; role of priests
	9:1-9 9:10-16 9:17-E		Army deployment and tactics; role of priests Deployment of the tower formation Ambush tactics?
	10:1-E		Instructions for speeches and prayers at war
	11:1-12 11:13-E		Prayer for war Prayer for war
	12:1-5		Prayer for war
12:6			

SENSE DIVISION IN 1QM (Part 2)			
Skipped lines	Paragraphs	Possible delimiters	Content
12:6	12:7-16 12:17-19/E		Prayer for war Prayer
	13:1-3 13:4-6 13:7-16/17		Blessings for war Curses for war Prayer for war
	13:18-E	13:17	Prayer?
	14:1 14:2-15 14:16-18 14:19-E		? Hymn and blessings at end of war Prayer ?
	15:1-3 15:4-E		God's deliverance Speech of the chief priest
	16:1		?
16:2	16:3-9		Army deployment and tactics for war; role of priests
16:10	16:11-14 16:15-E		Chief priest calling up the reserves Speech of the chief priest to the reserves
	17:1-3 17:4-9 17:10-E		Speech for war (to the reserves?) Speech for war (to the reserves?) Deployment of the reserves
	18:1-8		Final deployment for victory; prayer for victory
18:9	18:10-E		Prayer of victory
	19:1-8 19:9-E		Speech of victory Morning after battle

battle up until the point of victory. The rest of the scroll seems to deal with the victory battle and its outcome.

1.3.2.8. Conclusion of Test #2

As is immediately visible, this method of approaching the text reveals much consistency in the use of large and small unit delimiters. The only case where one would not have expected a major unit delimiter is at 12:16, since both units immediately before and immediately after the delimiter are about prayers. However, if the approach of ancient scribes was “impressionistic,” allowing for a certain amount of overlap between the two methods of delimiting units, 12:16 may not even be an exception. Alternatively, the author/editor may have wanted to draw our attention to a shift in the text, one that is not immediately apparent in its extant form. Even so, such a high degree of consistency does not appear to be merely coincidental, and seems to further support the notion that the author/editor of M did indeed use two levels of sense division.⁴³

2. SENSE DIVISION IN CAVE 4 WAR TEXTS

Sense divisions can also be seen in some of the M Material from Cave 4. However, because of the fragmentary nature of these texts, it is impossible to draw any conclusions about which system, if any, the scribes who wrote these scrolls used to divide their text. And, since there are no overlaps between the various copies of recensions similar to M (4Q492; 4Q494; 4Q495; 4Q496 frgs. 1–7,13), nor between the different recensions (4Q471; 4Q491; 4Q493; 4Q496), the only comparative work that can be done is between these individual copies or recensions and M itself.⁴⁴ Table 6 shows all sense divi-

⁴³ If this evaluation of unit delimitation in M is correct, and all the more so if there are unit delimiters after 2:9, 3:9, and 4:8, a reevaluation of sense division in the other non biblical scrolls from the Judean Desert may prove profitable, since Tov’s types 2a and 2b may not necessarily be subdivisions of his type 2. Some refining of our overall understanding of sense division in the Dead Sea Scrolls may be called for.

⁴⁴ There is one overlap between two of the recensions: 4Q494:4–6 and 4Q471 frg. 1:3–4. Both relate to material found in 1QM 2:1–2 (see Table 2), but the over-

sions in the Cave 4 material, as well as all parallel passages between Cave 1 and Cave 4 materials which contain some kind of unit delimiter. A dash (–) indicates the type of delimiter used. Where more than one dash is recorded for a particular passage, it is because it is impossible to determine exactly which was used, and it may be any one of the ones marked. Where no dash is recorded, it is because no sense division was recorded.

2.1. *Copies of a recension similar to the War Scroll*

2.1.1. Attestations of sense divisions found in the *War Scroll*

2.1.1.1. Sense division in 4Q492

The only copy of M's recension which undoubtedly preserves any sense divisions is 4Q492, and it preserves only one type, the short space within a line (an interlinear *vacat*; Tov's type 1), a type not represented in M. An initial conclusion, therefore, is that not all copies of M's recension preserved the same system of unit delimiters, as reflected by the different types used. This is all the more interesting since it has been suggested that 4Q492 may have been written by the same scribe who copied M.⁴⁵ 4Q492 frg. 1:1–13 corresponds almost exactly to 1QM 19:1–14.⁴⁶ Furthermore, 1QM 12:8–16 repeats 4Q492 frg. 1:1–8 and 1QM 19:1–8, albeit with some variants and additions.⁴⁷ Of the three sense divisions extant in 4Q492, only the last one is reflected in cols. 12 and 19 of M, but instead of being a short break within the line as in 4Q492, in both cases it is represented by the end of line left blank (12:6; 19:9).

That two copies of the same recension (M and 4Q492) are using different systems of unit delimitation, each with differing types of

lap between them is two words at most. However, no sense division is preserved in any of the manuscripts with that passage. Note also that in *Sefer haMilhamah* there are no recorded sense divisions. The short *vacat* after 4Q285 frg. 1:1 does not seem to be a sense division as it is in the middle of a sentence.

⁴⁵ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 45.

⁴⁶ As far as it can be determined, there are two small variants: 1QM 19:5's מואדה is spelled מאוד in 4Q492 frg. 1:5; ומלכים in 1QM 19:6 is ומלכיהם in 4Q492 frg. 1:6.

⁴⁷ See the discussion on cols. 10–14 in Chapter 6 for the relationship between cols. 12 and 19, beginning on page 279.

TABLE 6: SENSE DIVISION IN 4Q WAR TEXTS (Part 1)							
	Small Space (סתומה)	End of line left blank (פתוחה)	Skipped line	Scribal notation in margin	1QM Parrallels		
					Ref.	Divider type	
						End of line	Skipped line
Copies of 1QM							
4Q492							
frg. 1, line 5	–				12:13; 19:5		
frg. 1, line 7	–				12:15; 19:6		
frg. 1, line 8	–				12:16; 19:8	–	
4Q494							
line 5		?			2:2		
4Q495							
line 2		?			13:10		
Recensions							
4Q491							
frgs. 1-3:1				–			
frgs. 1-3:4				–			
frgs. 1-3:6				–			
frgs. 1-3:7	–				7:6-7		
frgs. 1-3:9	–						
frgs. 1-3:14				–			
frgs. 1-3:16				–			
frgs. 1-3:18				–	7:10-11		
frgs. 1-3:19				–	7:17?		
frgs. 8-10 i:1	–	–			14:4(?)		
frgs. 8-10 i:13					14:15	–	
frgs. 8-10 i:16	–	–					
frg. 11 i:16		–	–				
frg. 11 ii:8	–				16:9-11	–	
frg. 11 ii:18		[–]					
frgs. 14-15:4		–	–		15:6		
frg. 17:3	–						
frg. 19:2	–	–					
frg. 21:2	–						
frg. 31:1				–			
frg. 32:1-3				–			

SENSE DIVISION IN 4Q WAR TEXTS (Part 2)							
	Small Space (סתומה)	End of line left blank (פתוחה)	Skipped line	Scribal notation in margin	1QM Parrallels		
					Ref.	Divider type	
						End of line	Skipped line
4Q493							
line 12	–	–					
4Q496							
frg. 3:7					1:7-8	–	
frg. 2+1:7-8	?				1:15-16	–	
frg. 8:4	–	–	–				
frg. 8:8	–	–	–		3:2(?)		
frg. 10:2	?	?		–	3:12	–	
frg. 31:6	–	–	–				
frg. 32:5	–	–	–				
frg. 40:2	–	–	–				
frg. 55:2	–	–	–				
frg. 58:2	–	–	–				
frg. 58:4	–	–	–				
frg. 58:8	–	–	–				
frg. 62:1	–	–	–				
frg. 98:2		–					
4Q497							
frg. 1:1	–						
frg. 1:2		–	–				
frg. 13:4	–	–	–				
frg. 15:3	–	–	–				
frg. 28:4	–	–	–				

spacing, raises some initial questions. Could it be that in spite of the high degree of correspondence between the extant portions of 4Q492 and M, we may nevertheless be dealing with two different recensions of M? Fragments 2 and 3 of 4Q492 only contain portions of a string of four words plus an additional four letters. There is no parallel in M of this short phrase. Whether this is because it is of a portion not extant in M or because it reflects a variant, or even a different recension, is impossible to know. Alternatively, could it be that this difference in delimiting the text testifies to the fluidity of sense division between manuscripts? As Tov has pointed out:

As a rule, scribes copied the divisions between sense units from their *Vorlagen*, but they often deviated from them, and it is hard to determine under which conditions they did so. Some discrepancies were caused by differences in column dimensions between the scribe's *Vorlage* and the manuscript he created, as a result of which scribes often were not able to recreate the division which they found before them. Beyond this description, scribes must have felt free to change the sense divisions of their *Vorlage* and to add new ones in accord with their understanding of the context.⁴⁸

Should one accept the possibility that 4Q492 and M are copies of the same document, and that both were copied by the same scribe, we have here a perfect example of how diverse sense division can be: even the same scribe can record different sense divisions for a same text!

In this particular case, however, it may be possible to perceive some logic behind the scribe's rational for changing sense division between the two copies. When reading 1QM 12:8–16 and 1QM 19:1–8, there does not appear to be any great thematic shift in those lines, and the absence of sense division is not surprising. In both places, the lines are part of a prayer, a kind of call to action. Yet the breaks in 4Q492 are not random: the first break marks the switch in the prayer from a call upon God and his army to action to a call to the entire nation to rejoice, and the second break marks the transition to a call on the daughters of Israel to celebrate. Are these minor shifts in themes what these unit delimiters were intended to reflect?

⁴⁸ Tov, "Background of Sense Divisions," 324 (italics in the original).

Could it be that they may rather be preserving the different sources used by the author/editor in composing his ‘Call to Action’?

The third break in 4Q492, however, as after the one in 19:8, reflects a much greater thematic shift. There the topic changes from a speech to instructions for the battle field. The discontinuity is all the more visible in col. 12, where lines 17 and 18 preserve a completely different text than in 1QM 19:9–14 and 4Q492 frg. 1:8b–13. While col. 12 includes this “Call to Action,” it did not consider that which came after the third division in 4Q492 (or after the break in 1QM 19:8) as belonging to it. It is not surprising therefore, that the scribe of M thought it useful to keep that third sense division while ignoring the first two.⁴⁹ In this way, a couple small sense divisions were removed, but where one was preserved, its ‘quality’ remained identical: the smallest sense division possible (Tov’s type 1) in 4Q492 is represented by the smallest sense division used in M (Tov’s type 2). This may hint at another factor which should be taken into consideration when seeking to understand the reasons behind the differences in unit delimitation between copies of texts. Since different systems for dividing the text into units employ different types of sense divisions, one must first determine what system is being used before assessing whether or not the ‘quality’ of a division has been changed from one copy to the next. Finally, it could also be that such differences reflect the necessary adaptations when switching from a single-tiered system (4Q492) to a two-tiered system (M) of unit delimitation, resulting in the loss of sense divisions marking more minor thematic shifts that cannot be reflected in a different system.

2.1.1.2. Possible reconstructed sense divisions

While it cannot be proven, both 4Q494 and 4Q495 may preserve sense divisions not reflected in M. They are described here below,

⁴⁹ This scenario assumes that the scribe of M removed the divisions that were in his source, not that 4Q492 added them to his source. The rationale described above can be adapted to either scenario. It is nonetheless interesting to note that 4Q492 did not mark the third division any differently than the previous two. Since it is impossible to know whether 4Q492 contained unit delimiters other than Tov’s type 1, no further deductions about the nature of sense division in 4Q492 can be made.

although without extensive discussion: since these divisions are only reconstructed, nothing can be inferred with any certainty for a better comprehension of sense division among the copies of M. Nevertheless, the following observations may prove helpful when seeking to better understand their relationship to M.

2.1.1.2.1. 4Q494

4Q494:2–6 parallels 1QM 2:1–3, and it has been reconstructed accordingly. Lines 3 and 4 end up being about 77 spaces long.⁵⁰ When strictly following M, 4Q494:5 can only be 20 spaces long, implying that the rest of the line was left blank. One possibility is that such a break in the text would be marking the transition between priests to Levites. However, one would then expect another break earlier in the fragment, when the author/editor transitions from the “heads of the fathers’ (families) of the congregation” (ראשי אבות) (העדה) to the priests (line 3), and its absence there casts doubt on such a rationale for its presence in line 5. However, the fragmentary nature of the document may preclude us from grasping why the author/editor may have felt it necessary to include a break at this point, if one was present at all. The advantage of assuming that there was one is that it allows for reconstructing the text with more equalized line lengths and fewer variants from the M text.⁵¹ Because it is impossible to know what system of unit delimitation was used in 4Q494, one cannot determine what the ‘quality’ of a division represented by the end of a line left blank is. In any case, a *vacat* at the end of line 5 remains only a possibility, and alternate reconstructions which do not have any *vacat*, such as the one suggested by Baillet,⁵² may ultimately be more likely.

⁵⁰ Baillet’s line 3 is 81 spaces long (*Qumrân Grotte 4*, 53). However, he included the word “heads of” (ראשי) before “fathers’ (families) of the congregation” (אבות העדה) from the beginning of 1QM 2. However, nowhere in M is there “courses” (משמרות) composed of the “heads” (ראשים) of a particular group, suggesting that it should not be reconstructed here either. Furthermore, one cannot be sure if the word “courses” (משמרות) should not be reconstructed “their courses” (משמרותם).

⁵¹ Abegg, “War Scroll,” 78.

⁵² Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 53.

2.1.1.2.2. 4Q495

The situation with 4Q495 is quite similar. Reconstructing this text on the basis of 1QM 13:9–12 yields line lengths of 64–54–62–62 letter spaces, suggesting that there was a *vacat* at the end of line 2, especially since the scribe could have added the first two words of line 3 without making the line longer than 65 spaces. Furthermore, with the new sentence in line 3 switching from “angels of righteousness” (מלאכי צדק) to “angel of animosity” (מלאך המסטמה), a *vacat* marking the thematic shift at this point is certainly reasonable. On the other hand, a range of 54 to 64 spaces per column is not impossible, nor can one be sure that 4Q495 did not have some variant reading not found in M, one which precluded the presence of any sense divider.

2.1.2. *Sense divisions non attested in the War Scroll*

Finally, two instances in 4Q496 may preserve the opposite scenario, that of not reflecting sense divisions found in M. While technically not a copy of M, I have suggested that the first portion of this manuscript (frgs. 1–7, 13) may be treated as such,⁵³ making it appropriate to deal with these two examples here. The first example is 4Q496 frg. 3:7. The extant text seems to preserve both the end of 1QM 1:7 and the beginning of 1QM 1:8 without the sense divider between them. But this alleged omission of the *vacat* must remain nothing more than a possibility, for it may be that frg. 3:7 is preserving a variant ending to 1QM 1:7, and not the beginning of 1QM 1:8 as often assumed. The second is found in frgs. 2+1. When attempting to reconstruct them on the basis of M, Baillet has suggested that line 8 omits the *vacat* at the end of 1QM 1:15.⁵⁴ However, even without this *vacat*, the line remains too long, implying that the text was significantly different. It may therefore be that the text was quite different than in M, and that 4Q496 frgs. 2+1:8 had a much shorter

⁵³ See above, page 24.

⁵⁴ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 59.

sentence beginning the new paragraph, short enough to leave room for an interlinear *vacat* between the two paragraphs.⁵⁵

2.1.3. *Summary*

While none of the evidence from 4Q494, 4Q495, and 4Q496 concerning sense division can be used with any certainty, it nevertheless suggests that we should not expect all copies of the same recension of M to preserve the same system of sense divisions. Consequently, the variance in unit delimitation between M and 4Q492 should not be taken as evidence against 4Q492 being a copy of the same recension as M. Rather, since the changes between the two texts do not appear to be random, this seems to highlight how intentional and purposeful the practice of delimiting units actually was. The importance of not ignoring this aspect of a scroll's composition when exegeting it is all the more affirmed.

2.2. *Copies of recensions different than the War Scroll*

With respect to the differing recensions of M, all but 4Q471 preserve unit delimiters. It must be noted, however, that since these recensions do not necessarily follow M very faithfully, their sense divisions may reflect an altogether different rationale than in M. An additional problem when comparing these recensions to M is in identifying genuine parallels. Just because the same word, or a combination of a couple words, can be found in both M and one of its differing recensions does not automatically imply that there is a correspondence between the two paragraphs that contain them. Furthermore, in many cases the fragments of these recensions are so small that it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine what system of spacing was used to divide up the text. Consequently, one should not expect these recensions to contribute anything to our understanding of the rationale behind sense division in M and its copies.

⁵⁵ Abegg, "War Scroll," 84.

Nevertheless, for the sake of thoroughness, a few observations can still be made.

With respect to types of sense division used, it is certain that a small interlinear space (Tov's type 1) was used in 4Q491 and 4Q497, and that in at least one instance in 4Q496 the scribe left the end of the line blank (Tov's type 2). Whether any of the recensions ever skipped an entire line is impossible to tell. Additionally, the use of scribal notations in the margins (*paragraphoi*) to delimit units, not attested in any copies of M, is found in 4Q491 and 4Q496.

2.2.1. *Attestations of sense divisions in the War Scroll*

2.2.1.1. 4Q491 frg. 11 ii:8 and 1QM 16:10

Of all the sense divisions in these recensions, only two are attested in M. The first is the *vacat* in the middle of the line in 4Q491 frg. 11 ii:8 which is represented by a skipped line in 1QM 16:10. Here the 'quality' of the division appears to have been changed: the small sense division in 4Q491 is a large sense division in M. While typically skipped lines in M are considered to be the highest unit delimiters hierarchically, I have also pointed out that there may be some overlap with the smaller unit delimiter in cases where the line ends at the left hand margin of the column. While drawing conclusions on an isolated example is dangerous, it may be possible that in this case we have such an example of overlap. Since 1QM 16:9 reaches the left hand margin of the column, the scribe had no option, if he wanted to mark the division, than to start his new section after skipping a line, even though he did not intend it to mark a large sense division. Alternatively, it may be that the two manuscripts preserve totally different ways of dividing up the text. This would be all the more expected in light of how different 4Q491 is from M.

2.2.1.2. 4Q496 frg. 10:2 and 1QM 3:12

The second occurrence is the blank line at 3:12 which is represented by a *paragraphos* at the beginning of 4Q496 frg. 10 line 2.⁵⁶ While such scribal notations are not found in M, they are known from other

⁵⁶ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 62.

documents from the Judean Desert.⁵⁷ In this case, it is a horizontal line, beginning above the first letter, and extending into the left margin, with a slightly curved downstroke to the right (Tov's *paragraphos* type a). Since there are remnants of letters visible in the extant portion of line 1, thought to belong to the last line of 4Q496 frg. 11,⁵⁸ we know that the entire line was not skipped. However, because of how closely 4Q496 seems to parallel M at this point, it is highly likely that the end of the line was left blank. Tov suggests that such notations used "in conjunction with a spacing device *could* indicate a greater content division than mere spacing."⁵⁹ Because of the evidence from M, it seems that in this case it was indeed intended to mark a major break in the text.⁶⁰

2.2.2. *Sense divisions not attested in the War Scroll*

In addition, there are a number of sense divisions found in these recensions which may not be reflected in M, depending on how one chooses to reconstruct the various fragments, or on whether or not their loci in M have been properly identified. Because of such uncertainties, these instances cannot be brought to bear upon our understanding of sense division in M, and only a cursory summary is offered here. All of them are found in 4Q491. In five instances, frgs. 1–3:7, 18, 19,⁶¹ frgs. 8–10 i:1 and frg. 15:4, topics are introduced after some kind of unit delimiter, either a short interlinear *vacat* (frgs. 1–3:7), a *paragraphos* (frgs. 1–3:18, 19), or part or all of the preceding line left blank (frgs. 8–10 i:1; frg. 15:4). The parallel

⁵⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 179–84.

⁵⁸ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 63.

⁵⁹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 180 (italics in the original).

⁶⁰ It is interesting to note that in S, a *paragraphos* more often marks an 'open section' than a 'closed section' (Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 179). Another type of *paragraphos* is found in 4Q491 frgs. 1–3, lines 1, 4, 6, 14, 16, 18 and 19; frg. 31 line 1 and frg. 32, lines 1–3 (Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 13–14, 44). They are small hyphens written to the right of the first work in the line (Tov's type c; *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 184). However, there are no parallels of 4Q491 frgs. 1–3, 31, and 32 in M.

⁶¹ It may be, however, that frgs. 1–3 should not be joined together as usually assumed. See above, page 36.

texts in M (1QM 7:6–7, 10–11, 17; 14:4 and 15:6 respectively) are never preceded by any kind of sense division.⁶²

3. CONCLUSION ON SENSE DIVISION IN THE *WAR SCROLL*

This examination of sense division in the M Materials from Cave 4 has neither added to our understanding of sense division in M nor challenged our conclusions gathered from M alone. From the comparative work done above, it is obvious that different copies of M utilized different methods for delimiting units. Furthermore, there was no strict uniformity concerning the presence or absence of sense divisions, although, as we have seen, some rationale for these changes can at times be deduced. With respect to other copies of M's recension, the meager evidence suggests that only small sense divisions were removed or added, and where the sense division was preserved, it had the same 'quality'. When comparing M to the copies of differing recensions, the data is more ambiguous. Nevertheless, if one assumes that the accepted reconstruction of 4Q491 frgs. 8–10 i:1 is correct, then larger sense divisions were removed/added. And depending on how one evaluates the skipped line at 1QM 16:10, it may be that the quality of some sense dividers changed from manuscript to manuscript.

None of these differences, however, are significant. One possible explanation for the changes is that some of the sense divisions were intended to mark a change in sources, rather than a shift in content. If so, the absence of certain sense divisions in M, when attested in other parallel War Texts, may be due to the incorporation of a source into a larger framework. Whatever the case may be, one must take these sense divisions into consideration when exegeting the text. While it is impossible to know if there was an earlier text with different sense divisions, nor what it may have looked like, the present text of M nevertheless provides us with a very well preserved copy which reflects its own purposeful dividing of the composition. The scroll's

⁶² Note that reconstructing a possible sense division in 1QM 15:6 as based on 4Q491 frg. 15:4 happens to correspond exactly with a division in the text as assumed by van der Ploeg in his outline of M (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 6).

de luxe format,⁶³ together with its selection for safekeeping in Cave 1,⁶⁴ may point to some kind of special status it might have enjoyed. But even if only because it is our most complete witness of this unique text, it is incumbent upon the reader to note carefully the sense divisions it preserves and their possible implications.

4. OUTLINING THE *WAR SCROLL*

4.1. *Difficulties and assumptions*

There is a very close connection between sense division and the outline of a text. While the ancient method of unit delimitation is not an outline, nor as systematic, the two are similar in that both can reflect differences between ‘large’ and ‘small’ shifts in content. Furthermore, as in an outline, a unit preceded by a large sense division and followed by a small sense division should be understood as being more related to the unit that follows it than to the unit that precedes it. This is precisely where sense division is crucial. Failure to note such developments can lead to a misunderstanding of the author/editor’s thought progression. Furthermore, on several occasions in M, it does appear as though there is some kind of thematic unity between all the units contained between two large unit delimiters, almost as systematically as if it was an outline. While for the purpose of determining if the author/editor of M used one or two levels of sense division it was best not to reconstruct any of the non-extant portions of the text, nor to stipulate where extra unit divisions may have been located, this is now an integral part of outlining the scroll. This is based on the assumption that the shifts in content indicated by such an outline were originally marked by the author/editor via unit delimiters. Even if they were not, an outline seeks to understand the thematic progression of a text, regardless of the presence or absence of unit delimiters. Nevertheless, while an outline may go beyond what unit delimitation can transmit, it should never be at the expense or contrary to the extant text and the sense divisions con-

⁶³ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 126–27.

⁶⁴ See above, page 40.

tained therein. Thus, some of the challenges mentioned above in determining sense division are now all the more relevant and therefore briefly reiterated here. More unit delimiters may have existed in the non-extant sections at the bottom of all the columns. A few extant sense divisions defy determining if they are small or large (2:15, 6:18, 13:17). In one instance (4:17), there are hints that there may have been a sense divider, but the shape of the manuscript precludes knowing it for sure. Finally, it may be possible that there is some overlap between the two types of sense division used. In all of these instances, when outlining the text, one must evaluate the kind of shifts in content one perceives from one unit to the next, or from the extant bottom of one column to the top of the next. These assessments are to a certain extent subjective and remain open for refinement. Nevertheless, I have reconstructed an outline of M which takes all sense divisions into account (see Table 7). Where my conclusions are at odds with the general approach taken above, namely, that a skipped line indicates a major unit delimiter and that an 'open line' marks a minor unit delimiter, or where they reflect data from other M Material, they are listed below, in the order encountered in the scroll.

TABLE 7: 1QM OUTLINE (Part 1)
"[סרך] המלחמה" - THE RULE OF THE WAR

HISTORICAL SETTING AND OVERVIEW OF THE WAR		
SECTION ONE	1:1-E	Introduction to the War of the Kittim
Paragraph 1	1:1-7	Setting and historical background
Paragraph 2	1:8-15	The seven "lots" (גורלות) of the war
Paragraph 3	1:16-E	Angel's help in the war
SECTION TWO	1:E-2:14	Introduction to the War of the Divisions
Paragraph 4	1:E-2:9	Leadership for temple worship and conscription
Paragraph 5	2:10-14	"מלחמת המחלקות" - the war of divisions
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ARMY AND WEAPONRY		
GENERAL SETTING UP / STRUCTURE FOR THE ARMY		
SECTION THREE	2:16-3:11	Rule of trumpets (סרך החצוצרות)
Paragraph 6	2:16-E	First list of trumpets
Paragraph 7	2:E-3:11	Second list of trumpets
(Paragraph 7.1)	2:E-3:9	Trumpets for attack
(Paragraph 7.2)	3:10-11	Trumpets for withdrawal
SECTION FOUR	3:13-5:2	"סרך אותות כול העדה" - Rule of the banners of the entire congregation
Paragraph 8	3:13-4:5	Inscriptions on "אותות כול העדה" (banners of the entire congregation)
Paragraph 9	4:6-8	Inscriptions on priestly banners for the different stages of war
Paragraph 10	4:9-14	Inscriptions on "אותות העדה" (banners of the congregation) for the different stages of war
Paragraph 11	4:15-17	Length of the banners
Paragraph 12	4:18-5:2	Inscription on the "...]מ"
SECTION FIVE	5:3-6:6	"סרך לסדר דגלי המלחמה" - Description of the army's different infantry units
Paragraph 13	5:3-14	Description of the "מערכת הפנים" (frontal formation) and its weaponry
Paragraph 14	5:16-6:6	Description of the "דגלי הבינים" (skirmishers) and its weaponry
SECTION SIX	6:8-17	Description of the army's cavalry
Paragraph 15	6:8-17	Description of the "סדרי הפרשים" (cavalry) and its weaponry

1QM OUTLINE (Part 2)		
SECTION SEVEN	6:19-7:7	General regulations for the army
Paragraph 16	6:19-7:7	Age and purity restrictions of various positions in the army
TACTICAL ISSUES OF THE WAR		
ROLE OF THE PRIESTS DURING THE BATTLE(S)		
Introduced by "ובסדר מערכות המלחמה לקראת האויב" (When the army is set up against the enemy...)		
SECTION EIGHT	7:9-9:E	Role of the priests in the tactical operations of the military.
Paragraph 17	7:9-9:9	"ובסדר מערכות המלחמה לקראת האויב" - When facing the enemy
Paragraph 18	9:10-16	"סרך לשנות סדר דגלי המלחמה" - Modifying the formations
Paragraph 19	9:17-E	"ה"אורב" - the ambush
PRAYERS & SPEECHES TO BE SAID AT WAR		
SECTION NINE	9:E-12:5	Prayers for before the army is deployed
Paragraph 20	9:E-11:12	Prayer "וילמדינו" (And He has taught us)
Paragraph 21	11:13-12:5	Prayer "תסגיר" (You will deliver)
SECTION TEN	12:7-E	Prayers for after the army is deployed or during the fighting
Paragraph 22	12:7-16	Prayer and call to action "ואתה אל" (And You, God)
(Paragraph 22.1)	12:7-13a	Call upon God to act
(Paragraph 22.2)	12:13b-15a	Call upon Zion to rejoice
(Paragraph 22.3)	12:15b-16	Call upon the daughters to rejoice
Paragraph 23	12:17-E	Prayer "גבורי המלחמה" (Mighty ones of war)
SECTION ELEVEN	12:E-14:E	Prayers for victory time and after
Paragraph 24	12:E-13:3	Instructions and prayer "ברוך אל" (Blessed be God)
Paragraph 25	13:4-6	Prayer "וארור בליעל" (And cursed be Belial)
Paragraph 26	13:7-17	Prayer "אל אבותינו" (God of our fathers)
(Paragraph 26.1)	13:7-10a	Prayer "אל אבותינו" (God of our fathers)
(Paragraph 26.2)	13:10b-17	Prayer "ואתה עשית" (And You have made)
Paragraph 27	13:18-14:1	Prayer "כִּי־אָתָּה יַעֲדָתָנוּ" (For You have appointed us)

IQM OUTLINE (Part 3)		
Paragraph 28 (Paragraph 28.1)	14:2-15 14:2-4a	Instruction for after the victory Hymn of Return and instructions for the morning after the battle
(Paragraph 28.2)	14:4b-15	Prayer "ברוך אל ישראל" (Blessed be the God of Israel)
Paragraph 29 (Paragraph 29.a)	14:16-E 14:E-E	Prayer: "רומה רומה" (Rise up! Rise up!) [Instructions (and prayer?) for returning to camp]
SPECIFICS FOR THE WAR AGAINST THE KITTIM		
SECTION TWELVE	14:E-16:1	Preparations for the War against the Kittim
Paragraph 30	14:E-15:3	Short description of the war against the Kittim
Paragraph 31	15:4-16:1	Instructions for before engaging the enemy
(Paragraph 31.1)	15:4-6a	Instructions for the Chief Priest
(Paragraph 31.2)	15:6b-16:1	Speech of the Appointed Priest "הזקו ואמצו" (Be strong and courageous)
SECTION THIRTEEN	16:3-9	Instruction for during the fighting of the War against the Kittim
Paragraph 32	16.3-9	Launching of the war
(SECTION FOURTEEN)	16:11-18:E	Fall of the Sons of Light and launching the final attack
Paragraph 33	16:11-14	Fall of the Sons of Light and calling back of the troops
Paragraph 34	16:15-17:3	Chief Priest's speech "יבחן במצרף" (He puts to test in the crucible)
Paragraph 35	17:4-9	Chief Priest's speech "התחזקו" (Strengthen yourselves)
Paragraph 36	17:10-E	Deployment of the reserves
SECTION FIFTEEN	18:E-19:E	Instructions for victory time and after
Paragraph 37	17:E-18:9	Fall of the Kittim and prayer "ברוך שמכה" (Blessed be your name)
Paragraph 38	18:10-E	Prayer "הפלתה" (You have performed wonders)
Paragraph 39	18:E-19:8	Prayer and call to action "ואתה אל" (And You, God)
(Paragraph 39.1)	18:E-19:5a	Call upon God to act
(Paragraph 39.2)	19:5b-6	Call upon Zion to rejoice
(Paragraph 39.3)	19:7-8	Call upon the daughters to rejoice
Paragraph 40	19:9-?	Return to the camp and instructions for the morning after

4.2. Explanatory notes

1:7 - Note the possible omission of this division in 4Q496 frg. 3:7 (see page 67).

1:15 - Note the possible omission of this division in 4Q496 frgs. 2+1:8 (see page 67).

1:E - The last unit at the bottom of col. 1, only fragments of which are preserved, seems to be about the angels' (קדושים) role in bringing victory over the Sons of Darkness. In contrast, the first few lines of col. 2 are dealing with the nation's leadership, especially in the context of temple worship and conscription, and are seemingly unrelated to the end of col. 1. Thus I have chosen to reconstruct a major sense division between the two. Note that 4Q496 frgs. 2+1 may not preserve the break after 1:15 (see page 67) and that 4Q494 hints to the fact that 1QM 2:1–10 may once have had more sense divisions than presently (see page 66).

2:10 - As I have pointed out (see page 54), it makes good sense that there is a *vacat* at the end of 2:9, marking this line as the beginning of a new unit.

2:15 - While it is impossible to determine from the scroll if this line was completely blank or not, the drastic change in topics before and after, from war chronology to dealing with trumpets, justifies identifying this as a major break.

2:E - Based on 4Q496 frg. 8 which is helpful in reconstructing the bottom of 1QM 2, there appears to have been two trumpet lists, the *vacat* in 4Q496 frg. 8:4 preserving the division between the two. Consequently, what is preserved in 3:1–11 is the second list.⁶⁵ Note as well the more extensive dividing of 1QM 3:1–10 in 4Q496 frgs. 8–10.

3:10 - I am suggesting that this line may have been the beginning of a new unit (see page 54). While this remains a possibility, the

⁶⁵ Tov suggested that the supralinear inscription at the beginning of the line may be a title for a new section (*Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 177). I take it to be a correction or rewriting of what is underneath and in between parentheses (see Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 201). My understanding is that the first two words "formations of war" (סדרי המלחמה) are not the beginning of a statement, but part of the name for a trumpet whose name is repeated in line 6 together with its inscription.

continuity in theme before and after this potential divider is as significant as the change from trumpets used for advance to those used for withdrawal. Both possibilities can be assumed here, neither being in contradiction with the flow of the text.

3:12 - This skipped line is reflected by the *paraphos* in 4Q496 frg. 10:2 (see page 69).

4:9 - The small *vacat* at the end of line 8, and the introduction of a new topic with the word “rule” (סרך) confirms that this is the beginning of a new unit (see page 53).

4:17 - It seems likely that the *vacat* at the end of this line indicates a unit delimiter (see note 33).

5:3 - Although the author/editor did not skip a line here, there is a complete shift in theme from the preceding paragraph, from banner inscriptions to army unit formations. It may be that since 5:2 only has five words on it leaving much of the line blank, coupled by the fact that the new unit begins with the word “rule” (סרך - see page 53), the author/editor thought that these were sufficient to mark a large sense division, and did not see it necessary to skip yet another line.⁶⁶

5:15 - This blank line does not seem to be marking a sharp thematic difference between the units before and after it. Both deal with army formations. Since there is no *vacat* at the end of 5:14, I am assuming that this skipped line is a minor break marking these two distinct units on army formation, the first focusing on the “front formations” (מערכת פנים - 5:3), and the second on the “units of skirmishers” (דגלי בינים - 6:1).⁶⁷

6:18 - I am assuming the entire line was left blank (see page 44), and that it marks a major sense division between the description of the cavalry and general rules for the army as a whole.

⁶⁶ It is interesting to note that Carmignac, who also saw two-tiered sense division in M, similarly suggested that this particular break should be major (see *Règle de la Guerre*, 76).

⁶⁷ Carmignac also concluded that this skipped line did not mark a large sense division (*Règle de la Guerre*, 85–86).

7:1-E - Note that 4Q491 frgs. 1-3, when reconstructed together,⁶⁸ preserves a much more complicated system of sense division not reflected in M.

9:E - The shift in content from the extant part at the end of col. 9 to the beginning of col. 10 is quite dramatic. After a section with several units dealing with tactical issues, cols. 10 to 14 deal with numerous speeches, prayers, blessings, and curses that are to be recited when at war. It therefore seems obvious that a major unit delimiter separated these two sections.

12:6 - On this skipped line, and its possible implications for understanding the relationship of the units before and after it, see the discussion beginning on page 277.

12:7-16 - While in M this paragraph is a single unit, in the parallel passage in 4Q492 frg. 1 there are several *vacat* breaking up this paragraph into smaller subunits (see page 61).

13:10 - Note the possible extra sense division in 4Q495 (see page 67).

13:17 - The beginning of this line is not extant, precluding us from knowing whether the entire line, or just the end of it, was left blank. Since both before and after this break the text seems to be dealing with prayers, I have recorded it as a minor break. That 13:18 is a prayer is assumed from the fact that “you” (הָאָתָּא) in the phrase is an address to God.

14:2-15 - While this is a single unit in M, 4Q491 frgs. 8-10 seems to suggest that at one point there may have been an extra break in the text (see page 69).

14:E - The last few lines of col. 14 are parts of a prayer calling upon God to act. The same prayer is found in 4Q491 frgs. 8-10, col. 1 lines 13-16. After a *vacat* extending to the end of the line, a new unit begins on line 17, giving instructions for the return to camp, possibly with more prayers to be said. Not only does 4Q491 8-10 i:13-16 help in reconstructing the last three extant lines of 1QM 14, it may also preserve its continuation. If so, one should reconstruct an extra sense divider either at the end of 1QM 14:18 or 19. In Table 7, this reconstructed break is represented by indented italics within

⁶⁸ Such a reconstruction may not be warranted; see above, page 36.

parentheses. Furthermore, 1QM 15 deals with instructions for going to battle against the Kittim.⁶⁹ The contrast in topics between the two columns justifies reconstructing a large sense division at the bottom of col. 14. Alternatively, it may be that after the prayer calling upon God to act in 1QM 14, the continuation was not instructions for the morning after as in 4Q491 frgs. 8–10. Instead, after a major unit divider, it launched into instructions for going to battle against the Kittim, the topic which is continued at the top of 1QM 15.

15:4–16:1 - While this is a single unit in M, 4Q491 frgs. 14+15 suggests that it might have once had an extra sense division at 15:6 (see page 70).

16:10 - If one considers the evidence from 4Q491 (see page 69), it could be argued that this skipped line was intended to be a small sense division rather than a large one. I have reflected this data by not writing the section heading in bold.

17:E - The end of col. 17 deals with the launching of the “skirmishers” (אנשי הבינים) to the battle field, while the beginning of col. 18 gives instructions for the engagement of the entire army for the final pursuit, once it becomes clear that God has intervened to bring about the victory. I have therefore reconstructed a major break between these two columns to mark this transition in the war and the new set of guidelines it requires.

18:8 - In spite of the skipped line here which does not seem to be a minor sense division, the contents before and after this sense division are unequivocally and intimately related (see the discussion below beginning on page 283). For the purposes of outlining the tent of the scroll, therefore, it makes more sense to place the major break between cols. 17 and 18, and interpret this break as a minor sense division.

18:E - Column 18 ends with a prayer acknowledging that the battle is in God’s hands (18:13) and that by His power will there be victory. In contrast, the beginning of col. 19 is a prayer already encountered in 12:7–16. Therefore, I am assuming that there was a minor break between the two.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ See below, Chapter 5.

⁷⁰ This is assuming that col. 19 follows immediately after col. 18. Although this is the majority view, it is not unanimous (see page 12).

19:1–8 - as with 1QM 12:8–16, the evidence from 4Q492 suggests that this section may have been further subdivided at one point (see page 61).

4.3. *Identifying larger units in the War Scroll*

In addition, in the process of outlining the text it appeared to me that there were general themes that were being developed and whose scope transcended the large unit dividers. These I have indicated by large bold headings in capital letters without relating them to specific column and line references. In many ways, they are similar to the “Series” which Yadin suggested, in that they are not derived from evidence in the presentation of the text, but from a personal understanding of how various themes were dealt with. I have included them as guides to facilitate reader comprehension. Thus, the outline presented here aims at best representing the thought progression of the author/editor as witnessed by the sense divisions extant in the scroll. In my outline, any quotations taken directly from M are between quotation marks. Non extant unit delimiters are in italic letters. Possible breaks are recorded in parentheses. Breaks reconstructed from M Material are between parentheses and in italics. Major breaks in the text are in bold letters, and called “sections,” although realizing that this is not necessarily the way the author/editor understood these sense divisions. Some of the content headers emanate from my own understanding of the structure of the war, and will become clear over the course of this study. Finally, even if some of the following reconstructed outline must remain tentative, it nevertheless records all extant sense divisions.

4.4. *Comparison of various suggested outlines*

The results of the above exercise can now be compared to the research of other scholars who have outlined M. Table 8 is a comparison of various outlines that have been suggested. The left column records all sense divisions extant in the text, grouping them per column (systematically separating them by a blank line, whether

or not anyone suggested the end of the column had a unit delimiter or not). Skipped lines in M are marked in bold. In the other columns, references in bold are major sense divisions, while bold headings in capital letters are the scholar's own division of the scroll into major themes. Unit references recorded in italics indicate that they involve some measure of reconstruction. Those in parentheses are derived from the Cave 4 M Material. Dashes (-) indicate instances where sense division was ignored in the outline, and exclamation marks (!) where the text was divided up even though no sense division is recorded. What this table cannot represent, is the way the various scholars interpreted the text as a result of their particular outline, though the differences are at times significant.

TABLE 8: COMPARISON OF 1QM OUTLINES (Part 1)						
Sense Division	Schultz	Yadin	Martin	Carmignac	Ploeg	Duhaime
	Background	War Series				
	1:1-2:14		1:1-2:14	1:1-E	1:1-E	Introduction
1:1-7	1:1-7	1:1-7	1:1-7	1:1-7		1:1-7
1:8-15	1:8-15	1:8-15	1:8-15	1:8-15	-	1:8-15
1:16-E	1:16-E	1:16-2:14	1:16-2:14	1:16-E	-	1:16-E
	1:E-2:14			1:E-2:14	2:1-14	Organization
2:1-9	1:E-2:9			1:E-2:14		1:E-2:14
2:10-14	2:10-14	-	-	-	-	-
	Army	Battle Series				
2:15	2:16-3:11		2:16-3:11	2:16-3:11	2:16-3:11	
2:16-E	2:16-E	2:16-3:11		2:16-3:11		2:16-3:11
3:1-11	2:E-3:11 (2:E-3:9?) (3:10-11)					
3:12	3:13-5:2		3:13-5:14	3:13-4:17	3:13-5:2	
3:13-E	3:13-4:5	3:13-4:5	3:13-4:5	3:13-19/20		3:13-4:17
4:1-5				4:1-5		
4:6-8	4:6-8	4:6-14	4:6-5:2	4:6-8	-	-
4:9-14	4:9-14	-	-	4:9-14	-	-
4:15-17	4:15-17	4:15-5:2		4:15-17	-	-
4:18-E	4:18-5:2	-	-		-	4:18-5:2
				4:19-5:2		
5:1-2				4:19-5:2		
	5:3-6:6			5:3-6:6		
5:3-14	5:3-14	5:3-14	5:3-14	5:3-14	5:3-7:7	5:3-7:7
5:15			5:16-6:8		-	-
5:16-E	5:16-6:6	5:16-6:6		5:16-E		
6:1-6				5:E-6:6		
6:7	6:8-17		6:8-7:7	6:8-17	-	-
6:8-17	6:8-17	6:8-17		6:8-17		
6:18	6:19-7:7		-	6:19-7:7	-	-
6:19-E	6:19-7:7	6:19-7:7		6:19-7:7		
7:1-7						
	Tactics					
7:8	7:9-12:5		7:9-12:5	7:9-9:9		
7:9-E	7:9-9:9	7:8-9:9	7:9-9:9	7:9-9:9	7:9-9:9	7:9-9:9
8:1-E						
9:1-9						

COMPARISON OF IQM OUTLINES (Part 2)						
Sense Division	Schultz	Yadin	Martin	Carmignac	Ploeg	Duhaime
				9:10-E		
9:10-16	9:10-16	9:10-16	9:10-16	9:10-16	9:10-17	9:10-E
		Ritual Series				
9:17-E	9:17-E	9:17-11:12	9:17-11:12	9:17-E		War Prayers
	Prayers			9:E-12:E		
	9:E-12:5			9:E-11:12	10:1-12:18	9:E-12:E
10:1-E	9:E-11:12					
11:1-12						
11:13-E	11:13-12:5	11:13-12:5	11:13-12:5	11:13-E?	-	-
12:1-5				11:E?-12:5?		
12:6	12:7-E		12:7-13:16		-	-
12:7-16	12:7-16	12:7-16	12:7-16	12:7-16		
	(12:7-13a)					
	(12:13b-15a)					
	(12:15b-16)					
12:17-E	12:17-E	12:17-13:3	12:17-13:3	12:17-E	-	-
	12:E-14:E			12:E-14:1		
13:1-3	12:E-13:3			12:E-13:3	13:1-14:1	12:E-14:1
13:4-6	13:4-6	13:4-6	13:4-6	13:4-6	-	-
13:7-16	13:7-16	13:7-16	13:7-13:16	13:7-16	-	-
	(13:7-10a)					
	(13:10b-17)					
			13:18-16:1			
13:18-E	13:18-14:1	13:18-14:1	13:18-14:1	13:18-14:1	-	-
14:1						
				14:2-E		
14:2-15	14:2-15	14:2-15	14:2-15	14:2-15	14:2-18	14:2-E
	(14:2-4a)					
	(14:4b-15)					
		Kittim Series				
14:16-E	14:16-E	14:16-15:3	14:16-15:3	14:16-E	-	-
	(14:16-E)					
	(14:E-E?)					
	Kittim					Kittim
	14:E-16:1			14:E-16:9	15:1-19:13	
15:1-3	14:E-15:3			14:E-15:3	15:1-3	14:E-15:3
15:4-E	15:4-16:1	15:4-16:1	15:4-16:1	15:4-16:1		15:4-16:9
	(15:4-6a)				15:4-6 (!)	
	(15:6b-16:1)				15:6-16:1	
16:1						

COMPARISON OF IQM OUTLINES (Part 3)						
Sense Division	Schultz	Yadin	Martin	Carmignac	Ploeg	Duhaime
16:2	16:3-9		16:3-9			-
16:3-9	16:3-9	16:3-9	16:3-9	16:3-9	16:3-9	
16:10	16:11-18:E		16:11-18:8	16:11-17:E		
16:11-14	16:11-14	16:11-14	16:11-14	16:11-14	16:11-17:9	16:11-17:E
16:15-E	16:15-17:3	16:15-17:3	16:15-17:3	16:15-17:3	-	-
17:1-3						
17:4-9	17:4-9	17:4-9	17:4-9	17:4-9	-	-
17:10-E	17:10-E	17:10-18:8	17:10-18:8	17:10-E	17:10-E	-
18:1-8	17:E-18:9			17:E-18:3a	18:1-19:8	17:E-19:8
				18:3b-8 (!)		
				18:3b-8 (!)		
18:9?			18:10-	18:10-E	-	-
18:10-E	18:10-E	18:10-E	18:10-19:8	18:10-E		
	18:E-19:E			19:1-19:8		
19:1-8	18:E-19:8	19:1-8		19:1-8		
	(18:E-19:5a)					
	(19:5b-6)					
	(19:7-8)					
19:9-	19:9-	19:9-	19:9-	19:9-	19:9-E	19:9-20:?

CHAPTER THREE

THE WAR IN COLUMN 1

1. THE PROBLEM: AN APPARENT LACK OF COHERENCE IN THE *WAR SCROLL*

Having examined the physical lay-out of the text with its sense divisions, we can now turn to examining the scroll's content. Upon a first reading of M, one is not impressed with any coherent development of its various themes. Rather, the text gives the impression of being a collage of several subject matters apparently related to an end-time war, but the relationships between them are not always immediately discernible. Yet a proper understanding of the scroll is imperative for any subsequent comparative work with other related texts, be they fragmentary copies, recensions, or even different compositions altogether which relate to the eschatological war. Whatever the development of M's composition may have been, its presentation reveals that it was considered to be a final coherent product,¹ and it is incumbent upon the reader to understand it as best he can.

The seeming lack of logic in M can be seen right from the beginning, in what appears to be contradictory information on the war between cols. 1 and 2. In the first column we are told that the Sons of Light are the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin (1:2), apparently assuming that the rest of Israel is part of the violators of the covenant (1:2), those who help constitute the Sons of Darkness.² In col. 2, however, we read that the Sons of Light will choose their soldiers from *all* the tribes of Israel (2:7). In col. 1, one gets the impression

¹ See above, pages 40 and 71.

² For an alternative syntax of that line, leading to a different interpretation, see Hanan Eshel, "תפילת יוסף מקומראן, פפירוס ממצדה והמקדש השומרוני בהר גריזים," *Zion* 56 (1991): 126, n. 2, and the discussion below, beginning on page 102.

that the war will be short and effective (1:5–7, 9–11), yet in col. 2 one reads that the war will last forty years (2:6–9). While it could be that the two columns are discussing different stages of the war, col. 1 seems to clearly state that Belial, the sons of Japheth, Assyria, and the Kittim will all be soundly defeated, yet these very same enemies are listed later in cols. 17–19.

Other aspects in M do not seem to be very coherent. Column 6 lines 8–17 describe in detail the cavalry: its horses, riders, even its weaponry. Yet when the battle is described in detail in cols. 15–19, the cavalry is never mentioned again. A second example concerns the trumpets used for war. Column 3 describes at least 13 different types of trumpets together with their inscriptions, yet in all subsequent discussions of the war (such as in cols. 7 and 16), only four types are ever used, and like the cavalry, the other trumpets are never mentioned again.

Finally, there are sections which are repeated, at times almost verbatim, at times including slight additions or changes, but never with any explanations as to the rationale behind the repetition. Probably the most glaring example is 12:8–16 and 19:1–8, both being a call upon God and his people to act. Yet the order of events before and after this call is different in the two columns. Similarly, after a general description of the army (2:16–7:7), there is a section giving precise tactical instructions for a group of soldiers called the “skirmishers” (אנשי הבינים - 7:9–9:E). A similar discussion of their tactics, albeit shortened and somewhat altered, is found in 16:3–9. On the surface, there does not seem to be any need for such a repetition. In 10:2–5, there is a speech that is to be given by a priest (הכֹּהֵן) before the battle, while in 15:4–16 there is reference to a similar speech by the “assigned priest” (הכֹּהֵן הַחֲרוּץ), also to be delivered before the battle. No reference is made back to the first speech, and the reader is left wondering if it is the same speech by the same person or two separate speeches by two different priests. And as a last example, in 14:2–15, there are instructions for immediately after a victory. A different set of instructions for the same stage in the war are given in 19:8–14, yet nowhere is it explained why the two sets are needed nor is any rationale for the differences between them given.

While the above examples are obvious difficulties for the modern reader, the author³ of M obviously did not consider them to be problematic, but rather assumed that his text was sufficiently clear to be understood properly. More than likely, some of the difficulties mentioned above stem from the bottom part of the scroll not being preserved, resulting in the loss of key passages necessary for a complete understanding of the text. Nevertheless, with the majority of the scroll being preserved (at least up until the point where it breaks off at col. 19), it should still be possible to reconstruct the author's progression of thought with relative accuracy. I suggest that the key to this exercise depends on two aspects. The first is a proper grasp of the progression of the war, meaning its sequence (chronology), and the second is identifying key themes and expressions which help unify the different sections of the composition.

The basis for correctly deciphering the eschatological war as presented in M lies in a proper understanding of the first two columns and their relationship to the rest of the scroll. While it is immediately obvious that these two columns give the background and a general overview of the war, the finer details are not so easy to grasp.

2. THE PROBLEM OF RECONSTRUCTING 1QM 1:3–6

An initial difficulty in interpreting col. 1 are the missing first few words at the beginning of lines 3–6 which has allowed for multiple interpretations. Three main lines of reasoning were adopted in order to fill this lacuna. Yadin suggested that lines 4 and 5 were dealing with a specific attack of God upon the kings of the north, those belonging to Belial:⁴

³ From here on, by "author" I mean the one(s) responsible for the text in its present shape. He may or may not be responsible for the sense divisions (see note 1 on page 42).

⁴ Transcription and translation from Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 259 (italics in the original). A somewhat similar position was also held by Baastian Jongeling; see *Rouleau de la Guerre*, 57.

ואחר המלחמה יעלו משם³
 ע[ל כול גדודי] הכתיים במצרים ובקצו יצא בחמה גדולה להלחם במלכי⁴
 הצפון ואפו להשמיד ולהכרית את קרן
 [בליעל והי]אה עת ישועה לעם אל...⁵

- ³ ... and after the battle they shall go up thence
⁴ against [all the troops of] the Kittim in Egypt. In His appointed time He shall go forth with great wrath to fight against the kings of the north, and His anger *shall be such as* to destroy utterly and to cut off the horn
⁵ [of Belial. That shall be] a time of deliverance for the people of God...

Others, such as Dupont-Sommer,⁵ on the basis of the fact that they perceived similarities with Dan 11:40–12:3, suggested that the masculine singular suffixes and verbs in line 4 were referring to an individual, such as a king, coming out of Egypt and heading north to defeat his enemies there (the kings of the north), and that this inner-fighting amongst the enemies of Israel would bring deliverance to the Sons of Light:⁶

... ואחר המלחמה יעלו משם³
 ע[מים ומלך] הכתיים [יכנס] במצרים ובקצו יצא בחמה גדולה להלחם במלכי⁴
 הצפון ואפו להשמיד ולהכרית את קרן
 [אויביו והי]אה עת ישועה לעם אל...⁵

- ³ ... After this war the [nations] shall go up from there
⁴ [and the king of] the Kittim [shall enter] Egypt. And in his time he shall set out, the prey to violent fury, to battle against the kings of the North, and his anger shall (seek) to destroy and wipe out the horn of
⁵ [his] e[nemies]. This shall be the time of salvation for the people of God...

⁵ Dupont-Sommer, "Règlement de la guerre," 29–30; *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1959), 185–86 (see also the English translation, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. Geza Vermes [Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1961], 170; from here on, only it will be referenced). For a similar view, see also Geza Vermes, "Quelques traditions de la communauté de Qumran d'après les manuscrits de l'université hébraïque," *Cahiers Sioniens* 9 (1955): 28; van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 35, 59.

⁶ Transcription from Dupont-Sommer's notes in "Règlement de la guerre," 29–30, and translation from Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 170.

David Flusser took this idea even further. He agreed that these lines were referring to an attack by a king in Egypt, but based on his understanding of how the author of M was using Dan 11:40–12:3, he suggested that these lines were not referring to an attack against the kings of the north, but against Israel itself.⁷

... ואחר המלחמה יעלו משם ³
 [ויבוא מלך] הכתיים במצרים ובקצו יצא בחמה גדולה להלחם בלמכי הצפון ⁴
 ואפו להשמיד ולהכרית את קרן
 [ישראל והי]אה עת ישועה לעם אל... ⁵

³ ... And after the war they will go up from there.

⁴ [And the king] of the Kittim [will come] into Egypt. And in his time he will go out with great fury to wage war against the kings of the north, and his wrath (is) to destroy and cut off the horn of

⁵ [Israel, but i]t will be a time of salvation for God's people...

This reconstruction was quite a bold one, as it contradicted all commentators before him. That an attack to “cut off Israel’s horn” should be a “time of salvation for God’s people” hardly seemed to make sense. Flusser, however, found support in Dan 11:45 where the king’s doom happens rather mysteriously, without anyone being able to rescue him.

Already the interpretation and reconstruction of just these three lines resulted in differing opinions concerning the development of the war. In this particular case, the eventual publication of one of the Cave 4 manuscripts proved to be particularly helpful. Although 4Q496 is a different recension than M, with respect to col. 1 it appears to be particularly similar, if not altogether identical.⁸ Frag-

⁷ Transcription from Flusser, “היסודות האפוקליפטיים,” 434–52, with my own translation (see also the translation in the English translation of the article, “Apocalyptic Elements,” 155, though it does not have the Hebrew transcription of the relevant passage in M). A summary of Flusser’s arguments can be found in Hanan Eshel, “The Kittim in the *War Scroll* and in the Pesharim,” in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz, STDJ 37 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 34–36.

⁸ Although frg. 3 is extremely difficult to read (“L’ensemble du texte est presque illisible.”), Baillet still felt he could reconstruct most of the text based on 1QM 1. Assuming that all his readings are correct, reconstructing 4Q496 frg. 3 in light of 1QM 1 results in lines of relatively equal lengths, somewhere between 50 and 70

ment 3 line 4 reads ...]ראל והיא^ם עת[... , thereby confirming Flusser's reconstruction of the beginning of 1QM 1:5, and by default, his understanding of the relationship between the introduction of M and Dan 11.

3. THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE WAR: A DEPENDENCE UPON DANIEL 11:40–12:3

Very important to Flusser's understanding of M's introduction was that its author had used Dan 11:40–12:3 not only linguistically,⁹ as had been already recognized by many scholars,¹⁰ but also to set the historical background for the eschatological war.¹¹ Interestingly enough, modern scholarship has established that in the prophetic oracle of Dan 11, v. 40 is the transition from prophecy *ex eventus* to genuine prediction: while it is possible to trace the series of events

letters each. The only difference between the two texts would be that 4Q496 frg. 3:6 adds "all" (כול) above "for the sons of" (לבני) of 1QM 1:7, as if the phrase is to be read "for all the sons of darkness" (לכול בני חושך - see *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 58). See also Abegg's suggested emendation of the text in order to better balance the number of letters per line ("War Scroll," 83).

⁹ Note Gregory Beale's study, where he suggests that there are more allusions to Dan 11–12 in 1QM 1:1–15 than to all other biblical books put together (*The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John* [New York: University Press of America, 1984], 60, n. 89).

¹⁰ Jean Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans la « Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres »,» *RB* 63 (1956): 234–60; van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 22–25; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 18–26, 256–59; von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 30–34; Alfred Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte des Texte vom Toten Meer*, SBM 12 (Stuttgart: Echter, 1971), 79–83.

¹¹ Both Gregory Beale (*Use of Daniel*, 42–66) and Dean Wenthe ("The Use of Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM," *DSD* 5 [1998]: 297–98) looked at the relationship between Dan 11 and 1QM 1, without seeing any historical implications, but neither seem to have been aware of Flusser's article. The fact that the author of M quoted from 11:40 to 12:3 (and not just to 11:45) may be evidence against the idea that ch. 11 was added to a more primitive text comprised of chs. 10 and 12 (E. Jepsen, "Bermerkungen zum Danielbuch," *VT* 11 [1961]: 389–90; Paul L. Redditt, "Daniel 11 and the Sociohistorical Setting of the Book of Daniel," *CBQ* 60, no. 3 [1998]: 471). On the history of the development of Dan 10–12, see Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, AB 23 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), 14.

allegorized in vv. 1–39, those in vv. 40–45 remain unfulfilled.¹² It appears, therefore, that the author of M realized that these verses had not been fulfilled as expected, and consequently composed the introduction to M as an explanation as to how these verses could still be expected to be fulfilled.¹³

3.1. *Summary of Daniel 11:40–12:3*

The order of events depicted in Dan 11:40–12:3 is quite clear: at “the time of the end” (וּבַעַת קֵץ) a king of the south is to oppose a king of the north, only to find himself attacked and invaded by the very king he hoped to subdue (v. 40). As the king of the north sets out to invade the king of the south’s territory, he will pass through the Land of Israel, causing great destruction, although Edom, Moab, and some of the Ammonites will be able to escape (v. 41). But this will not hinder the king of the north’s advance so that he will take over many countries, including Egypt and its neighbors which he will plunder (vv. 42–43). However, being alarmed by news coming from the east and the north, he will leave Egypt with great fury, intent on destruction (v. 44). On his way, he will camp between the sea and the Holy Mountain, where he will come to a sudden end, with no one to help him (v. 45). During “that time” (וּבַעַת הַהִיא), that very time of the end, God’s people will be going through a “time of tribulation” (עַת צָרָה) as never before, but the archangel Michael will come to rescue them, so that those who had been predestined may be saved (12:1). At the

¹² The last identifiable event in ch. 11 precedes Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ death. The events of vv. 40–45 were those expected to lead up to his death. See James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, ICC 19 (New York: Scribner, 1927), 470 and John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 388–89. The last identifiable event in the book of Daniel as a whole that can be identified dates to 166–165 BCE, putting the final editing of the book to just after 165 BCE (see Hartman and di Lella, *Daniel*, 253–54).

¹³ The *War Scroll*, therefore, would stand in direct opposition to the book of 1 Maccabees which, if Jonathan Goldstein’s perspective is correct, did not hesitate to show how the prophecies of Daniel had proven false (*I Maccabees*, AB 41 [New York: Doubleday, 1976], 42–54).

end of it all, the radiance of those who will have been rescued will be like that of heavenly luminaries (v. 3).

3.2. *Understanding column 1 in light of Daniel*

3.2.1. *Historical considerations*

In light of these details, Flusser saw that it was possible to make better sense of col. 1. The beginning of the Sons of Light's "dominion" (משלוח יד)¹⁴ will be against the army of Belial, which includes Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, the Kittim of Assyria, and the violators of the covenant. The key for understanding the chronology of the eschatological war is that Edom, Moab, and Ammon are among the Sons of Light's enemies.¹⁵ Since from Dan 11:41 it is known that they are the very ones who escape the wrath of the king of the north on his journey south into Egypt, this implies that this event is to have *already* taken place by the time the final war is to take place. This does not mean, however, that this southern campaign had already occurred prior to the composition of M. Rather, it seems as though the author was still expecting it.¹⁶ Apparently, he believed that the reason these nations would be able to escape the wrath of the king of the north on his way south is because they will have signed a treaty with him, just as those living along the coast (Philistia), as well as the violators of the covenant, these last ones being Jews who had aligned themselves with the king of the north.¹⁷ Thus, for M, this crucial event of the king of the north passing through the Land of Israel on his way to Egypt, as depicted in Dan 11:40–41, would have to take place first. Only afterwards will the final confrontation be engaged. We are not told when these events were expected to take

¹⁴ On the meaning of this phrase, see Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 2. It may be that this is in opposition or in reaction to the king of the north's action in Dan 11:42 where he extends his rule over territories (וישלח ידו בארצות). However, it is important to note that this expression, when applied to a people group, is found only in Isa 11:14 (Beale, *Use of Daniel*, 45, n. 63). See also the discussion below on page 99.

¹⁵ Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 145–46.

¹⁶ Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 154.

¹⁷ Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 146.

place, only that M still anticipated them as a fulfillment of the portion of Daniel's prophecy that was as of yet still unrealized.¹⁸

This idea is confirmed in line 4. There, we learn that the eschatological war will be launched when someone, on his own time and initiative, will leave Egypt with great fury (... בחמה גדולה - בקצו יצא - 1:4) to deal with *other* northern kings who are causing him worry. This is clearly based on Dan 11:44, where the king of the north has become alarmed by rumors coming from the north and the east, although M omits the reference to the east. It was by understanding this aspect in the chronological relationship between Dan 11 and M that allowed Flusser to properly reconstruct the beginning of line 5. Realizing that in Daniel the acting agent is the king of the north, Israel's enemy, it had to be likewise in line 4. And if so, he concluded, the object of this king's wrath at the beginning of line 5 could only be Israel, and not her enemies as had been surmised by the commentators before him. Consequently, it became obvious that the beginning of line 4 could be no other than Daniel's king of the north, where, based on the extant text, he must have been called the "king [of the Kittim]" (מלך [הכתיים]).¹⁹ Although he is the king of the "Kittim of Assyria" (1QM 1:2 - כתיי אשור), at this particular point in time he would be "in Egypt" (במצרים). What permitted Flusser to foresee this unexpected reading was that he had already understood that the reference to "Edom, Moab, and the sons of Ammon" as enemies of the Sons of Light in lines 1–2 meant that the king's campaign south had already taken place. Consequently, he reconstructed the beginning of the line to give the context implied in Dan 11:42–44: "and [the king of] the Kittim will c[ome] to Egypt

¹⁸ This is a different view than both Russell Gmirkin and Giovanni Ibba who have sought to identify historical allusions in 1QM 1. Gmirkin thinks that 1QM 1:1–3 were composed as a type of prophecy *ex eventus*, while lines 4–7 contained genuine prophecy, which the author anticipated would find fulfillment with Antiochus V in 163 BCE ("Historical Allusions in the War Scroll," *DSD* 5 [1998]: 188–208). Ibba has a slightly different perspective. He suggests historical allusions can be found in 1QM 1:1–7 and 11b–12a, while 1QM 1:8–11a and 12b–15 were the actual predictions which were expected to take place sometime after 160–157 BCE (*Rotolo della Guerra*, 45–50). According to Flusser, however, M does not contain any *vaticina ex eventus*. See also page 168, especially note 286.

¹⁹ As was already suggested by Dupont-Sommer in 1955 ("Règlement de la guerre," 29), and later emphasized by Flusser ("Apocalyptic Elements," 147).

(וְיֵצֵא מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן בְּאַדְוָה גְּדוּלָה לְהַשְׂמִיד וּלְהַחֲרִים רַבִּים). Thereafter, just as in Daniel, the king of the north “will go out in great fury to destroy and annihilate many” (Dan 11:44) so in M the king of the Kittim “will go out in great fury... to destroy” (...בְּאַדְוָה גְּדוּלָה לְהַשְׂמִיד - 1QM 1:4), with the hope “to cut off Israel’s horn” (לְהַכְרִית) - את קרן [יש]ראל - 1QM 1:4–5; 4Q496 frg. 3:4; see also Lam 2:3).²⁰

From Daniel we learn that the war will take place exactly when the king of the north is camping between the Holy Mountain (Jerusalem) and the sea (Dan 11:45); from M we learn that this encounter will happen when the Sons of Light are camping out in the wilderness of Jerusalem (1QM 1:3). Interestingly, Jerusalem does not seem to be the main focus of this war.²¹ Nevertheless, at that precise point, Assyria will fall down, the Kittim’s dominion will come to an end, and there will be no escape for them (1QM 1:6), just as the king of the north had left none for the Land of Egypt (Dan 11:42). More importantly, there will be no one to help him (Dan 11:45).²²

Thus we have the historical setting and initial chronology for the apocalyptic war as presented in Dan 11:40–45 and interpreted by 1QM 1:1–7. In lines 1–3, the author of M introduces the war from the perspective of the Sons of Light, from beginning to end. In lines 4–7, he looks at it again, but this time from a broader political and historical perspective, explaining why it is that the king of the Kittim will be on his way from Egypt to the north.²³ But this paints only a partial picture of the war, as both Dan 12:1–3 and 1QM 1:8–15 reveal. Two additional aspects are introduced in Dan 12 and developed in M. The first is the involvement of the archangel Michael,

²⁰ See also 4QFlor (4Q174) frgs. 6–7:1: “to destroy the horn of [...] (לְהַאֲבִיד אֶת-...) קרן].”

²¹ On the geography of the war in col. 1, see the discussion beginning on page 159.

²² Note the play on words between 1QM 1:4 and Dan 11:45: “and in his time he will go out... and come to his end” (וּבְקִצּוֹ יֵצֵא... וְבָא עַד קִצּוֹ). On the terminology of קֵץ (“time, end”) and related terms, see Jacob Licht, “תורת העתים של כת מדבר יהודה ושל” מ, in *TDOT*, vol. 13, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, trans. David E. Green (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 78–86; Cana Werman, “Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 229–55.

²³ Flusser, “Apocalyptic Elements,” 148.

and the second is a time of unprecedented tribulation. I begin here with the latter of the two.

3.2.2. *Additional considerations*

3.2.2.1. A time of tribulation

Daniel 12:1 says that “during that time” (ובעת ההיא), it will be “a time of tribulation” (עת צרה) as never before experienced by the people of God. Already this fact could have been assumed by what has already been said in M: in 1:4–5, we learn that the king of the north is intent on “cutting off Israel’s horn” (להכרית את קרן ישראל). And from Dan 11:44 we know that in this process he will “exterminate and destroy many” (להשמיד ולהחרים רבים). These two facts are first summarized in 1QM 1:12: “and in all their tribulations there was never like it, because of its hastening until the end” (ובכול צרותמה לוא נהיתה כמוהו) (מחוושה עד תומה).²⁴ Then they are elaborated upon even further: contrary to what could have been assumed in 1QM 1:1–7, the war will not be a single all-out battle between the Sons of Darkness and the Sons of Light, but a battle of seven “rounds” (גורלות),²⁵ during which there will be “carnage” (נהשיר - 1QM 1:13–14).²⁶ During those seven rounds, those having the upper hand will alternate between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness. Possibly, then, this is how it was expected that the “many” (רבים) of Dan 11:44 would die. It is also a hint as to how close to defeat the Sons of Light will have come.²⁷

²⁴ Note that this idea of the tribulation being intense because of its hurrying to the end is different than the tribulation in 1QpHab 7:12 where it is said to be long. See also note 60 on page 387.

²⁵ For the meaning of גורל (literally “lot”) in the sense of a “round,” see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 4. He is followed by most commentators.

²⁶ J. P. de Menasce, “Iranien Naxčir,” *VT* 6 (1956): 213–14; Jes P. Asmussen, “Das iranische Lehnwort nashir in der Kriegsrulle von Qumrân,” *AcOr* 26 (1961): 3–20; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 260. For alternate views as to the meaning of this word, see G. R. Driver, “Review of E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (1955),” *JTS* 8 (1957): 142; Chaim Rabin, “Hittite Words in Hebrew,” *Or* 32 (1963): 132–33; and K. William Whitney Jr., “The Place of the ‘Wild Beast Hunt’ of Sib. Or. 3,806 in Biblical and Rabbinic Tradition,” *JSJ* 25 (1994): 68–81.

²⁷ Later on in the scroll (col. 15), this theme of the “time of tribulation” (עת צרה)

3.2.2.2. The involvement of angels

This brings us to the first matter introduced by Dan 12:1, that of the archangel Michael's role. In col. 1, it is not mentioned explicitly,²⁸ but only hinted at, for in M, his involvement is part of a greater divine intervention without which it can be assumed that the war would have ended in total defeat for the Sons of Light. During the seventh round, the "hand of God" (יד אל) together with the "angels of his dominion" (מלאכי ממשלתו) - 1QM 1:14–15) will be manifested to bring about the victory. Hints of this heavenly dimension could already be seen in lines 10–11: not only are men fighting in the battle, they are accompanied by the "congregation" and the "war-cry" of the "divine beings" (תרועת אלים and עדת אלים). Suffice it to say that this duality to the war, the physical and the spiritual, is a crucial element behind the rationale of M. Among other things, it explains why there will be no one to help the king of the Kittim (1QM 1:6) at the time of his demise, for his defeat is not merely a human matter: it is brought about by God himself. The connection to Isa 31:8 as suggested by Flusser now makes sense: Assyria will fall by a sword which is not man's.²⁹ This association of the "hand of God" (יד אל) with the "sword of God" (חרב אל) is confirmed later on in the scroll (cf. 1QM 16:1).³⁰

3.2.2.3. The emphasis on "day"

What has just been described here is the "day of their war against the Kittim" (יום מלחמתם בכתיים) - 1QM 1:12), the "day during which the Kittim will fall" (יום נפול בו כתיים) - 1:9), the "day appointed for the war of annihilation of the sons of darkness" (יום יעוד... למלחמה כלה בני) (1:10), the "day of calamity" (יום הוה) (1:11). It is impossible to know whether the term "day" was intended to be taken literally or not. The fact that it bears much resemblance to the prophetic expression "day of the Lord" suggests that the author may not have

will be picked up again. See below, page 242.

²⁸ The role of the archangel Michael may have been dealt with in 1QM 1:16–E. From the small amount of extant text, it seems as though this unit dealt with the part played by the angels (קדושים).

²⁹ See page 129.

³⁰ See also page 243.

had a literal 24 hour day in mind. It does seem, however, that this “day” is to encompass all seven rounds of the war (1:12–13). Furthermore, 1QM 1:12 points out that the period will be all the more violent because of its “hurrying until its end” (מחוישה עד תומה), so that it seems unlikely that this “day” is to be a lengthy drawn-out affair. This is the war for which the Sons of Light were expecting to have to prepare. It is the war that will usher in a new dawn to the world: “they that turn the many to righteousness (will shine) as the stars for ever and ever” (Dan 12:3); “and[the sons of right]eousness will shine unto the uttermost ends of the world, increasingly so until the end of the appointed time for darkness” (וְבָנֵי צַדִּיק יֵאִירוּ לְכוֹל קְצוֹת תְּבֵל הַלַּיְחַד וְאוֹר עַד תּוֹם כּוֹל מוֹעֲדֵי חוֹשֶׁךְ) - 1QM 1:8).

3.3. *Past misunderstandings on the relationship between column 1 and Daniel 11*

3.3.1. *General observations*

This structural or chronological connection between Dan 11:40–12:3 and 1QM 1:1–15, as first pointed out by Flusser, now seems quite obvious. Many who had studied the relationship between M and the book of Daniel not only failed to see this connection, but even argued against its possibility. In many cases, their arguments were based on a faulty reading of the beginning of line 5 (and consequently of line 4 as well), as they did not have access to 4Q496. A few examples will suffice to illustrate the point. It was claimed that in M the eschatological war would take place when the king of Egypt would attack the kings of the north, rather than when the king of the north would attack the king of the south;³¹ that it is Israel going down into Egypt to conquer it, rather than the king of the north;³² similarly, that it is God who is marching out in great fury to exterminate and cut off the enemy, rather than the king of the

³¹ van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 23.

³² Beale, *Use of Daniel*, 50–53.

north.³³ Other objections to a structural dependence of M upon the book of Daniel resulted from a failure to understand how the author was using Dan 11–12. Thus, the fact that Edom, Moab, and the Sons of Ammon are in a coalition together with the Sons of Darkness is not a difference from Dan 11 where they have escaped the wrath of the king of the north,³⁴ but a explanation of why they escaped. Nor is the expression “kings [plural] of the north” in 1QM 1:4 a change from Daniel’s “king [singular] of the north,”³⁵ but rather a referent to the worrying rumors from the north (Dan 11:44). And while it is true that in Daniel “there will be no escape” is applied to Egypt when attacked by the king of the north, whereas in 1QM 1:6–7 it refers to the Sons of Darkness when defeated by the Sons of Light,³⁶ this is only a secondary motif in the sentence: the primary one is that “there is none to rescue him” (וְאֵין עֹזֵר לוֹ), which refers to the evil king in both Daniel and M.³⁷

3.3.2. *The role of the Sons of Light in the start of the war*

There remains one difference between Dan 11–12 and 1QM 1 that defies this structural or chronological dependence. It has been pointed out that in Dan 11:40–12:3, Israel is passive throughout, while in M Israel is actively engaged.³⁸ While this is an accurate observation, it may need to be mitigated somewhat. We have seen that lines 4–7 give a more historical-political perspective on the conflict than in lines 1–3. Lines 4–5 make it quite clear that the battle is not engaged because of an initiative of the Sons of Light, but in response to an attack by the king of the Kittim. Also interesting is

³³ Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel*, 79–80.

³⁴ von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 32.

³⁵ von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 32.

³⁶ Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel*, 79.

³⁷ Beale has also pointed out that in Dan 11 the Kittim are the enemies of the king of the north, while in M, the king of the north is the king of the Kittim (*Use of Daniel*, 62). This may well be the most striking difference between the two texts and necessitates a separate discussion. It is intricately connected to the identification of the Kittim in M, a matter which is discussed below, beginning on page 127.

³⁸ von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 32. This is somewhat similar to Beale’s view that the Sons of Light are portrayed as the attackers rather than those being attacked (*Use of Daniel*, 62–63).

that in those lines, the role of the Sons of Light is not mentioned, only God's salvation that brings about a period of rule for His people. Israel's passivity in Dan 11:40–45 is accurately echoed in those lines.

Traditionally, the opening line of M has been understood as describing the Sons of Light launching the first battle. For example, Yadin's translation of the opening line is as follows: "The first engagement of the Sons of Light *shall be* to attack the lot of the Sons of Darkness..."³⁹ Van der Ploeg is even more emphatic: "Les fils de lumière devront commencer d'attaquer..."⁴⁰ On the other hand, Sukenik's own understanding of the opening lines avoided assigning such initiative to the Sons of Light. Rather, "The scroll contains a description of the war which is to break out between the 'sons of light' and the 'sons of darkness'."⁴¹ In light of lines 4–7, Carmignac's more nuanced translation therefore seems much more appropriate: "Début de la mainmise des Fils de Lumière, à commencer contre le parti des Fils de Ténèbres..."⁴² He points out that the expression "the first of the [Sons of Light's] dominion" (ראשית יד משלוח יד - 1QM 1:1) is not related to the beginning of the war itself, but to the Sons of Light's universal rule, of which this war is only the beginning.⁴³ This certainly fits well with line 8 which highlights the procedural aspect of the Sons of Light's dominion, clearly indicating that it is not a one-time event. This is all the more obvious in line 4, where we read that the king of the Kittim will set out "in *his* time" (ובקצו יצא) - emphasis mine). Understood in this way, the opening lines of M are not so much concerned with describing how the war will be launched, but whom the Sons of Light will have to overcome first.

Even so, the Sons of Light are taking an active role in the eschatological war, something which is not mentioned in Dan 11, where instead the conflict appears to be resolved by God's effort only. Yet while Israel's active participation is not explicit in

³⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 256 (italics in the original).

⁴⁰ van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 35.

⁴¹ Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 36.

⁴² Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 1.

⁴³ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 2.

Daniel's prophecy, it is easily understandable how it could have been understood as being implicit. Although Dan 11:45 hints at a divine intervention independent of all human participation, just like the Assyrian withdrawal from Jerusalem at the end of the eighth century BCE (2 Kgs 19:35), Dan 12:1 suggests that the situation is otherwise: God's miraculous deliverance will not leave the Sons of Light untouched, rather it will be a time of suffering. While Beale failed to properly understand the relationship between Dan 11–12 and 1QM 1, his suggestion that the beginning of M may be "a creative explanation of Daniel 12:1–3" may still be valid.⁴⁴ The innovation of M is that it saw the "time of distress" (עת צרה) in Dan 12:1 as one of war (1QM 1:11–12), the fighting back against the campaign launched by the king of the north.

3.4. *Implications of column 1's dependence upon Daniel 11*

3.4.1. *The political background behind column 1*

Thus, in spite of some minor changes between Dan 11:40–12:3 and 1QM 1, there is nothing contradictory between the two. There is no question that the author of M was using Dan 11:40–12:3 as a model for the structure and chronology of his introduction, just as suggested by Flusser. With the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 164 BCE having failed to bring about the expectations of the prophet's vision, M offered an alternative scenario, one which was not so dependent upon precise historical events nor bound by chronological constraints. Yet it nevertheless reflected the same socio-political dynamics as in the book of Daniel: there is still conflict between Egypt in the south and Syria in the north; within Judea, those who violate the covenant do so by their alliance with Syria; Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Philistia are all beyond Judea's political and military reach. It seems unlikely that these were to be taken allegorically only, but were intended to reflect some measure of historical reality,

⁴⁴ Beale, *Use of Daniel*, 63.

in the same way that there were to be understood as such in Daniel's vision.⁴⁵

3.4.2. *The composition date of column 1*

This being the case, all these elements have implications in determining M's date of composition. From the perspective of realism, the sooner it is composed after the people have realized that that portion of Daniel's prophecy did not come to fruition, the easier it is to reflect the same socio-political environment and the more plausible the scenario will seem to its readers.⁴⁶ Furthermore, the more the Hasmonean state expanded, the less the above scenario would seem relevant. By the time of Alexander Jannaeus, little of Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Philistia was left outside of Jewish control. Thus by virtue of M's dependence upon Dan 11 alone, we ought to expect its composition to have taken place soon after the Maccabean revolt or early on in the Hasmonean dynasty.⁴⁷ As we shall see, this date can be confirmed with other data.⁴⁸

4. THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE WAR

The above historical scenario can now be completed by a closer examination of some of its particulars. Important for our purposes is

⁴⁵ See also below, page 126. An alternative suggestion could be that both Dan 11–12 and 1QM 1 reflect or are dependent upon a common source. However, Dan 11–12 was finalized before Antiochus IV's death, while 1QM 1 was composed only once it was realized that his death did not bring about Israel's deliverance as expected. Because of such a chronological development, to posit M's dependence upon Dan 11–12's source rather than on Dan 11–12 itself contributes nothing to understanding the literary development of these texts. Instead, it only multiplies sources by assuming a additional source for which there is no evidence nor even any need.

⁴⁶ Hanan Eshel, "Review of J. Duhaime, *The War Texts: IQM and Related Documents*," *JSJ* 37 (2006): 111; Daniel J. Harrington, "'Holy War' Texts Among the Qumran Scrolls," in *Studies in Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*, ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 175–83, esp. 177.

⁴⁷ Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 154–55; Hanan Eshel, "Kittim," 37.

⁴⁸ See below, note 247, for a possible scenario suitable for M's composition.

a better understanding of who are the participants in this eschatological war, both the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness.

4.1. *The Sons of Light*

4.1.1. *An unusual description*

Traditionally, the Sons of Light have been identified as being the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin—the exiles in the wilderness (1QM 1:2).⁴⁹ However, Davies noted that this list of the three tribes together is unusual in the Dead Sea Scrolls, “Judah and Levi” being the normal Qumranic usage.⁵⁰ Indeed, in all the Dead Sea Scrolls, there is only one other time where these three tribes are listed in the same order and as a single entity, in the non-sectarian text 4Q372 (frg. 1:14).⁵¹ Based on this second text, Hanan Eshel has come to the conclusion that in M these three tribes should not be understood as belonging to the Sons of Light but to the Sons of Darkness.⁵² He suggests that the end of the sentence in 1QM 1:2, assumed to come after “the violators of the covenant” (מרשיעי הברית) should be pushed back until after “Benjamin” (בנימין), thereby reviving Dupont-Sommer’s reading of the text in which he suggested that these tribes are in fact the “violators of covenant.”⁵³ Obviously, this is no small difference, and may well have implications for our understanding of the eschatological war depicted in M. Thus it is necessary to review

⁴⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 4.

⁵⁰ Davies, *1QM*, 114, n. 7.

⁵¹ A second, although very fragmentary, copy of the same portion of text was also found (4Q371). It nevertheless helped restore almost a dozen words in 4Q372 (see Eileen Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Prayer About Joseph,” *RevQ* 14 [1990]: 349). Eventually, yet another copy was identified, complementing the reading of a few words and even adding one (Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “On the Unidentified Fragments of *DJD* XXXIII and PAM 43.680: A New Manuscript of *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*, and Fragments of *4Q13*, *4Q269*, *4Q524* and *4QSb* [?],” *RevQ* 21 [2004]: 481–82).

⁵² Hanan Eshel, “תפילת יוסף,” 126, n. 2.

⁵³ Dupont-Sommer, “Règlement de la guerre,” 28; *Essene Writings*, 169. This reading is also considered possible by Beale in *Use of Daniel*, 48, n. 71.

the evidence emanating from 4Q372 frg. 1 for understanding to whom “Levi, Judah, and Benjamin” may refer in M.

4.1.2. *The evidence from the Prayer of Joseph (4Q372 frg. 1)*

4Q372 seems to be one of possibly as many as five copies of the same composition, now called *Narrative and Poetic Composition*.⁵⁴ It had formerly been called *Apocryphon of Joseph* or *Prayer of Joseph* because its largest portion (4Q371 frgs 1–2, 4Q372 frg. 1, and 4Q373a) centered on the person of Joseph and his prayer. However, the other fragments contain material seemingly unrelated: there are references to Zimri son of Salu (Num 25:14), the five kings of Midian (Num 31:8), and possibly even to David and Goliath (1 Sam 17). Even the style varies greatly, so that it may be that what is now classified as a single text may in fact be several compositions.⁵⁵ The oldest of these manuscripts is dated to the first quarter of the first century BCE,⁵⁶ providing a *terminus ad quem* for its composition. Furthermore, since it contains a reference to the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim as if it is still standing, it is thought to have been composed prior to John Hyrcanus’ attack on the Samaritan community in and around Shechem in 111/110 BCE.⁵⁷ Alternatively, Eshel has suggested that the prayer may have been composed for the purpose of being read on the 21st of Kislev, the “day of Mount Gerizim,” a day which commemorated the destruction of the Samaritan temple. Should this be the case, the prayer may have been

⁵⁴ Schuller, “4Q372,” 349–76; Elisha Qimron, “Observations on the Reading of ‘a Text About Joseph’ (4Q372, 1),” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 603–4; Moshe Bernstein and Eileen Schuller, “4QNarrative and Poetic Composition,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVIII - Miscellanea, Part 2*, Moshe Bernstein, et al., DJD XXVIII (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 151–204; Tigchelaar, “Unidentified Fragments of DJD XXXIII,” 481–83.

⁵⁵ Bernstein and Schuller, “4QNarrative and Poetic Composition,” 152.

⁵⁶ Bernstein and Schuller, “4QNarrative and Poetic Composition,” 155.

⁵⁷ Bernstein and Schuller, “4QNarrative and Poetic Composition,” 154. For the date of the attack, see Ytzhak Magen, “הר גריזים: עיר-מקדש,” *Qad* 23 (1990): 96; Dan Barag, “New Evidence on the Foreign Policy of John Hyrcanus I,” *Israel Numismatic Journal* 12 (1992–93): 1–12; Gerald Finkielsztein, “More Evidence on John Hyrcanus I’s Conquests: Lead Weights and Rhodian Amphora Stamps,” *BAIAS* 16 (1998): 33–63.

composed soon after the temple's destruction.⁵⁸ The latest copy (2Q22) dates to the late Herodian period.⁵⁹ Since there is nothing typically sectarian about the text,⁶⁰ it would appear that the composition is not one of the Qumran sect, but one which was brought into the community by a member and subsequently copied.

In relationship to M, only the unit dealing with Joseph is of interest, as it contains the reference to "Levi and Judah and Benjamin" (4Q372 frg. 1:14). Consequently, for the purposes of the present study, only that portion of *Narrative and Poetic Composition* will be examined. Since the name once given to the entire composition, the *Prayer of Joseph* (PJ), accurately describes the contents of that particular section, I will use it as a way of isolating this portion of text from the rest of *Narrative and Poetic Composition*. Understanding PJ is not immediately straightforward, but it is clearly divided into two sections. The first, lines 1–15, is some kind of historical survey. The second, lines 16–36, is the actual prayer by Joseph, lamenting the exile and the resulting presence of enemies in his land, followed by a promise to serve God faithfully once restored to the land. Mainly the first part needs our attention, as it includes the reference to the three tribes in question. The full text of that first part, therefore, including what can be complemented from 4Q371, is given here below with minimal reconstructions.⁶¹

]ם[]	1
	את עושה] [ה זרים]	2
	ואת הכמרים וכבדו את עבדי] הפסל	3
	עליון ויתנם ביד הגוים ל]...ויפץ]	4
	אתם בכל הארצות ובכל] הגוים [יבזרם]	5
[לו יבואו]	ישראל וישמד אתם מארץ] [ץ]	6
[לו ינחזו להמה	הגוים יתד עומדת בגי החזון ו] [ס] [ציון וישעו]	7
[...וישימו את]	ירושלים לעינים ואת הר אלהי לבמות יע]	8
[לו לחקי	אל וגם יהודה יחד עמו והוא על אם הדרכים יעמוד לעש]ות	9

⁵⁸ Hanan Eshel, "תפילת יוסף," 133.

⁵⁹ Maurice Baillet, "22. Un apocryphe de David (?)," in *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân*, Maurice Baillet, Jozef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, DJD III (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 81–82.

⁶⁰ Bernstein and Schuller, "4QNarrative and Poetic Composition," 154.

⁶¹ Both the transcription and the translation are from Bernstein and Schuller, "4QNarrative and Poetic Composition," 167–70. The text above does not include the variants found in 4Q373a, for they do not affect the present discussion.

- 10 להיות יחד עם שני אחיו ובכל זה יוסף מוטל בארצות לא־דע
 11 בגוי נאָכר ובכל תבל מפצפצים כל הריהם שממים מהם [וּנְבִלִים] וְנִשְׁבְּתִים [בְּאַרְצֵם]
 12 ועשים להם בְּמָה על הר גבה להקניא את ישראל וידברו בדבֿרי
 13 בני יעקב וישעירו בדברי פיהם לגדף על אהל ציון וידברו [דְּבָרֵי] שֶׁקֶר
 וְכָל
 14 אמרי כזב ידברו להכעיס ללוי וְלַיהוּדָה ולבְּנֵימִן בדבריהם וְכָל זה יוסף [נִתַּן]
 15 ביד בני נאכר אכלים את כחו ושברים את כל עצמיו עד עת קץ לו...
- 1]m[
 2 the doer of[...h; strangers
 3 and the idol-priests, and they honored those who serve[idols
 4 the Most High, and he gave them into the hands of the nations
 l[and he scattered]
 5 them in all the lands, and among all[the nations]he dispersed
 them.[] they did n[ot] come[
 6 Israel. And he destroyed them from the land[]s[]from the
 place of y[]the nations did n[ot] leave for them
 7 a peg standing in the valley of the vision and [y]s[]Zion and
 they did[and they made]
 8 Jerusalem into ruins and the mountain of my God into
 wood[ed] heights[]wn to the laws of
 9 God and also Judah (was) together with him, and he stood at
 the crossroads to d[o
 10 to be together with his two brothers. And in all this, Joseph
 was cast into lands he did not k[now
 11 among a foreign nation and dispersed in all the world. All their
 mountains were desolate of them []w and fools were dwel-
 ling[in their land]
 12 and making for themselves a high place upon a high mountain
 to provoke Israel to jealousy; and they spoke with wor[ds of
 13 the sons of Jacob and they acted terribly with the words of their
 mouth to revile against the tent of Zion; and they spoke ..[
]words of falsehood, and all
 14 words of deceit they spoke to provoke Levi and Judah and
 Benjamin with their words. And in all this Joseph [was given]
 15 into the hands of foreigners, who were devouring his strength
 and breaking all his bones until the time of the end for him...

4.1.3. The editors' understanding of the Prayer of Joseph

According to the editors, the text refers to Joseph as a type of the Northern Tribes who have been taken away into captivity. Joseph is

not, however, seen in a negative light. With this in mind, the first section can be understood as following a pattern of sin (lines 2–3), exile (lines 4–10a), and return (10b–15a). Accordingly, lines 2–3 discuss the sins of Joseph, lines 4–6 describe his exile, lines 7–8a lament the destruction of Jerusalem. Lines 8b–10 are more problematic. In line 9, Judah is mentioned in association with another individual. Two brothers, unnamed, are referred to in line 10. Eileen Schuller, who first published the scroll, suggested they are Levi and Benjamin who are listed together with Judah later on in line 14. While it is uncertain who the referent is at the beginning of line 9b, whether the one who is with Judah or Judah himself, the individual is depicted as being at the “crossroads” (אם הדרכים). This is a clear allusion to the “crossroad” (אם הדרך) of Ezek 21:26, the only other occurrence of this expression in Hebrew. Since in Ezekiel it is used in the context of Nebuchadnezzar’s trek to Jerusalem, Schuller postulated that this section is dealing with the return of these three tribes and contrasting it to Joseph who remains in exile.⁶² Lines 11–14 refer to a high place being built causing indignation to Israel, and to offensive words spoken against the sons of Jacob as well as against Zion, so as to anger the three tribes—Levi, Judah, and Benjamin. Lines 14–15 conclude with the fact that Joseph remains in captivity, prompting his prayer in lines 16–32: he hopes that in the same way that Judah and his two brothers have been restored, so too may he and his people be restored.

4.1.4. *Eshel’s understanding of the Prayer of Joseph*

Eshel’s interpretation varies slightly from the above.⁶³ He suggests that the reference to Judah in line 9a is based on 2 Kgs 17:19,⁶⁴ where the reference to “Judah also” (גם יהודה) is negative, relating to how Judah imitated the Northern Kingdom in its disobedience to God. Should this negative connotation from 2 Kgs 17:16–20 be intended in PJ by its author, then the end of line 8 cannot be referring

⁶² Schuller, “4Q372,” 370–71.

⁶³ Hanan Eshel, “תפילה יוסף,” 128–29; “השומרונים בתקופה הפרסית וההלניסטית:” “התהוותה של עדה דתית” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1994), 180–83.

⁶⁴ See also Hos 5:5 and 6:10.

to something, or rather someone, positively, and Judah's association with him must have been derogatory. Eshel has therefore reconstructed the end of line 8 as "and Levi ceased to under]stand God's laws" (ויחדל לוי להב]ין לחקי אל).⁶⁵ Eshel finds further support for his reconstruction in another non-sectarian composition, 4Q390 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah E [Pseudo Moses^e]*),⁶⁶ especially frg. 1:2–5a, which levels harsh criticism against the priesthood.⁶⁷ The rest of line 9 seems to provide additional evidence in support of such a reading. The allusion to the "crossroads" (אם הדרכים) from Ezek 21:26 may not be in reference to the way to Jerusalem, but rather to Nebuchadnezzar's practice of divination in order to decide which road to take on his way to bring destruction and exile to Jerusalem, whether to Rabbath Ammon first or straight to Jerusalem.⁶⁸ For Eshel, Levi is being equated to Nebuchadnezzar's (or his priests') evil practices as a way of illustrating how the Levitical priesthood had ceased to follow God's laws and turned to divination as practiced by the Babylonian king. This would also be the reason why the priesthood is so strongly condemned in 4Q390. And since "and also Judah" (וגם יהודה) - line 9a) was together with Levi in this, lines 8b–9

⁶⁵ Hanan Eshel, "השומרונים," 181. Other suggested reconstructions include "And Levi returned to understanding God's laws" (וישב לוי להב]ין לחקי אל) - Bernstein and Schuller, "4QNarrative and Poetic Composition," 174; "and Benjamin returned to understanding God's laws" (וישוב בנימ]ין לחקי אל) - Qimron, "Observations," 603–4). Both of these make use of the possibility that 4Q371 frg. 1:6 may have [ן] rather than [ן] (see Bernstein and Schuller, "4QNarrative and Poetic Composition," 158).

⁶⁶ It is doubtful that 4Q390 is actually a part of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* as claimed by the Dimant (Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4 XXI - Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, DJD XXX [Oxford: Clarendon, 2001], 91–116); see Hanan Eshel, מגילת קומראן והמדינה החשמונאית (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004), 22–23, n. 29; "4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, ed. Gabriele Boccacini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 104, n. 6; Werman, "Epochs and End-Time," 229–30.

⁶⁷ For the publication of 4Q390, see Devorah Dimant, "New Light from Qumran on Jewish Pseudepigrapha: 4Q390," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21, 1991*, ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11,2 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 405–47; *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 235–53. For Eshel's discussion of it, see *המדינה החשמונאית*, 21–26; "490-Year Prophecy," 102–10.

⁶⁸ Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, AB 22A (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 426–31.

would be describing that which brought about the destruction of the temple, and not the return of the Southern Tribes as suggested by the editors. Rather, the restoration would only be briefly mentioned, presumably in a single sentence beginning in the non-extant portion at the end of line 9 and ending with the first phrase of line 10. With respect to lines 11–14, Eshel's interpretation does not vary from that of the editors: "Levi and Judah and Benjamin" refer to the Southern Tribes who have returned to their homeland.

4.1.5. *Implications*

Whichever interpretation one chooses to follow, PJ appears to be an anti-Samaritan polemic, suggesting that the true Joseph are not those residing in the land of Ephraim and Manasseh and who have built themselves a place of worship there, but those who are still in captivity and who hope to come back to their ancestral land and worship God, presumably in Jerusalem. Since three copies of this text were found at Qumran,⁶⁹ it seems to be indicative of the bad relations between the Qumran sect and the Samaritans. With M clearly sectarian,⁷⁰ it is most natural to assume it adopted the epithet of the three tribes from PJ, rather than the reverse. The key, however, is to understand why and in what sense.

The anti-Samaritan polemic of PJ is apparently what warranted this non-sectarian text to be brought into the Qumran library and subsequently copied. Furthermore, it has been pointed out that PJ is among those texts which acknowledges that in spite of the return from exile, it is still a time of apostasy and suffering.⁷¹ This is

⁶⁹ Not counting those copies of *Narrative and Poetic Composition* which do not preserve any of PJ.

⁷⁰ Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, STDJ 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58; Armin Lange, "Kriterien essenischen Texte," in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Testfunde von Toten Meer*, ed. Jörg Frey and Hartmut Stegemann (Bonifatius: Paderborn, 2003), 59–69.

⁷¹ Schuller, "4Q372," 370–71, n. 33; Michael A. Knibb, "A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390," in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls - Studies in Honour of A.S. Van der Woude on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne, VTSup 49 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 165–70.

certainly consistent with the experience of the Qumran sect, and may be an additional rationale behind its appropriation of the composition as its own. The question nevertheless remains: what was it in particular about this epithet of “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” that motivated its being used in M? In PJ, it unequivocally refers to the Southern Tribes who have returned from exile. What aspect about these returnees was it that the author of M wished to highlight? Two interpretations are possible, the first which has been followed, or rather assumed, by most commentators, and the second expounded by Eshel.

4.1.5.1. Assuming the view of the editors

The first suggests that the Qumran sect not only identified with PJ in its opposition to the Samaritans, but also with the idea that the tribes of “Levi and Judah and Benjamin,” although having returned to the land, were still in a time of conflict. They may have been back in their homeland, but they had not yet been fully restored. Since this situation paralleled the sectarians’ condition, they adopted this sobriquet for themselves. The author of M, therefore, would have used the epithet to highlight the pending need for complete restoration. This would be consistent with M’s description of the Sons of Light as returning from “the wilderness of the peoples to camp in the wilderness of Jerusalem” (בשוב גולת בני אור ממדבר העמים להננות במדבר ירושלים) - 1QM 1:3). It seems as though the expression “the wilderness of the peoples” is based on Ezek 20:35 where it means Babylon or the wilderness leading up to it.⁷² The fact that the eschatological war is to take place when the Sons of Light have returned from there, but not to Jerusalem itself, suggests that in their minds restoration was not yet complete, just as in PJ.

4.1.5.2. Assuming Eshel’s view

For Eshel, PJ may be communicating something different. In it, “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” represent all the Jews who have returned to Judea, and would therefore not be a reference to the sec-

⁷² Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 5; Davies, *1QM*, 115.

tarians only.⁷³ Indeed, it is known that the Qumran sect rejected temple worship as it was practiced in their day.⁷⁴ If in PJ “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” are a reference to the ones who have been restored, rebuilt the temple, and who are worshipping there, then for the Qumranites, this sobriquet cannot be a reference to themselves. In lines 13–14, we read that Levi, Judah, and Benjamin are angered by words spoken out against the Jerusalem temple. Such talk, rather than being offensive to the Qumranites, would instead be something of which they themselves could have been guilty. Thus, even if the three tribes were originally viewed in a positive light by the non-sectarian composer, they may have been subsequently considered evil by the later readers at Qumran, since they were the very same people from whom the Qumranites separated themselves. In such a context, it would then make sense that the epithet was used in M to describe the “violators of the covenant” (מרשיעי הברית - 1QM 1:2). It would also be consistent with a contrast being made by the author of M: those who have been restored to the land but who are nevertheless “violators of the covenant” on the one hand, and the “exiles of the wilderness” (גולת המדבר - 1QM 1:2) who are the Sons of Light on the other hand.

4.1.6. *Resolving the quandary*

Initially, both interpretations seem equally possible. Resolving this quandary is only possible if additional data, either from PJ, M, or even from other documents, can provide additional arguments for either side of the debate. There are, in my opinion, several such factors which ought to be taken into consideration, and which may prove helpful in this debate.

⁷³ Hanan Eshel, “תפילת יוסף,” 126, n. 2.

⁷⁴ Philip R. Davies, “The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 287–301; Johann Maier, “Temple,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 923–24; Hilary E. Kapfer, “The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes Toward the Temple as a Test Case,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 152–77.

4.1.6.1. Confusion of terms

First of all, while it seems that the author of M borrowed the epithet from a non-sectarian composition such as PJ, to use it in a negative way appears to be inconsistent with the general practice of the Qumranites who traditionally refer to themselves as “Judah” in their own compositions.⁷⁵ The use of such a sobriquet containing the names of three tribes to designate their opponents, when one of them is the same as that which they use to refer to themselves, seems rather confusing. On the other hand, it could possibly be argued that M does not explicitly use “Judah” to refer to the Sons of Light as in other sectarian compositions. Could this be due to its possible negative use in 1:2? The other two occurrences of the term “Judah” in 1QM (12:13 and 19:5) are in connection to the victory of the Sons of Light: Zion, Jerusalem, and the cities of Judah are commanded to rejoice. Here, “Judah” is used in a historical-ideological, possibly even geographical sense, and would not necessarily be in contradiction to its possible negative meaning as part of an epithet in col. 1. Nevertheless, was the reader to understand “Judah” in 1QM 1:2 as a reference to the sect’s opponents while simultaneously knowing that the “cities of Judah” were to be understood in a positive sense? While this may be theoretically possible, it remains in my opinion quite unlikely. That “Judah” can have opposite meanings in different compositions is confusing enough, how much more when it could happen within a single text.⁷⁶

In the case of M, the conundrum would not be with the term “Judah” alone, but with “Levi” also. While the only other mention of Levi in 1QM (5:1) is in the context of the twelve tribes of Israel, a

⁷⁵ David Flusser, “Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in Peshet Nahum,” in *Qumran and Apocalypticism*, vol. 1 of *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*, trans. Azzan Yadin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 214–57; Joseph D. Amoussine, “Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Peshet de Nahum (4QpNahum),” *RevQ* 4 (1963): 389–96; André Dupont-Sommer, “Observations sur le Commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte,” *Journal des savants*, October–December 1963, 201–26; “Le Commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte (4QpNah): traductions et notes,” *Sem* 13 (1963): 55–88; Daniel R. Schwartz, “‘To Join Oneself to the House of Judah’ (Damascus Document IV,11),” *RevQ* 10 (1981): 435–46.

⁷⁶ By “opposite,” I mean that it can be used to describe both sides of a conflict or an issue, not just that the word can have different meanings, like one geographical and the other historical.

situation much different from what is implied in 1:2, throughout the rest of the scroll there are numerous references to the Levites, and without exception it is clear that they are part of the Sons of Light. In fact, for a document about war, it puts a special emphasis on the role of the Levites.⁷⁷ As in the case with Judah, such a dual use of the name “Levi” is in my opinion problematic.

4.1.6.2. From protagonists to antagonists

Another difficulty also needs to be considered. In PJ, there is no doubt that the three Southern Tribes are listed together as protagonists. How then, if Eshel’s reading is to be accepted, could a negative connotation come to be associated with “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” in M? One obvious possibility is that it happened over time: when PJ was first composed, all the returnees from exile were viewed as a single entity in a positive way; eventually, however, as the returnees split into various religious movements, those in the minority, like the Qumran sectarians, began seeing the majority as faithless. But that the Qumranites continued to copy both M and PJ simultaneously, with both containing that unique expression yet assigning it opposite connotations seems unlikely. If the three tribes eventually came to be viewed negatively as those from whom the Qumranites had separated themselves because they had become their enemies, it makes little sense for the sect to continue copying PJ repeatedly, without adapting it to their new outlook. Rather, since it was copied over the course of nearly a century, this suggests that PJ’s original meaning remained valid throughout.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ Robert C. Stallman, “Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *JSP* 10 (1992): 172–77.

⁷⁸ Applying the newer meaning of the epithet in M back onto PJ as there would have been a tendency to do as it continued to be copied makes little sense. The following illustrate the incongruence that would have resulted. Why would it matter that those who “make for themselves a high place upon a high mountain to provoke Israel to jealousy” (ועשים להם במה על הר גבה להקניא את ישראל) - line 12) “spoke words of deceit to provoke Levi and Judah and Benjamin” (אמרי כזב ידברו להכניס ללוי וליהודה) (line 14)? If one of the sect’s enemies attacked another of its enemies, why should it care? The use of “words of deceit” (אמרי כזב - line 14) often implies betrayal or condemnation, yet if “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” were their enemies, the sectarians would have felt neither betrayal when the three tribes were attacked, nor the need to condemn those who attacked them.

4.1.7. *The possible implication of “sons of..”*

Even so, there may still be another possibility by which these three tribes may have represented the Sons of Light’s enemies. With respect to PJ, the sectarians certainly did not consider themselves as part of Joseph, but of “Levi and Judah and Benjamin.” With respect to M, however, they would have to see themselves as distinct or separate from these same returnees. Could this be why in M we find the extra phrase “the sons of” these three tribes, rather than simply “Levi and Judah and Benjamin?” This subtle modification might have been to highlight the difference between them and the other returnees from the exile. If so, the challenge is to determine which sub-group would then be intended in M: the sectarians themselves—as the Sons of Light, or the rest of the Jews in Judea from whom they have separated themselves—meaning the Sons of the Darkness. A way to test this possibility is to see if in other compositions they happened to use the expressions “sons of ‘a tribal patriarch’,” as a method of designating a specific group, either as protagonists or antagonists.

4.1.7.1. “Sons of..” in Qumran texts

Unfortunately, the expression “sons of ‘a tribal patriarch’” is quite rare at Qumran.⁷⁹ One composition which does include it is 4Q385a. In frg. 18 ii:7 there is the phrase “sons of Judah and Benjamin” (בני יהודה ובנימין).⁸⁰ 4Q385a frg. 18 is thought to be the conclusion of a composition now named *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*, of which there may have been as many as five copies.⁸¹ While these manuscripts all date to the last half of the first century BCE, it is suggested that the text was first composed in the last quarter of the second century BCE.

⁷⁹ With the exception of the *Temple Scroll* (see below). The only other instances not discussed below are 4Q221 (*Jubilees*) frg. 6:4 with a mention of the “sons of Reuben” and 4Q365 (*Reworked Pentateuch*) frg. 36:4 which has “sons of Joseph.”

⁸⁰ Devorah Dimant, “An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385^B = 4Q385 16),” *STDJ 15* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 11–30; Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 159–66.

⁸¹ According to Dimant, there are six copies, namely 4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q387a, 4Q388a, 4Q389, and 4Q390 (*Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 91–116). However, it is doubtful that 4Q390 is part of the same composition; see above, note 66.

According to Devorah Dimant who published the text, it is not thought to be strictly Qumranic, although it shares some definite affinities with the spiritual outlook at Qumran.⁸² The composition appears to be a discourse of God to Jeremiah shortly after the fall of Jerusalem. In it, Israel's history is recalled, following a chronology of weeks from Dan 9, beginning in the First Temple Period and extended prophetically into the Second Temple Period. Allegedly, it was concluded with a narrative account of Jeremiah's activities, preserved in 4Q385a frg. 18. In col. 2, Jeremiah is commanded "to speak to] the sons of Israel and to the sons of Judah and Benjamin" (דבר אל] בני ישראל ואל בני יהודה ובנימין) (lines 6–7) exhorting them to keep God's commandments and turn away from idolatry (lines 8–10).⁸³ What is particularly striking about this statement is that it is unique in all the Dead Sea Scrolls in considering Judah and Benjamin as a single entity, in the same way that it is unusual at Qumran to find the combination of "Levi and Judah and Benjamin" together. The obvious difference between the two is that in the latter, Levi has been added and given priority over the other two tribes. Nonetheless, the only conclusion one can draw from this text is that like in PJ, the expression is used to mark the division between the tribes of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms.⁸⁴ Unfortunately, little more than this can be inferred.

One document in which the expression "the sons of" Levi, Judah, and/or Benjamin appear is the *Temple Scroll*, 11QT (11Q19) and 11QT^b (11Q20).⁸⁵ While the sectarian nature of this composition is debated, its importance to the Qumran community is not in question, as it probably represents the religious current out of which the sect

⁸² Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 112.

⁸³ Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 163.

⁸⁴ Bernstein and Schuller, "4QNarrative and Poetic Composition," 176.

⁸⁵ Only these two manuscripts of the *Temple Scroll* mention Levi, Judah, and/or Benjamin. For their publication, see Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vols. 1–3 and Supplement (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983); Elisha Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*, JDS (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1996); Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11: II 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*, DJD XXIII (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 357–409.

came forth.⁸⁶ This is consistent with the manuscript evidence, since its composition must be anterior to the earliest copy (4Q524) which dates to the third quarter of the second century BCE.⁸⁷ In the *Temple Scroll*, the names of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin are never found other than in the genitive of construct chain, except in 11QT 39:12 where tribal names are assigned to the temple courts.⁸⁸ This means that in the *Temple Scroll* a reference to any one of these three tribes is never by its name alone, but always incorporates “tribe of” (מטה - 11QT 23:10; 24:10; 11Q20 6:13), or “sons of” (בני - 11QT 21:1; 22:4; 24:11; 44:7, 11, 15; 63:3).⁸⁹ Even more interesting is that in the order of sacrifices for the “Feast of the Wood Offering” to be offered in the temple by the various tribes, Levi comes first, Judah

⁸⁶ For a summary of the issues pertaining to the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the Qumran sect, see Florentino García Martínez, “Temple Scroll,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 930–31.

⁸⁷ Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*, DJD XXV (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 87.

⁸⁸ The only other exception is 11Q20 6:13–15 where we read: “and on the first day the tribes of Levi and Judah, and on the second day Benjamin and the sons of Joseph” (וביום הראשון מטות לוי ויהודה וביום השני בנימין ובני יוסף). However, the word “tribes of” (מטות) probably intends all the tribes listed thereafter, and not just those of Levi and Judah; alternatively, it is to be understood elliptically. If not, this is the only place in the *Temple Scroll* that tribal names are not in the genitive of a construct chain. The only exception are Ephraim and Manasseh (24:13; 44:13) but they are not listed as tribes but as sons of Joseph. The presence of the word “tribes of” is all the more significant in light of its absence in *Rewritten Pentateuch*^c (4Q365 frg. 23:10), in a portion about the same Wood Festival as in the *Temple Scroll*, where incidentally Levi is also listed first. Note as well the interesting feature in 11QT 44:14 where the scribe erased the *beth* and the *yod* in “מבני,” but without changing the medial *nun* to its final form. The sentence was therefore changed from “to the sons of Kohath of the sons of the Levites” to “to the sons of Kohath of the Levites” (see Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2.187). I agree with Robert Stallman (“Levi and Levites,” 166–67, n. 15) that the scribe had not originally written “from the sons of the Levi” (מבני הלוי) as suggested by Yadin, for the expression “sons of the Levi” (בני הלוי) is never found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Based on this scribal correction, Barbara Thiering (“*Mebaqqer* and *Episkopos* in the Light of the Temple Scroll,” *JBL* 100 [1981]: 63) has suggested that we should read a distinction between “the Levites” and “the sons of the Levites.” Her argument fails if for no other reason than the fact that in the Dead Sea Scrolls there is never mention of “the sons of the Levites” (בני הלויים). See also the discussion in Stallman, “Levi and Levites,” 167.

⁸⁹ There is also mention of the “gate of” (שער - 11QT 39:16; 40:14, 15; 44:4, 5, 7, 14, 15), and in once case of the “burnt offering of” (עולת - 24:12).

second, and Benjamin third (11QT 23:9–24:13; 11Q20 6:13–15).⁹⁰ Yadin has pointed out that two of the author's purposes were to highlight Levi's preeminence and to emphasize these three tribes as the senior ones.⁹¹ While it is clear that the injunction for the entire festival is based on Neh 10:35 (E:34), the priority of these three tribes is not. Jacob Milgrom suggests it may have resulted from their being the "original returnees from the exile."⁹² The priority given to Levi is nevertheless surprising, although less so when considering that the Levites' role in the *Temple Scroll* is particularly elevated, even to the point that they take on certain duties normally assigned to the priesthood.⁹³ It is particularly interesting to note that in *m. Ta'an.* 4:4–5 only certain families from the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi are recorded as bringing wood for the sacrifices, although Levi is not set above the other two tribes as in the *Temple Scroll*. While this description stands in contrast to Josephus' statement that everyone brought wood (*War* 2:425), this may be explained by the fact that in the Mishnah as in Ezekiel, this practice is associated to the return from exile, while in Josephus it is not. It would seem therefore that the connection between these three tribes and the Feast of the Wood Offering is directly related to their being the first returnees from the exiles, just as suggested by Milgrom. Because of its eschatological nature, references to any of the tribes in the *Temple Scroll*, including the three in question, are not pejorative. Still, it is difficult to know whether or not this should have any bearing on our understanding of M. What can be affirmed, however, is that we have here yet another text dear to the Qumranites which refers to these three tribes as meaning those who have already returned from exile.

⁹⁰ Levi is also listed first in the instructions for the Festival of the Wood Offering in 4Q365 frg. 23:10 (see note 88). On the Festival of the Wood Offering, see Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1.122–31; Jacob Milgrom, "Qumran's Biblical Hermeneutics: The Case of the Wood Offering," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 449–56; Cana Werman, "על מועדיי," *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 107–15.

⁹¹ Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1.124–25.

⁹² Milgrom, "Wood Offering," 454.

⁹³ Jacob Milgrom, "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke, JSPSup 7 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 165–80; Stallman, "Levi and Levites," 165–72.

Apart from the *Temple Scroll*, the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* and *M*, there are only a few other instances in the Dead Sea Scrolls where one of the three Southern Tribes is referred to as being the sons of their tribal father. If the reconstruction is correct, the expression “sons of Judah” may appear in one other composition, *Festival Prayers*^c (4Q509 frg. 183:7 - לבני יהודה). It is one of four copies also known as *Prières pour les fêtes* (1Q34, 1Q34^{bis}, 4Q507–509),⁹⁴ which is believed to be sectarian in nature.⁹⁵ Unfortunately, the text is so fragmentary that nothing can be determined about the connotation associated to the sons of Judah.

As for the phrase “sons of Levi,” it is also found in 1QSa 1:22, 4Q159 frg. 5:2, and 4Q247 frg. 1:5. The *Rule of the Congregation* is a sectarian text describing how the community is to be ordered in the messianic age.⁹⁶ In it, the “sons of Levi” (1:22) are responsible for the proper ordering of the congregation according to the rule.⁹⁷

4Q159 frg. 5,⁹⁸ once thought to be part of a group of sectarian texts called *Ordinances*, has now been identified as a pesher, possibly to Lev 16:1.⁹⁹ In all likelihood, therefore, it is also sectarian. The line in question is partly reconstructed (בני לוי), and may have

⁹⁴ For an initial bibliography, see Charlesworth and Olson, “Prayers for Festivals,” 49. Important works that have appeared subsequently include Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 155–215; Elisha Qimron, “Prayers for the Festivals from Qumran: Reconstructions and Philological Observations,” in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen, OLA 118 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2003), 383–93.

⁹⁵ Charlesworth and Olson, “Prayers for Festivals,” 48; Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, trans. Jonathan Chipman, STDJ 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 10. Daniel Falk, however, disagrees (*Festival Prayers*, 156–57).

⁹⁶ Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, 108–18; Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 241–70; Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, Cambridge Commentaries on the Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200 - 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 145–55; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*.

⁹⁷ Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 28–29.

⁹⁸ John M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4. I (4Q158–4Q186)*, DJD V (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), 6–9; “An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4Q Ordinances),” *JSS* 6 (1961): 71–73; John Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan’,” *RevQ* 7 (1970): 175–79.

⁹⁹ Francis D. Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation for an Essene Community Outside of Qumran,” *JSJ* 5 (1974): 203–4.

equated the death of the certain Levites with the death of Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu, their punishment for having offered unholy fire before the Lord.¹⁰⁰ Should this reading be correct, the "sons of Levi" in 4Q159 frg. 5:2 would not be honorable priests. Interestingly, the same event is recalled in M (17:2) as part of the speech of the High Priest to the reserves, as a reason for explaining why some of the Sons of Light have fallen in the War against the Kittim. This is significant, because the death of Aaron's sons is apparently used to illustrate that there can be unfaithfulness to God within the Sons of Light, that such individuals will be judged on account of it, but that it does not disqualify the entire community as God's chosen ones.

The final instance of "sons of Levi" is in 4Q247. This small fragment is an apocalyptic text relating to the book of *Enoch*, possibly as a pesher.¹⁰¹ With what is preserved, it is impossible to determine whether the text is sectarian or not, although there is nothing in it that precludes it from being sectarian, and its pesher-like character would suggest that it certainly could be. The composition summarizes biblical history according to weeks just as in the book of *Enoch*. In it the sons of Levi and the "people of the land" (עַם הָאָרֶץ) are mentioned together, possibly during the seventh week, thought to be the Persian period. While references to "people of the land" of the Persian period in the Hebrew Bible can carry a negative connotation, it is not thought to be the case here.¹⁰² Accordingly, it would be unlikely for the sons of Levi, who are associated with them, to be perceived negatively. As for the expression "the sons of Benjamin," it is not found elsewhere in the Qumran Scrolls other than in the *Temple Scroll* and M.

¹⁰⁰ Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Ordinances and Rules," in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994), 157, nn. 49–50.

¹⁰¹ Jozef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 256; Magen Broshi, "247. 4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks," in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, Stephen J. Pfann, et al., DJD XXXVI (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 187–91.

¹⁰² Broshi, "4Q247," 190–91.

Thus, the collocation of “the sons of” to one of the three Southern Tribes (Levi, Judah, and Benjamin) happens in only seven documents at Qumran. Four of them are sectarian (Sa, M, 4Q159, 4Q509), one is possibly sectarian (4Q247), while the last two (4Q385a, 11QT/11Q20) may find their origins in the movement(s) out of which the sect grew. In one case (Sa), there is absolutely no doubt that the “sons of Levi” are part of the Qumranites. In all the other texts, there is nothing to suggest that the references to the Southern Tribes as sons of their patriarch carry any negative connotation, except possibly for 4Q159 frg. 5. And while the “sons of” Levi, Judah, and/or Benjamin in the *Temple Scroll* are not a reference to the Qumranites, it is certain that they do not carry any negative connotation whatsoever. Rather, the collective evidence seems to suggest that referring to the tribe as “the sons of their patriarch” is in fact complimentary. Admittedly, such a conclusion is weak, especially since it does not eliminate the possibility that the collocation “the sons of” with one of the three tribes could be used both positively and negatively depending on context. What can be affirmed, however, is that since the “sons of Levi” are mentioned in Sa, prefixing “the sons of” to a tribe’s name does not automatically imply a negative connotation. Therefore, the emendation from PJ’s “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” to M’s “sons of Levi and sons of Judah and sons of Benjamin” is not one that blatantly identifies them as antagonists to the Sons of Light. It may be simply an emendation from ‘less sectarian’ to ‘more sectarian’-like vocabulary. What can be affirmed however, is that the combination of Judah and Benjamin, with or without Levi, clearly indicates returnees from the Babylonian exile.

Returning to PJ, it is certain that the Qumranites saw themselves as part of “Levi and Judah and Benjamin.” Otherwise, even with its anti-Samaritan polemic, it makes little sense for them to have adopted this composition, let alone copied it as one of their own. Therefore, for both the original author of PJ and Qumran, “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” as returnees from the exile were viewed in a positive light.

The above considerations were examined in an effort to understand why it is that Levi, Judah, and Benjamin are listed together in

that particular order only in M and PJ, and what implications it has for our understanding of whom they are meant to describe in M. Unfortunately, no matter which way one reads PJ, one can still understand Levi and Judah and Benjamin in M as being either the “violators of the covenant” or the “sons of light.” However, it seems to me that the collective weight of the evidence examined above does tip the balance in favor of reading these three tribes, when listed in that particular order, as implying a positive connotation.

4.1.8. *Additional considerations*

First, it is certain that in PJ “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” represent the restored tribes of the Southern Kingdom, that they are viewed in a positive light, and that Levi is given preeminence. This same list, also connected to the return from exile, is reflected in the *Temple Scroll*. Since the three tribes are viewed positively in a historical sense in PJ as in an eschatological sense in the *Temple Scroll*, one would expect it to be so in M as well. Second, it is also certain that both PJ and the *Temple Scroll* was adopted by the Qumran sect and subsequently copied, even after the epithet for the Southern Tribes was used in M.

That all three texts were being copied simultaneously further weakens the possibility that in M alone the sobriquet was meant negatively. Rather, one may even want to entertain the possibility that the epithet’s transformation from “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” in PJ into “the sons of Levi and the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin” in M was the result of the influence of the *Temple Scroll* or some other sectarian literature, though this can of course not be proven.

Finally, there is no question that the library collected at Qumran, and not just those texts composed there, put an unparalleled emphasis on Levi and the Levites.¹⁰³ We have seen that in the case of PJ

¹⁰³ See above, note 77. For possible theories as to why this is the case, see George J. Brooke, “Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac*, vol. I, ed. Zdzislaw J. Kapera (Kraków: Enigma, 1993), 105–29; Cana Werman, “Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period,” *DSD* 4

and the *Temple Scroll*, this emphasis on Levi has been associated with the return from exile. It appears that this elevating of Levi's status is one of the characteristics which differentiated the Qumran sect from mainstream Judaism. We have also seen that even at Qumran, as in the majority of other non-sectarian literature, it is possible to refer to the tribes of the Southern Kingdom without any reference to Levi at all (4Q385a frg. 18). Thus, had the author of M meant to designate some of the returnees from the exile as his enemies, one would have expected him to use a designation which would have also highlighted that difference. That a sectarian group collected texts elevating Levi as one of its distinctives, then composed a text in which it ascribed that same distinctive to its enemies, seems rather unlikely.

More importantly however, there is yet another factor which implies that the Sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin are none other than those who are to fight the Sons of Darkness. We have seen that the historical setting for M is intimately based on Dan 11. As noted above, it was not expected that the great eschatological would be initiated by the Sons of Light, but that it would be in response to an attack on Israel launched by Daniel's king of the north. As the context of Daniel's prophecy makes clear, the battle in question is against the entire nation, or in other words, all the Jews living in Judea who oppose him. Obviously, if the majority of the people were already in league with the king of the north, no such campaign would be necessary. Neither does it seem likely to me that the sectarians interpreted Daniel as if it implied that the evil king would be targeting them only and not the rest of the Jewish people in Judea. Rather, realizing that some within Israel have aligned themselves with the king of the Kittim, the author follows Daniel in isolating them as the "violators of the covenant" (1QM 1:2). But for the rest of the Jews in Judea, they too will have no choice but to defend themselves when attacked. This explains why there is mention of the evil king wanting to destroy the "horn of [Is]rael" (קרן [יש]ראל - 1QM

(1997): 211–25; Robert A. Kugler, "The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 465–79.

1:4–5), and that it will be a time of deliverance for the “people of God” (עַם אֱלֹהִים - 1QM 1:5). These terms—“Israel’s horn” and “God’s people”—describing the army of the Sons of Light, are not dualistic and their usage is not necessarily characteristic of only the Qumran’s community.¹⁰⁴ Rather, the great eschatological war will be fought by all Jews who oppose the king of the Kittim and his allies, whether or not they belong to the sectarians’ community. This further explains why all involved in the war are *not* necessarily God’s chosen ones. In Dan 12:2, we read that only those whose names have been recorded in the book will be delivered out of this time of suffering. In M, the war is a time of testing and purifying for God’s people, and those who fall are merely being exposed as wicked whose judgment is similar to that of Nadab and Abihu (1QM 17:1–2). But most importantly, this is why the army in M is not comprised of “Judah” (i.e. the Qumranites) only, but of the sons of Levi and of Benjamin as well, meaning Jews who have returned to the land. They are the ones who, like the non-sectarian text PJ suggests, still live in a time of conflict in spite of being restored to the land.

4.1.9. *The Sons of Light: not just the sectarians*

In conclusion, it seems to me that the author of M chose the unique expression of “the sons of Levi and the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin,” possibly borrowing it from PJ or a similar composition, to describe those who will be involved in the opening battle of the eschatological war.¹⁰⁵ Specifically, it meant those who have returned from exile as in PJ. Yet M also makes it clear that the war will not be against all those who have returned, as some will have aligned themselves with the enemy, these being the “violators of the covenant.” In line with PJ, the returnees who will fight in the army of the Sons of Light are those who feel that although they have returned to the land, they are still living in a time of apostasy. Thus Eshel and Dupont-Sommer were right in alerting us to the fact that

¹⁰⁴ In fact, see below for the use of the “people of God” (עַם אֱלֹהִים) at Qumran.

¹⁰⁵ It is important to note that the only other place this unique expression is found is in a second century BCE composition (PJ in *Narrative and Poetic Composition*). Equally important is that it is not found in the rest of M.

the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin could not be an epithet designating the sectarians only. However, I suggest that instead of designating the “violators of the covenant,” this unique sobriquet was purposely used to alert the reader to the kind of battle that was expected to kick off the 40-year eschatological war: it will be launched by Daniel’s king of the north, or as he is called in M, the king of the Kittim, and it will be against all the Jews living in Judea who have not aligned themselves with him. While this included the sectarians, it was not limited to them only.

I suggest this is further supported by the designation of the Sons of Light as the “people of God” (עם אל - 1QM 1:5; 3:13).¹⁰⁶ In the entire Qumran corpus, it is used only in M. That the sectarians never used it in any other composition as a designation for their own community suggests that the expression was not specific enough to just them, but that it allowed for the existence of others who, although not part of their movement, sought to remain faithful to God in contrast to those who were the “violators of the covenant.”¹⁰⁷

This being the case, it is of crucial importance to take note of the point being made by this short phrase: Israel’s eschatological war would begin with only a portion of the three tribes fighting in it, and not with all twelve tribes as mentioned later on in col. 2.

4.2. *The Sons of Darkness*

Opposing the Sons of Light are the Sons of Darkness. These are also called the army of Belial, comprised of Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, the Kittim of Assyria, and the violators of the covenant (בגדוד אדום ומואב ובני עמון וחי'ל בני [פלשת ובגדודי כתיי אשור ועמהם בעזר] - 1QM 1:1–2).¹⁰⁸ Suggestions as to from which biblical passage(s) this list may have been drawn abound: 2 Kgs 24:2; Isa

¹⁰⁶ Also reconstructed in 4Q496 frg. 10:4.

¹⁰⁷ See below, note 247, for a possible scenario as to when and how the sectarians may have assumed that those faithful to God were not restricted to their own numbers.

¹⁰⁸ Note that 4QNew Jerusalem^a (4Q554 frg. 3 iii:16), after mentioning the Kittim in line 4, lists Edom, Moab, and the sons of Ammon. Unfortunately, the line then breaks off so that it is impossible to know if Philistia was also mentioned.

11:14; Jer 9:25; 25:21; Dan 11:32, 41; 1 Chr 18:11; Ps 83:7–9.¹⁰⁹ The eclectic nature of this list of enemies is confusing and has led to various interpretations. For example, Carmignac and van der Ploeg suggested that the list was not meant to be exhaustive, but was intended to be a representative sampling of nations who seek to destroy Israel.¹¹⁰ Yadin assumed it to be geographical in orientation, enumerating those living in and around the Land of Israel.¹¹¹

4.2.1. *Biblical influence behind the list of enemies*

As we have seen above, however, the introduction of M is based primarily on Dan 11. In the list of enemies, this connection is most obvious with the “violators of the covenant” (מרשיעי ברית), an expression which appears in the Hebrew Bible only in Dan 11:32.¹¹² Additionally, Edom, Moab, and the sons of Ammon are listed in the same order in Dan 11:41, further strengthening this connection. We have also seen that the expression “dominion” (משלוח יד - 1QM 1:1) is found applied to a people group only in Isa 11:14.¹¹³ It is not coincidental, therefore, that in Isa 11:14, not only are Edom, Moab, and the sons of Ammon listed together in the same order, but that Philistia is added as well just as in M. It would have been nice to be able to associate confidently the “sons of the east” (בני קדם) of Isa 11:14 with the “Kittim of Assyria” (כתיי אשור), thereby giving us all the enemies listed in opening lines of M, except for the “violators of the covenant” which can only come from Dan 11.¹¹⁴ While such an

¹⁰⁹ It has also been suggested that it is drawn from *Jub.* 37-38 (Gmirkin, “Allusions,” 189).

¹¹⁰ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 4; van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 57.

¹¹¹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 21–26. To fit this paradigm, he suggested that the expression “Kittim of Asshur” referred to those living just north of the Land of Israel.

¹¹² Note that it is also found in the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* (4Q387 frg. 3:6); see Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 191, and my discussion of the *Apocryphon* below, starting on page 165.

¹¹³ See above, note 14.

¹¹⁴ Note both Dupont-Sommer and Geza Vermes who tried to reconstruct the beginning of 1QM 1:2 based on Isa 11:14. See Dupont-Sommer, “Règlement de la guerre,” 28: “et la mul[titude des fils de l’Orient et] de la Philistie” (ה[מון בני קדם] ו[פלישת]); Vermes, “Traditions de Qumran,” 27–28: “et l’a[rmée des fils de l’Orient

interpretation cannot be verified, 1QM 1:1–2 allows us to postulate that it may have been intended, and the idea should not be discounted. Scholars often appeal to Ps 83:7–9 as yet another passage the author of M drew upon to create his list of enemies, since in addition to Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Philistia, it also mentions Assyria, all in the same order as in M.¹¹⁵ However, never is it convincingly explained why the author then refrained from listing the other nations found in those verses, such as the Ishmaelites, the Hagarites, the Amalekites, and others still.¹¹⁶ Most likely, therefore, we should understand this list as having been inspired by Dan 11 and Isa 11:14.

4.2.2. Possible historical implications

At the same time, this list may not be devoid of historical significance. James VanderKam has noted how in the Maccabean sources (1 Macc 5:1–68; *Ant.* 12:327–353) the foreign enemies defeated by Judah Maccabeus in 163 BCE. immediately after the rededication of the temple are Idumea (Edom), Moab (Be‘on), Ammon, and Philistia (Jamnia, Azotus) . He further posits that this list is reflected in *Jub.* 37–38, although with some minor variants, as a historical gloss of that specific period.¹¹⁷ Russell Gmirkin has used this to suggest that the opening lines of M were also meant to reflect those specific events.¹¹⁸ However, his overall read of the scroll and his attempt to identify further elements of 1QM 1 that would belong to the early Maccabean period are problematic. He suggests that the composition does not display any features of religious or sectarian dispute,¹¹⁹ tries to connect the “violators of the covenant” with those

et] la Philistie” (וח[יל בני קדם ו]פלשת).

¹¹⁵ See for example Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 3; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 22, n. 1.

¹¹⁶ See Jongeling, *Rouleau de la Guerre*, 49.

¹¹⁷ James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, HSM 14 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 235–38, but see a summary of the various objections put forward about such an interpretation in Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees – Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*, JSJSup 117 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 36.

¹¹⁸ Gmirkin, “Allusions,” 172–214.

¹¹⁹ Gmirkin, “Allusions,” 190, n. 82.

stationed in the Acra and their allies,¹²⁰ sees the base of operations for the Sons of Light as Jerusalem,¹²¹ associates the “return from the wilderness of the peoples” with the Ḥasidim and not the sectarians themselves,¹²² wrongly associates the “they will ascent from there” (םשל ׁעלו ממשם) -1QM 1:3) as referring to renegade Jews rather than to the Sons of Light,¹²³ and suggests that the Temple worship of col. 2 is that which took place after Judah Maccabeus cleansed the temple,¹²⁴ ignoring the fact that M expected a solar calendar and not a lunar one.¹²⁵ Yet, while it is problematic to assume that the first few lines of M reflect the events of 163 BCE as may be the case in *Jubilees*, the foregoing list of enemies may nevertheless portray the political climate of the early Hasmonean period, one which prevailed until the expansions of the kingdom under Jonathan Hyrcanus and his successors.¹²⁶ Should this be the case, the list may be more than just a reference to Israel’s “traditional enemies” on her borders, as suggested by Yadin.¹²⁷

5. THE KITTIM

To this list of enemies are appended the “Kittim of Assyria.” The fact that this last expression is exclusive to the M corpus and not found in the Hebrew Bible implies that we ought not to seek for its source from there, but from the exegetical or ideological principle that resulted in its creation. When dealing with the expression “Kittim of Assyria” (כתיי אשור), two aspects need to be explained. The

¹²⁰ Gmirkin, “Allusions,” 191, 193.

¹²¹ Gmirkin, “Allusions,” 192.

¹²² Gmirkin, “Allusions,” 192–93.

¹²³ Gmirkin, “Allusions,” 193.

¹²⁴ Gmirkin, “Allusions,” 198–99.

¹²⁵ Note the “twenty-six chief of divisions” in 1QM 2:2.

¹²⁶ Also based on the list of enemies, Moshe Segal suggested a similar late second century BCE composition date for M (“The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of Its Composition,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Chaim Rabin, ScrHier 4 [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965], 140–41). See also below, note 247.

¹²⁷ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 21–22.

first is the presence of the term “Kittim,” and the second is its collocation to Assyria.¹²⁸

5.1. *Origins of the name*

The name “Kittim” is apparently derived from the city Kition on the eastern coast of Cyprus, near present-day Larnaca.¹²⁹ In Gen 10:4 (cf. 1 Chr 1:7), Kittim is listed as one of the sons of Javan (Greece). However, in the rest of the Bible, the designation extends beyond the city to mean the entire island, if not most of the western Mediterranean world. For example, Jer 2:10 and Ezek 27:6 make reference to the islands (plural) of the Kittim. Similarly, at the end of the Second Temple Period, Josephus defines the term as referring to all the Mediterranean islands and most of its coast line as well (*Ant.* 1:128). This is confirmed by its use in post-biblical literature, where the Kittim are identified with various groups, such as the Macedonians or the Romans, to name only two of its more prominent uses.¹³⁰ This has made their identification in M even more difficult. Opinions are therefore divided:¹³¹ some suggest it refers to both the Seleucids and

¹²⁸ Portions of the following study on the Kittim in M have already been published in Brian Schultz, “The Kittim of Assyria,” *RevQ* 23 (2007): 63–77.

¹²⁹ David W. Baker, “Kittim,” in *ABD*, vol. 4 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 93.

¹³⁰ For a survey of the literature see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 22–25; Baker, “Kittim,” 93; I. R. Tantlevsky, “The Term « Kittim » in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Jews and Greeks: Dialogue [Sic] Throughout Generations*, ed. A. Lvov (St. Petersburg, 1999), 279–83 (Russian); Timothy H. Lim, “Kittim,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 469–71; Stanislav Segert, “Kition and Kittim,” in *Periplus: Festschrift für Hans-Günter Buchholz zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Paul Åström and Dietrich Sörenhagen (Jonserend: Paul Åström Forlag, 2000), 165–72; Hanan Eshel, “Kittim,” 29–44.

¹³¹ For a treatment of the Kittim within M only, see Carmignac, “Les Kittim,” 737–48; Harold Henry Rowley, “The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *PEQ* 88 (1956): 92–109; Yehoshua M. Grintz, פרקים בתולדות בית שני (Jerusalem: Y. Marcus, 1969), 144–50; George J. Brooke, “The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” in *Images of Empire*, Loveday Alexander, JSOTSup 122 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 135–59; Duhaime, *War Texts*, 77–81.

the Ptolemies,¹³² others to the Seleucids alone,¹³³ others still to the Romans,¹³⁴ while some maintain that it is only a general reference to Israel's eschatological opponents.¹³⁵ In light of the fact that M does not mention the "Kittim of Egypt" (כתיי מצרים) as had once been suggested¹³⁶ but rather "the Kittim in Egypt" (הכתיים במצרים - 1QM 1:3), and that the term, when associated with a nation, is always and only attached to Assyria (1:6; 11:11; 18:2; 19:10),¹³⁷ it is unlikely that it refers to both the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Should "Kittim" represent a specific enemy, therefore, it should most likely be limited to a single nation. That the author was careful to distinguish between the Kittim of Assyria and the Kittim in Egypt might hint to the fact that he did not have the Romans in mind, since they were equally foreigners to both lands.¹³⁸

5.2. Equivocating the Kittim with Assyria

These initial thoughts highlight the fact that identifying the Kittim in M cannot be done without properly understanding the collocation between "Kittim" and "Assyria." In 1QM 1:6 we read: "Assyria will fall, and there is none to help him; the rule of the Kittim will come to an end" (ונפל אשור ואין עוזר לו וסרה ממשלת כתיים). This line

¹³² Yehoshua M. Grintz, "אנשי היחד, איסיים, בית (א)סין," *Sinai* 32 (1953): 26; Rowley, "Kittim," 95–96; Marco Treves, "The Date of the War of the Sons of Light," *VT* 8 (1958): 419–20; Moshe H. Segal, "Qumran War Scroll," 141–42; von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 29; John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Routledge, 1997), 107.

¹³³ Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 154–55; Hanan Eshel, "Kittim," 37.

¹³⁴ André Dupont-Sommer, "Le rouleau de la guerre des fils de lumière," *Evidences* 62 (1957): 33–34; Cecil Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), 77–78; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 244–46; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 212; Brooke, "Kittim," 136.

¹³⁵ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 4; van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 57.

¹³⁶ Sukenik, I מגילת גנוזות, 18, n. 6.

¹³⁷ Or to Japhet (1:6 and 18:2), since Assyria is one of his descendants (Gen 10:2–4).

¹³⁸ Neither do I think that the collocation with Assyria and Egypt is geographical only, as suggested by William Brownlee in "Kittim," in *ISBE*, vol. 3, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 45–46.

quotes from both Isa 31:8 “And Assyria will fall” and Dan 11:45 “there is none to help him.” Interestingly enough, a more complete citation of Isa 31:8 is found later on in M (11:11–12). Flusser’s suggestion is that here in col. 1, Dan 11:45 is used as a replacement or as an interpretation of the continuation of Isa 31:8 which is quoted in col. 11: “And Assyria will fall, by a sword not of man, a sword not of men” (בחרב לא איש וחרב לא אדם).¹³⁹ This idea is confirmed later on in the scroll when the “sword of God” is mentioned by name as the agent of the Kittim’s fall (15:3; see also 19:11). Thus, this creative joining of Isa 31:8 and Dan 11:45 in M makes it clear that the reason why there is no help for the king of the north in Dan 11 is because of God’s sword: against it there is no escape.

The fall of the Kittim, or Assyria, in the Land of Israel is also reminiscent of another prophecy: Mic 5:4–5 (E:5–6).¹⁴⁰ There it is predicted that if Assyria should come into the Land of Israel, it will be defeated by Israel’s army. Not only so, but Israel will in turn invade Assyria. As we shall see in the next chapter, this is in fact what M outlines, confirming that while the author did not explicitly allude to these verses, they are nonetheless implied. At the same time, it must be noted that Micah’s proclamation appears to stand in direct contradiction to the prophecy in Isaiah just alluded to in M: whereas Isaiah states that deliverance will be accomplished in a miraculous way by God alone, Micah suggests that Israel will be strong enough and have the necessary leadership to fend off the invasion. Historically, Micah’s vision did not come to fruition.¹⁴¹ Rather, Hezekiah’s escape from Sennacherib’s wrath was nothing short of miraculous (2 Kgs 19:35), just as Isaiah had suggested. The

¹³⁹ Flusser, “Apocalyptic Elements,” 156.

¹⁴⁰ I wish to thank Hanan Eshel for bringing this reference to my attention. See also Hanan Eshel, “Review of *War Texts*,” 111.

¹⁴¹ The passage has confounded commentators, as it seems to stand in direct contradiction to the verses which precede it. For two different ways of interpreting it, see Francis I. Andersen and David N. Freedman, *Micah*, AB 24E (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 480–81, and Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 347–51. Note that there is an even more extreme position that suggests the oracle is not Micah’s but of his opponents (Shmuel Vargon, עיונים ופירושים: ספר מיכה: [Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1994], 152–53).

sectarians certainly did not envision such a scenario, but combined it with Mic 5:4–5 in mind: deliverance from the Assyrians would come through waging war, while the actual victory would be God's miraculous doing as predicted in Isa 31:8.

We have already seen the close relationship between 1QM 1:1–2 and Isa 11:14. This use of Isaiah in M is probably building on such a practice already found in Dan 11, as this chapter relies particularly on the book of Isaiah.¹⁴² Since the beginning of M is in turn modelled after Dan 11, it is not surprising that it too did the same. The author of Dan 11, by citing from the book of Isaiah, applied language used in the context of Assyria's dominion at the end of the eighth century BCE to his own historical realities, that of Seleucid rule. This is exactly what we see in M when it joins these two verses: the "him" of Dan 11:45 which refers to the king of the north (מלך הצפון) - cf. v. 40 where he is identified as the subject of the next five verses) now means "Assyria." Without a doubt, therefore, M, just like other Second Temple Period literature,¹⁴³ equivocated Assyria with Syria.¹⁴⁴ Another detail in M may lend further support to this idea. Flusser, in addition to seeing the chronological connection between Dan 11 and M, also noted the unique expression "king of the Kittim" (מלך הכתיים) - 1QM 15:2) over and against all other references in the Qumran Scrolls to the leadership of the Kittim

¹⁴² Note several expressions which in the Hebrew Bible appear only in Isaiah and Dan 11: "overthrow and pass over/through" (שטף ועבר) in Isa 8:8 and Dan 11:10,40; "it will not rise/stand nor come to be" (לא תקום/תעמוד ולא תהיה) in Isa 7:7 and Dan 11:17; "indignation will come to an end" (כלה זעם) in Isa 10:25 and Dan 11:36 (in that verse, see also a possible reference to "end/completion and the decreed" [כלה] from Isa 10:23, especially in light of Dan 9:27). I wish to thank Andrew Teeter for pointing these out to me. For yet another such possibility, see below, page 151.

¹⁴³ Grintz, "אנשי היחד," 26, n. 34; Richard N. Frye, "Assyria and Syria: Synonyms," *JNES* 51 (1992): 281–85; Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000), 94. Precedence for this practice can already be found in Ezra 6:22. Note as well that there is no Hebrew word for Syria in Biblical Hebrew.

¹⁴⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 25–26; Menahem Stern, "ירושלים שבארץ אשור," *Tzion* 42 (1977): 295–97; Menahem Stern, *From Tacitus to Simplicius*, vol. 2 of *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), 345–46; Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 149.

where it is mention of “rulers” (מושלי הכתיים) - 1QpHab 4:5, 10; 4QpNah frags. 3–4 i:3).¹⁴⁵ Based on his understanding of the use of Dan 11 in M, he suggested reconstructing the beginning of 1QM 1:4 as follows: “And the king [of the Kittim will come to Egypt...” (ויבאו... [מלך] הכתיים במצרים...¹⁴⁶ Indeed, in Dan 11:44–45, we learn that the “king of the north” who is in Egypt will leave there “in great wrath to exterminate and destroy many” (ויצא בחמא גדלה להשמיד ולהחרים) (רבים). We have already seen how this verse parallels the rest of 1QM 1:4 “he will march out with great fury, his wrath to exterminate and cut off...” (ובקצו יצא בחמה גדולה... ואפו להשמיד ולהכרית). It only makes sense, therefore, that the missing part of whoever it is of “the Kittim in Egypt” should be a king, just as in Dan 11. This reconstruction has two advantages. First of all, it builds upon what is already known about the structure and content of M’s introduction and its relationship to Dan 11. Second it explains why M differed from most other sectarian literature in naming the Kittim’s leader(s).¹⁴⁷ In fact, it has been suggested that the term “king of” can only be applied to the Seleucid (or Ptolemaic) kingdom, and not to Roman leadership.¹⁴⁸ By replacing the “king of the north” in Dan 11:44 with the “king of the Kittim,” this is another example of how M has equivocated Syria with Assyria.

5.3. *The problems of equating the Kittim with (As)Syria*

This being done implicitly in Dan 11 and explicitly in M, coupled with M’s use of the term “king of the Kittim” for Daniel’s “king of the north,” there is little doubt that the Kittim in M were meant to refer to the Seleucids. However, this introduces three significant problems. First, in Dan 11, the foundational passage for 1QM 1, the “Kittim” unequivocally refer to the Romans and not to the Seleucids.

¹⁴⁵ Flusser, “Apocalyptic Elements,” 154–55.

¹⁴⁶ See above, page 94.

¹⁴⁷ The only other mention of the “king of the Kittim” is in the *Peshar on the Apocalypse of Weeks* (4Q247 frg. 1:7). See Broshi, “4Q247,” 189–91.

¹⁴⁸ Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 344–46; Moshe H. Segal, “Qumran War Scroll,” 142, n. 10.

Verses 29–30 describe Antiochus IV’s second attempt to invade Egypt in 168 BCE. It failed because of the intervention of the Roman envoy Gaius Popilius Laenas. In Daniel, this event is described as the coming of the ships of the Kittim (ובאו בו ציים כתיים - Dan 11:30).¹⁴⁹ That the Kittim are thought to be the Romans here is confirmed by the Old Greek which translates “Kittim” (כתיים) as “Romans” (Ρωμαῖοι).¹⁵⁰ Thus in Daniel we have the “king of the north” being stopped by the Kittim, while in M, this same “king of the north” is called the “king of the Kittim.”

Second, in the sources where they are mentioned interacting together, the Kittim and the (As)Syrians are always seen in conflict one with another. Such is already the case in the biblical texts (Num 24:23–24; Isa 23:12–13).¹⁵¹ In Num 24:24, the Kittim are described as afflicting Assyria. Isaiah 23:12–13 may be a reference to the Assyrians having razed Cyprus in order to establish it as a center for their own war ships,¹⁵² although the text is quite corrupt and defies certain interpretation.¹⁵³ In Dan 11:30, the Kittim are the opponents of the (As)Syrians. Additionally, 1 Macc 1:1 describes Alexander the Great as coming from the Land of the Kittim, and credits him with defeating Darius of Persia. Not only had the Persians taken over the Neo-Assyrian empire, in Ezra 6:22 they are even called Assyrians. In light of all these passages, Yadin’s idea that the two were combined into a single expression in M because of their proximity in the biblical texts makes little sense.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁹ Collins, *Daniel*, 384.

¹⁵⁰ As does the Vulgate (*Romani*).

¹⁵¹ Yadin mentions a third passage where the two are mentioned together: Ezek 27:6 (*The Scroll of the War*, 25, n. 3). However, the association is nothing more than just a mentioning of the two entities in the same chapter.

¹⁵² Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27: A Continental Commentary*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 405, 409–10, 415–19, 431–33.

¹⁵³ It has been thought that the text may have been emended in order to apply the prophecy to Babylon rather than to Assyria. See the brief summary of the issues in John Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1–39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 426, n. 11, and the reasons given there as to why some commentators view the conflict as being between Assyria and Babylon rather than between Assyria and Cyprus.

¹⁵⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 25.

Third and finally is a geographical problem. Outside of M, the Kittim are always associated with Mediterranean sea-faring localities west of Israel: the Aegean world,¹⁵⁵ Macedonia,¹⁵⁶ Greece,¹⁵⁷ Cyprus,¹⁵⁸ and Rome.¹⁵⁹ In fact, Josephus explains the term as referring to any Mediterranean coastal nation west of Israel (*Ant.* 1:128). Thus, if M assigned the name “Kittim” to the Seleucids, it would have been a very bold innovation indeed, for it contradicted what all other contemporaneous sources claimed about the Kittim’s territory as well as their role.¹⁶⁰ At the very least, such an identification was not adopted for long, for in two of the later pesharim (1QpHab,

¹⁵⁵ Should the Sea Peoples be the historical referent intended by Num 24:24 (William F. Albright, “The Oracles of Balaam,” *JBL* 63 [1944]: 230–31; Timothy R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, NICOT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993], 509–10). For a concise summary of the various theories concerning the origins of the Sea Peoples, see Itamar Singer, “Sea Peoples,” in *ABD*, vol. 5, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1059–61.

¹⁵⁶ 1 Macc 1:1; 8:5; *Jub.* 24:28–29 and 37:10 (Robert Henry Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* [London: A&C Black, 1902], 155, alternatively referring to Greeks in general).

¹⁵⁷ Gen 10:4 (1 Chr 1:7); *Jub.* 24:28–29 and 37:10; Arad Ostraca (see Yohanan Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions*, JDS [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981], 12–13; alternatively referring to Cyprus).

¹⁵⁸ Gen 10:5; Isa 23:1, 12; and possibly the Arad Ostraca.

¹⁵⁹ Dan 11:30 (as confirmed by the Septuagint; see also the Targum and Vulgate of Num 24:24 and Ezek 27:6, and the Targum of 1 Chr 1:7), 1QpHab (Bilhah Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea [1QpHab]* [Jerusalem: Bialik, 1986], 125–28), and 4QpNah (Shani L. Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, *STDJ* 53 [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 103). A text in which it is impossible to know to whom the Kittim refer is the non-sectarian *Pesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks* (4Q247) and 4QNew Jerusalem^a (4Q554 - I wish to thank Florentino García Martínez for pointing out this last reference to me). Not included here are *Pesher Isaiah*^a (4Q161) and *Sefer haMilhamah* (4Q285, 11Q14), both of which, like M, deal with the eschatological War against the Kittim. Note however that Joseph Amusin [= Amoussine] suggested that the Kittim in 4QIsa^a are the army of Ptolemy Lathyrus (Joseph D. Amoussine, “A propos de l’interprétation de 4Q161 [fragments 5–6 et 8],” *RevQ* 8 [1974]: 391). Should this be the case, this would be another example of the Kittim coming from Cyprus.

¹⁶⁰ Note Bilhah Nitzan who emphasizes that both in the Bible and Second Temple Period literature the Kittim are always from the Mediterranean islands and nearby areas, and that this geographical element is an important component of the name (*Pesher Habakkuk*, 66). She further rejects Harold Rowley’s view (“Kittim,” 97) that the presence of mercenaries from the Mediterranean islands in the Seleucid army qualified it to be the Kittim (*Pesher Habakkuk*, 126).

4QpNah), the sectarians identified the Kittim with the Romans.¹⁶¹ This is all the more interesting, for all our extant copies of M were copied at the same time as these pesharim, in the second half of the first century BCE,¹⁶² creating an interesting dynamic where the same term is given two different meanings in texts being copied contemporaneously.¹⁶³

5.4. Proposed solutions

There have been several attempts to resolve these difficulties. One is simply to claim that the term does not really refer to any one nation in particular. Rather, the term is thought to be a general reference to any Gentile enemy from far away,¹⁶⁴ or to Israel's eschatological enemy.¹⁶⁵ An initial problem with this view is that it contradicts Josephus' explanation of the term, and that we have no extant source where Kittim is used for any other nation than western Mediterranean ones. That said, there is no doubt that the Qumranites used it to refer to Israel's eschatological and final enemy. However, since in 1QpHab and 4QpNah it is clear that they applied it to the Romans specifically, one would expect them to apply the term to a specific enemy in their other compositions as well. Furthermore, the reference to the "Kittim of Assyria" and the "Kittim in Egypt" in M

¹⁶¹ Note that Hanan Eshel has recently demonstrated that the references to the Kittim in *Pesher Habakkuk* are in fact the result of a late editorial stage in the scroll's composition ("שני הרבדים ההיסטוריים המתועדים במגילת פשר חבקוק," *Zion* 71 [2006]: 143–52).

¹⁶² For a recent summaries of the data pertaining to the dating of the various pesharim, see Timothy H. Lim, *Pesharim*, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3 (New York: Sheffield Press, 2002), 20–22; James H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 77–118.

¹⁶³ This problem was already highlighted by Cecil Roth in *Historical Background*, 77–78. If one holds the position that *Sefer haMilhamah* contains the end of M, then M would have been copied into the first century CE, well after both the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms had fallen to the Romans.

¹⁶⁴ Theodor Herzl Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 28; Baker, "Kittim," 93; Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scroll: A New Translation* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 150.

¹⁶⁵ See note 135 and Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk*, 66–67.

shows that they were trying to locate them, rather than just use the term as a kind of esoteric concept.

5.4.1. *The view of Grintz and Lim*

In his attempt to harmonize their identification between the War Texts and 1QpHab and 4QpNah, both Yehoshua Grintz and Timothy Lim have suggested that the term “Kittim” at Qumran was always applied to the Romans, that the shift from “leaders of” to “king of” the Kittim reflects the transition from the Republic to the Empire, and that the references to their downfall reveals a later more militant stage in the sect’s thinking.¹⁶⁶ But this view contradicts the evidence. The shift from the Republic to the Empire happened only in 27 BCE. However, most of our copies of M date to the middle of the first century BCE, with 4Q496, which also preserves col. 1 of M,¹⁶⁷ dating to the first half of the first century BCE. The use of “king of the Kittim” therefore antedated the shift to Empirical Rome.¹⁶⁸ It would seem, therefore, that the War Texts reflects an earlier stage in the community’s thinking than these two pesharim, and not the opposite as suggested by Lim.

5.4.2. *The view of Stegemann and Eshel*

Rather than seeking a single meaning for the Kittim in all of the Qumran Scrolls, both Harmut Stegemann and Hanan Eshel have suggested a chronology in the sectarians’ use of the term. According to them, in the *Pesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks* (4Q247), M (together with 4Q285), and in 4QpIsa^a, the Kittim refer to Hellenistic

¹⁶⁶ Grintz, פְּרָקִים בְּתוֹלְדוֹת בֵּית שֵׁנִי, 149–50; Lim, “Kittim,” 470.

¹⁶⁷ It is true that 4Q496 does not preserve the expression “king of the Kittim,” or even just the word “Kittim.” However, based on what is extant of the text and reconstructing it on the basis of M, it is reasonable to assume that it did once have them.

¹⁶⁸ It has been suggested that the term “king” may have been applied to Julius Caesar who was effectively sole leader in 46–44 BCE (Brownlee, “Kittim,” 46). While theoretically possible, it seems unlikely that such an eclipse of leadership style in Republican Rome would have motivated such a change in the sect’s naming of the Roman leaders. Furthermore, it still does not predate 4Q496 which we can assume already had “king of the Kittim.”

kings of the Seleucid empire, while in 1QpHab and 4QpNah they refer to the Romans.¹⁶⁹ As support for this chronology, Eshel notes that in the latter two texts there is neither the mention of the “king of the Kittim” nor any reference to an eventual fall of the Kittim as in M and 4Q285, and that both betray knowledge of Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem in 63 BCE.¹⁷⁰ He suggests that since the sect kept changing whom they meant by the term Kittim, and that with time they realized that their previous identification could no longer hold true, the sect simply decided to cease writing down their pesharim. He bolsters this last point with the fact that although the years 31–30 BCE were particularly tumultuous in the Middle East as in Judea, none of the events which transpired then are reflected in any of the sect’s writings, contrary to what one would have expected.¹⁷¹

Accordingly, referring to the Seleucid kingdom as Kittim would not necessarily be an innovation of the Qumran sect, nor unique to it. It would have simply been mimicking the current practice of assigning ‘Kittim’ to whatever nation that was Israel’s nemesis at the time.¹⁷² In some ways, it is similar to the view mentioned above, that ‘Kittim’ was only a generic term for Israel’s eschatological enemy, whomever they were believed to be. Nevertheless, this leaves all of the above problems unresolved. First, it implies that in the case of M, the author was apparently indifferent to the contradiction it created with Dan 11, even though he based his composition upon it. Second, it does not explain how the Seleucids could be called Kittim, especially after the battle of Ipsus in 189 BCE when they were forced to retreat from Asia Minor, with the result that their only contact with the Mediterranean Sea was via the northern continuation of Israel’s coast.

¹⁶⁹ Hanan Eshel, “Kittim,” 41–44; Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 131.

¹⁷⁰ See also Hanan Eshel, “שני הרבדים,” 143–52.

¹⁷¹ Hanan Eshel, “תולדות של הקבוצה שישה בקומראן והרמזים ההיסטוריים שבמקילות,” *Qad* 30 (1997): 93; המדינה החשמונאית, 145–58.

¹⁷² This is not something that Eshel mentions specifically in his article, but one of his assumptions, since he does not address the contradiction of assigning the term ‘Kittim’ to their own traditional enemies, but simply takes for granted that the Qumranites should seek to identify who are the Kittim.

5.5. *The Kittim in Second Temple Period literature*

Even apart from these two questions, neither is it certain that identifying the Kittim with a specific nation or people group was a concern of the Jews at the time of M's composition. While at Qumran there are over thirty occurrences in at least six of the sectarian compositions,¹⁷³ in all other extant non-biblical literature from the end of the Second Temple Period, the Kittim appear only five times in three compositions (1 Macc 1:1, 8:5; *Jub.* 24:28–29, 37:10; and *Ant.* 1:128). This paucity of references suggests that the rest of Judaism did not have the same kind of fixation with identifying the Kittim as the Qumranites.¹⁷⁴ In addition, a survey of these non-Qumranic references reveals that even if there was a concerted effort at defining who the Kittim are, there certainly was no consensus.

We have already seen that in Dan 11, the Kittim are associated with the Romans. In 1 Maccabees, the Kittim are unequivocally associated with the Macedonians (1:1; 8:5). In *Jubilees*, however, the matter is not so obvious. R. H. Charles understood them as being a reference to Greeks or Macedonians, in harmony with 1 Maccabees.¹⁷⁵ The immediate context is far from clear, and any designation would have to remain extremely tentative. In *Jub.* 37:10, the Kittim are described as “mighty men of war.”¹⁷⁶ This may give us a window into the meaning of the term, namely that they are primarily considered to be warriors. The situation here is similar to that of the Kittim mentioned in the Arad Ostraca from the end of the First Temple Period where they are mercenaries in foreign armies.¹⁷⁷ In

¹⁷³ 1QpHab, 1QM, 4QpIsa^a (4Q161), 4QpNah (4Q169), 4QApWeeks (4Q247), 4Q285; additionally, it has been suggested to reconstruct the term in 1QpPs (1Q16) and 4QHistorical Text D (4Q332). It is also found in the Aramaic text 4QNew Jerusalem^a (4Q554).

¹⁷⁴ An alternate explanation is that once it became fully accepted that the Kittim are in fact the Romans, that Jewish authors stopped using the term, and instead just referred to Rome, as in the Targumim (see above, note 159).

¹⁷⁵ Charles, *Jubilees*, 155.

¹⁷⁶ Notice the description of the Kittim in *Peshar Habakkuk* as being “swift and strong in battle” (קלים וגבורים במלחמה - 1QpHab 2:12-13), fitting this militaristic definition perfectly.

¹⁷⁷ Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions*, 12–13.

fact, this could potentially explain why they are not counted in the total number of soldiers in *Jub.* 37:14–15: although they are mentioned in the list in v.10, it may have been for the sake of pointing out that they were part of the armies listed just before them, not additional fighting units. In *Jub.* 24:28, they are listed together with Gentiles as those who are to afflict the Philistines. Here too, their being understood as mighty warriors would fit the context well, even more so when considering their maritime origins, most appropriate for those eligible to afflict the Philistines. Finally, even if 1 Maccabees and *Jubilees* are at odds with each other and with the book of Daniel about the identity of the Kittim, they are all nevertheless consistent with what Josephus has to say on the matter: he claims that the term refers to all the Mediterranean islands in the Mediterranean Sea and most of its coast line as well (*Ant.* 1:128). Accordingly, all three texts are correct, as the Greeks, the Macedonians, and the Romans all qualify as Kittim. It also suggests that in the Second Temple Period, outside of Qumran, there may not have been any effort to narrow the identification of the Kittim down to a single nation.

5.6. *The Kittim and Numbers 24*

The above survey has highlighted not only how unique the Qumran literature as a whole is when dealing with the Kittim, but also how shocking it is for M (and other sectarian compositions) to assign the term to the Seleucids. Undoubtedly it was motivated by the community's eschatological outlook, based in part on Balaam's fourth and fifth oracles (Num 24:15–24) in which the Kittim are mentioned.¹⁷⁸ Balaam's fourth oracle (Num 24:15–19) is introduced as being about the "end of days" (בִּאֵהָרִית הַיָּמִים - v. 14). While originally this was understood as simply meaning the future,¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ The most elaborate study of the Balaam pericope is Hedwige Rouillard, *La péricope de Balaam (Nombres 22–24). La prose et les 'Oracles'*, EBib NS 4 (Paris: Gabalda, 1985).

¹⁷⁹ Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, AB 4A (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 199.

eventually it came to take on eschatological significance.¹⁸⁰ At the same time, it is important to underscore that an eschatological application of Balaam's fifth oracle in Num 24:23–24 to specific events in the Second Temple Period could only have taken place after it was already considered appropriate to do so with Balaam's fourth oracle in Num 24:15–19. The two are technically not the same oracle, and only the first one carries the explicit mention of being related to the “end of days” (אחרית הימים - Num 24:14). While it is reasonable that this eschatological dimension was understood as encompassing all of Balaam's subsequent oracles, it is not required by the text. In other words, the eschatological introduction of v. 14 could not have been applied to vv. 23–24 without being first applied to vv. 15–19. Consequently, the use of Balaam's fourth oracle might be a way of determining how early Jews began seeing Num 24 as key to understanding their not so distant future.

Indeed, the expressions “star from Jacob” (כוכב מיִעֶקֶב) and “scepter from Israel” (שֵׁבֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל) are in fact quoted in texts with apocalyptic and messianic undertones, beginning in the second half of the second century BCE onward: M (11:6–7),¹⁸¹ *Rule of the Benedictions* (1QSb 5:27–28),¹⁸² *Damascus Document* (CD 7:18–21); 4QTest (4Q175 12–13), *Messianic Apocalypse* (4Q521 frg. 2 iii:6),¹⁸³ Philo (*Rewards* 95), 2 Pet 1:19, Rev 22:16, and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*T. Levi* 18:3, and *T. Jud.* 24:1–6).¹⁸⁴

¹⁸⁰ Annette Steudel, “אחרית הימים In the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225–46.

¹⁸¹ However, while M's origins date back to the second century BCE, it may be that this particular passage dates to the first century BCE; see Chapter 7, especially the discussion beginning on page 383.

¹⁸² Note however that Géza Xeravits does not think that this mention of the “scepter” (שֵׁבֶט) is related to Num 24:17 (*King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*, STDJ 47 [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 161).

¹⁸³ Some have challenged the reading as referring to a “scepter,” and preferring the meaning “tribe” instead (see Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 162).

¹⁸⁴ See John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 61, 63–65; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 159–64.

The verse may also be alluded to in *Ps. Sol.* 17:2,¹⁸⁵ Matt 2:2, Josephus (*War* 6:312–313), Tacitus (*Hist.* 5:13), and Suetonius (*Vespasianus* 4). It was of course used later on by Rabbi Akiva concerning Ben Kosiba (y. *Ta'an.* 68d).¹⁸⁶

While not textual, there may be another use of the “star” motif from Num 24:17: on the coins of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE). On one group of coins, the symbols are a lily on the one side and an anchor on the other. On a second group, they are an anchor and a star surrounded by a diadem. On the former, he identifies himself as king both in Hebrew and in Greek, while in the latter the title is only in Hebrew.¹⁸⁷ It has been suggested that the star was Alexander Jannaeus’ way of representing his position as king, an innovation for the Hasmonean dynasty,¹⁸⁸ by drawing from the imagery of Num 24:17.¹⁸⁹ Should this be the case, we would have here another use of this passage at the very beginning of the first century BCE.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁵ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 163. This is not the majority view. For example, Kenneth Atkinson does not think such an allusion is intended in that verse (see *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 49 [Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2000], 330).

¹⁸⁶ Peter Schäfer, “Rabbi Aqiva and Bar Kokhba,” in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, vol. 2, ed. William Scott Green (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1980), 113–30; Peter Schäfer, *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981), 55–57.

¹⁸⁷ Ya’akov Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins from the Persian Period to Bar Kokhba* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2001), 37–38.

¹⁸⁸ According to Josephus, Aristobolus I was the first to call himself king (*Ant.* 13:301), although his reign was very short (104–103 BCE). Note that the coins once attributed to him are now thought to be of Aristobolus II (67–63 BCE) (see Meshorer, *Treasury of Jewish Coins*, 27–29). Even if not, Alexander Jannaeus was the first to use the title “king,” both in Hebrew and in Greek, on the coins he minted.

¹⁸⁹ Cecil Roth, “Star and Anchor: Coin Symbolism and the End of Days,” *Erlsr* 6 (1960): 13*–16*; Baruch Kanael, “Jewish Coins and Their Historical Importance,” *BA* 26, no. 2 (1963): 44.

¹⁹⁰ James VanderKam, in his survey of messianism in Second Temple Period compositions, concluded that the earliest mention of a messianic hope is in the *Animal Apocalypse* of 1 Enoch, dated approximately to 160 BCE (“Messianism and Apocalypticism,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, vol. 1, The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity, ed. John J. Collins [New York: Continuum, 1998], 223). Other contemporaneous texts, although having apocalyptic characteristics, do not betray such an expectation. Since an eschatological reading of Balaam’s fourth oracle is also messianic, we would not expect such a reading to antedate the birth of such hopes. As we have just seen, that is indeed the case.

5.6.1. *The relationship of the Kittim to Numbers 24*

As is immediately visible, the Qumran sectarian material is the oldest non-biblical attestation to the use of Num 24:15–19 in a specific messianic or eschatological context, dating to the second half of the second century BCE.¹⁹¹ Outside of Qumran’s sectarian writings, the earliest possible allusion to Balaam’s oracle in such a manner is dated to the beginning of the first century BCE. Textually, however, it is in the *Psalms of Solomon*, dating only to the fourth decade of the first century BCE at the earliest.¹⁹² Thus, outside of the

¹⁹¹ I support a composition date of M during the second half of the second century BCE (see page 102). The dates of the various other Qumranic compositions are: the end of the second century BCE for 4Q521 (Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII*, 3) and D (Charlotte Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, CQS 1 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 23); and the first quarter of the first century BCE for Sa (James H. Charlesworth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Rule of the Congregation [1QSa],” in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994], 108) and 4QTest (Frank M. Cross, “Testimonia [4Q175 = 4QTestim],” in *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scroll: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002], 308). While it is acknowledged that the Christian recension of the *Testament of Levi* from the second century CE uses the third century BCE *Aramaic Levi* as its source, *T. Levi* 17–18 have no parallels in *Aramaic Levi*, so that one cannot even postulate that those chapters have an earlier origin (Marinus de Jonge, “The Testament of Levi and ‘Aramaic Levi’,” in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* [Leiden: Brill, 1991], 253–55; Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, SVTP 19 [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 10, 19–20, 203 n. 328). Similarly, the suggestion that Hebrew copies of the *Testament of Judah* were found at Qumran have been shown to be unfounded (Émile Puech, “Une nouvelle copie du livre de Jubilés: 4Q484 = pap4QJubilés¹,” *RevQ* 19 [1999]: 262–64; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi*, 26–28). For a survey of the reasons put forward to date the origins of the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* to the second century BCE, see Michael E. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, vol. 2 of *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple Period and the Talmud*, CRINT, Section 2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 343; Marinus de Jonge and H. W. Hollander, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, SVTP 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 3–7.

¹⁹² Traditionally, it is dated to between 63 and 48 BCE (see Kenneth Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon’s Historical Background and*

Qumran texts, there is no evidence that in the second century BCE, possibly even during the first half of the first century BCE, there was any special interest in Balaam's oracles as eschatological prophecies for the final age. The only way this would not be so is if it could be shown that one or several of the references to the Kittim in Second Temple Period literature¹⁹³ were inspired by Num 24:24. Such a connection must be demonstrated, for without it, the mere mention of the Kittim in a text does not imply an eschatological dimension. This is clearly seen in the Bible (Isa 23:1, 12; Jer 2:10; Ezek 27:6), and Josephus' definition of the Kittim at the end of the Second Temple Period (*Ant.* 1:128) only underscores that fact, all the more so since he is apparently aware of the messianic interpretation of Balaam's oracles (*War* 6:312–313). Thus, while it is relatively safe to assume that a citation of or an allusion to Num 24:15–19 implies some kind of messianic or eschatological theme, this is not necessarily the case with the term Kittim. Consequently, in order to see if our texts are indeed based on Num 24:24, it is best to begin by examining it first.

The relevant portion reads as follows: “And ships from the side¹⁹⁴ of the Kittim, and they shall subjugate¹⁹⁵ Assyria, and they shall subjugate Eber” (וציִים מִיַּד כְּתִיִּים וְעִנּוּ אֶשׁוּר וְעִנּוּ עֵבֶר). Immediately visible through this very wooden translation is that the text is problematic and defies certain interpretation. Martin Noth summed it up as follows: “The text is obviously corrupt and the original wording can be reconstructed only hypothetically.”¹⁹⁶ A first challenge is the opening phrase. Since it lacks a verb, commentators have often supplied it: “And ships (shall come) from the side of Kittim...” (וציִים (יבואוּ) מִיַּד (כְּתִיִּים)).¹⁹⁷ It needs to be highlighted, however, that this difficulty does

Social Setting, JSJSup 84 [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 4–6, 211).

¹⁹³ As listed above, page 138, with the addition of Dan 11:30.

¹⁹⁴ Even more literally: “from the hand of”; see also the Septuagint, quoted below.

¹⁹⁵ For the translation of עִנּוּ as “subjugate,” see Levine, *Numbers 21–26*, 206.

¹⁹⁶ Martin Noth, *Numbers*, trans. James D. Martin, The Old Testament Library 4 (London: SCM, 1968), 194.

¹⁹⁷ For example, as does Philip Budd (*Numbers*, WBC 5 [Waco: Word Books, 1984], 253) and Martin Noth (*Numbers*, 171). See also Baruch Levine's translation: “...when ships [are sent] by the Kittim?” (*Numbers 21–26*, 190).

not exist in either the Samaritan Pentateuch (“He leads them out from the side the Kittim...” [ויוציאם מיד כתיים]) or the Septuagint (“And he shall go out from the hand of the Kittim...” [καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ χειρὸς Κιτιαίων], possibly reflecting a Hebrew vorlage “And they are going out from the side of the Kittim...” [ויוציאם מיד כתיים]).¹⁹⁸ A second peculiarity is the possible use of the Egyptian loan word “ship” (צי),¹⁹⁹ found only rarely in the Hebrew Bible.²⁰⁰ However, if one accepts the Septuagint or the Samaritan Pentateuch reading, then it could be that the word is only the result of the text’s corruption over time. An additional issue is identifying who is intended by “Eber” (עבר). It may possibly be used to refer to the “Hebrews” (עבריים), as in the Septuagint (Ἑβραίους) and the Vulgate (*Hebraeos*), or to “Eber hannahar” (עבר הנהר - cf. Josh 24:2–3)²⁰¹ as in the Targumim, meaning the other side of the Euphrates river. With all of these challenges, it is difficult to know exactly what the oracle was trying to communicate. The simplest reading is that the Kittim were expected to come and subjugate the Assyrians, then Eber, the latter being either Israel or Mesopotamia: “This prophecy predicts an invasion of Assyria and Syria by a Cypriot fleet, as well as the ultimate defeat of those very invaders.”²⁰²

Traditionally, it has been assumed that Dan 11:30, *Jub.* 24:28–29; 37:10; 1 Macc 1:1 and 8:5 all use the term Kittim in an eschatological sense. While this is certainly possible, neither does it need to be so. Josephus is a good reminder how at the end of the Second Temple Period, the term “Kittim” did not necessarily carry any eschatological dimension (*Ant.* 1:128). Yet because of the preponderance of the term in the Qumran sectarian texts where it is most certainly used in such a way, scholars have come to assume that it must carry that valence elsewhere as well. For example, William

¹⁹⁸ See Ashley, *Numbers*, 505. Based on the Septuagint alone, one would have expected the Hebrew to be the same as the Greek “And he shall go out” (ויוציא). However, by suggesting a third person plural participle instead, one can understand how the text could have become corrupt to its present state: ויוציאם → וציים.

¹⁹⁹ Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, 1020.

²⁰⁰ Isa 23:13, 33:21; Dan 11:30; and possibly Ezek 30:9.

²⁰¹ Levine, *Numbers* 21–26, 206.

²⁰² Levine, *Numbers* 21–26, 206.

Brownlee has suggested that beginning in the Hasmonean period, Num 24:24 was applied eschatologically.²⁰³ In his view, the author of *Jubilees* used the term Kittim in 24:28–29 and 37:10 respectively to refer to the Seleucids who oppressed the non-Jews living in Philistia and the Jews living in Judea. In the book of Daniel, a roughly contemporaneous composition,²⁰⁴ the situation would have been different. Following Louis Ginsberg's suggestion,²⁰⁵ Brownlee claimed that Num 24:24 was read by the author of Dan 11 as implying that the Kittim, being the Romans, would afflict the Assyrians (meaning the Seleucids), and that they, the Assyrians, would in turn afflict the Hebrews. Finally, at the end of the second century BCE or shortly thereafter, the author of 1 Maccabees assumed that Balaam's prophecy had been fulfilled in the coming of Alexander the Great, which is why he is described as coming from the Land of the Kittim.²⁰⁶

5.6.1.1. *Jubilees* and Numbers 24:24

One advantage to such a view is that it would give a precedent to M for calling the Seleucids "Kittim," and that instead of being its own innovation, it would be the result of a dependence upon *Jubilees*.²⁰⁷ But in addition to the problem it creates with all other literature on

²⁰³ Brownlee, "Kittim," 45–46.

²⁰⁴ *Jubilees* can be confidently dated to between 170–150 BCE (see James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, CSCO 511, *Scriptores aethiopicici* 88 [Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1989], VI and George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981], 78–79) though recently Michael Segal has suggested a later date for the final redaction layer (*Jubilees*, 35–40, 318–22). The book of Daniel dates somewhere shortly after 165 BCE (see note 12).

²⁰⁵ Harold Louis Ginsberg, *Studies in Daniel* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948), 72.

²⁰⁶ Opinions are divided as to whether 1 Maccabees should be dated to the end of the second century BCE (Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989], 151–70) or the first half of the first century BCE (Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 63).

²⁰⁷ Such a dependence has already been stipulated by Ben Zion Wacholder in *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*, HUCM 8 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), 81, although this is not one of the arguments he mentions.

the relationship between the Kittim and (As)Syria, such a reading of *Jubilees* is far from obvious, as we have seen above.²⁰⁸ What can be affirmed, however, is that in *Jubilees* the Kittim are *not* fulfilling the role attributed to them in Num 24:24: they are not described as subjugating either Assyria or Eber, whoever the latter may be. Furthermore, in the rest of *Jubilees*, even in the two most apocalyptic chapters (1 and 23), there is no mention of any messianic hope,²⁰⁹ as we would expect if the author was already reading Num 24:15–24 eschatologically and applying it to his own period. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the Kittim in *Jubilees* are related to Balaam’s prophecy in any way, even should they be later interpolations as suggested by Yadin.²¹⁰ Instead, it appears that the author of *Jubilees* is using the term in its geo-political meaning only, just as it is in Isa 23:1,12, Jer 2:10, Ezek 27:6, and the Arad Ostraca: they are simply “mighty men of war” (*Jub.* 37:10).

5.6.1.2. First Maccabees and Numbers 24:24

In 1 Maccabees, we are told that Alexander the Great came from the land of the Kittim (1:1) and that Philip V and Perseus, the last two kings of Macedonia, were kings of the Kittim (8:5). It is interesting to note that the author did not also call Alexander the Great king of the Kittim, and that he is careful to differentiate between the Macedonians and the Greeks (1:1; 6:2).²¹¹ Nevertheless, he clearly identifies the Kittim as the Macedonians. Should this have been inspired by Num 24:24, then one must assume that he considered them to have afflicted Assyria and Eber. Historically, in fact, this was the case. Alexander the Great did overrun both Assyria and the

²⁰⁸ Page 138.

²⁰⁹ VanderKam, “Messianism,” 202–3.

²¹⁰ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 24, nn. 7–8. Should they indeed be interpolations into an earlier text, we would assume that they were then meant to represent either the Romans as in Dan 11:30, or the Macedonians as in 1 Macc 1:1 and 5:8. The former is most plausible in light of the evidence from the translation of Kittim in the Septuagint, the Targumim, and the Vulgate. It would be unlikely that it preserved the view of M, when even the members of the sect which composed it eventually abandoned that identification. This would argue against Brownlee’s view described above.

²¹¹ Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 192.

lands east of it,²¹² as well as Judea, so that no matter how one interprets Eber in Num 24:24, he and his army effectively fulfilled the role assigned to Kittim in that verse.²¹³ More specifically, this fits particularly well with the Septuagint's translation of Num 24:24, that *one* going out (ἐξελύσεται) from the Kittim would afflict Assyria and Eber. It also conforms especially well with the last part of the verse according to the Masoretic Text: after several clauses in the plural, the text suddenly switches to the singular: "and also *he* will perish forever" (וְגַם הוּא עַדֵי אָבֶד). In light of these parallels, one can certainly understand how Alexander the Great could have been considered as having fulfilled Balaam's prophecy. Should such a reading of Num 24:24 be what motivated the author of 1 Maccabees to identify Macedonia as being the land of the Kittim, two conclusions can be inferred. The first is that because of Alexander the Great, the identity of the Kittim was no longer generic as in *Jubilees*, but now specific to a single country or people group: Macedonia. Second, since such a perspective fits the Septuagint best, one would expect that like it, the author of 1 Maccabees interpreted Eber to be the Hebrews (meaning Judea), and not the land east of the Euphrates.²¹⁴

In light of Josephus' definition of the Kittim (*Ant.* 1:128), however, it could be argued that even the author of 1 Maccabees was not trying to identify who the Kittim of Num 24:24 were, but was simply pointing out the maritime origins of Alexander's "mighty men of war" (cf. *Jub.* 37:10). From very early on in Alexander's military campaigns, the ruling force in the Mediterranean were the Macedonians, so that the Kittim could hardly have been identified as any one else at that time. Yet at the same time, if in 1 Maccabees the Macedonians were identified as the Kittim of Num 24:24, its author was also claiming that the prophecy of Num 24:24 had long been fulfilled: by the time 1 Maccabees was composed, the Macedonian kingdom had ceased to be a political reality for over half a century

²¹² In Ezra 6:22 the Persian empire is called "Assyria."

²¹³ Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 191.

²¹⁴ One should also allow for the possibility that the Septuagint was translated to reflect Alexander the Great's accomplishments specifically (see below, note 238). Even if not, it still gives us a window into how the Jews understood "Eber" in Num 24:24.

already, as it is in fact careful to point out (1 Macc 8:5). This point is particularly significant because, as mentioned above, the book of Daniel, composed slightly before 1 Maccabees, identifies the Romans as the Kittim. One could have expected that by highlighting the Roman's conquest of the Kittim and their land (1 Macc 1:1; 8:5), the author of 1 Maccabees could have affirmed Daniel's identification of the Kittim as the Romans. Instead, he negates it by being very specific that they are the Macedonians. This means that the earlier composition, Daniel, identified the Kittim as being the political power that rose last to power, while the later composition, 1 Maccabees, reverted their identification back to an earlier political power, even though it had already ceased being a relevant military force in the Mediterranean world for over a century.²¹⁵ At the very least, if both Dan 11 and 1 Maccabees were inspired by Num 24:24 in their use of the term Kittim, they did so in very different ways. At the same time, we have seen that it is possible that 1 Maccabees was not seeking to identify the Kittim of Num 24:24 when it used the term. Another point is that 1 Maccabees does not seem to consider Alexander the Great's death to have been anything special, as one could have expected it to be treated if it was considered to be the fulfillment of a biblical prophecy.

5.6.1.3. Daniel and Numbers 24:24

In the book of Daniel, there is little doubt that the Kittim are the Romans, and it is often assumed that the choice of the word "Kittim" in 11:30 is an allusion to Num 24:24.²¹⁶ This connection is apparently strengthened since the verse also uses the rare Egyptian loan word "ships" (כִּיִּים), just like Num 24:24. Furthermore, in light of the chapter's eschatological nature, it would only make sense that its author turned to the Balaam oracles for inspiration.

²¹⁵ By calling the Ptolemies "kings of Egypt" (1:18; 10:51; 11:1) and the Seleucids "kings of Asia" (8:6; 13:32), the author of 1 Maccabees does not seem to be emphasizing their descent from Alexander the Great, the "King of Greece" (1:1).

²¹⁶ Montgomery, *Daniel*, 455; Hartman and di Lella, *Daniel*, 270–71; Ashley, *Numbers*, 509.

Even so, not all scholars are certain that the connection exists.²¹⁷ An initial problem is with Num 24:24. As we have seen, the text in its present state hints that it has been corrupted. Should one choose to follow Albright's restoration, the word "Kittim" may not even have appeared in the original.²¹⁸ The question would then be, when did it become part of the text. Unfortunately, of the six copies of the book of Daniel at Qumran, none of them preserve Dan 11:32. We have also seen that two early textual witnesses, the Septuagint²¹⁹ and the Samaritan Pentateuch,²²⁰ both suggest that the Egyptian loan word "ships" was not originally part of the text. Nor is Daniel quoting Num 24:24 sufficiently close enough to be used as a means to restore what the original reading might have been.²²¹

Presupposing that the Num 24:24 which the Dan 11 author saw was similar to what is preserved in our Masoretic Text, another problem is that what is described of the Romans fail to fulfill what is expected of the Kittim. They only "subjugate Assyria," but not

²¹⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 384. See also John Goldingay who does not see the slightest connection to Num 24:24, but thinks instead that the term Kittim is purely geographical, and translates the phrase in Dan 11:30 as "And ships from the west..." For him, Kittim is a way of saying "Cyprus and beyond" (*Daniel*, WBC 30 [Dallas: Word Books, 1989], 273, 279).

²¹⁸ Albright, "Oracles," 222–23.

²¹⁹ The Pentateuch of the Septuagint is believed to have been translated in the third century BCE. See Henry B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 2 ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 1–58; Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 29–99; Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 29–44.

²²⁰ The Samaritan Pentateuch is thought to have become an independent tradition in the second century BCE. See Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch's Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," in *Emanuel - Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom Paul, et al., VTSup 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 215–40, as well as the more comprehensive treatment in James D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*, HSM 2 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968).

²²¹ Note that just as in Numbers, several emendations have been suggested for the word ציִים in Dan 11:30: ביצִים, יצאים, צירים (Montgomery, *Daniel*, 456; see also Hartman and di Lella, *Daniel*, 270–71).

“Eber,” no matter whom Eber may represent.²²² Also certain is that Dan 11 is not suggesting that the Kittim are Israel’s final eschatological enemies. Philip Alexander, for example, even calls them the “friends of Israel.”²²³ Instead of the Kittim, it is the Seleucids, led by the “king of the north,” who fulfill that role. Therefore to posit a dependence upon Num 24:24, one is forced to assume that either the author of Dan 11 has misunderstood the verse, or that he is offering his own “free interpretation.”²²⁴ This is, in fact, what scholars have suggested, following Ginsberg’s interpretation mentioned above.²²⁵ This would be a very ‘free’ interpretation indeed, as it is most problematic to read the verse in such a way: Assyria would have to be the subject of the second “subjugate” (ויענו - third person masculine singular) in v. 24, while earlier in the same oracle Assyria is referred to in the feminine singular (v. 22).²²⁶ Finally, apart from this possible allusion to the “ships of the Kittim,” nowhere in the rest of Daniel is there any hint that the author may be alluding to Balaam’s oracles.²²⁷

In light of all these difficulties, one ought to be wary of assuming that Dan 11:30 is based on Num 24:24. As we have seen, in the Bible the word Kittim does not always carry eschatological connotations (Isa 23:1, 12; Jer 2:10; Ezek 27:10; cf. also *Ant.* 1:128). It should not be unexpected, therefore, to see the author of Daniel using

²²² In fact, if עינו is truly “subjugate” as argued by Baruch Levine (see above, note 195), then one could even suggest that the Romans do not even fulfill any part of Num 24:24.

²²³ Philip S. Alexander, “The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of the Jewish Opposition to Rome,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul, et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 18.

²²⁴ Hartman and di Lella, *Daniel*, 270.

²²⁵ See page 145. It is also followed by Louis Hartman and Alexander Di Lella (*Daniel*, 270–71). Another attempt at harmonizing Num 24:24 with Dan 11 suggested that the Kittim were to come with the king of the north against the king of the south (Anatole M. Gazor-Ginzberg, “The Structure of the Army of the Sons of Light,” *RevQ* 5 [1965]: 176).

²²⁶ This in itself is a peculiarity, as the verb following Assyria in the Bible is always in the third person masculine singular (but see Ezek 32:22). For this reason, Albright suggested not even reading it as being Assyria (“Oracles,” 222, n. 104). See also the discussion in Ashley, *Numbers*, 504.

²²⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 458; Hartman and di Lella, *Daniel*, 331.

the term in a similar way, even in an eschatological context.²²⁸ Rather, as we have seen above, it could be assumed that the author of Dan 11 was building off of the same outlook as is found in 1 Maccabees: since the Macedonians were once considered to be the Kittim, now that they have been defeated by Rome, and Macedon incorporated into the greater Roman world, the Romans became heirs of their epithet.

On the other hand, there may have been a different motivation. From a stylistic perspective, the author certainly did not want to call the Romans by their actual name. In order to remain somewhat cryptic as throughout the rest of his prophecy, yet at the same time decipherable, there could hardly have been a more fitting sobriquet. Since the Roman delegation was led by a general, our author could not use the epithet “king of the west” in the same manner with which he named the Seleucid and the Ptolemaic monarchs “king of the north” and “king of the south” respectively. The more vague “Kittim” was perfect for his purposes, especially since the Romans arrived from the western Mediterranean world, fitting the term’s geopolitical definition nicely.

Furthermore, we have seen that the author of Dan 11 used several expressions which are exclusive to Isaiah.²²⁹ Interestingly enough, both the word Kittim and the rare Egyptian loanword for “ships” (כִּיִּים) appear together in the same context in Isa 23:12–13.²³⁰ In fact, outside of Dan 11 and Num 24, the only other place that this word for ships appear is in Isaiah (23:13; 33:21) and Ezekiel (30:9). However, the Ezekiel passage, like the Num 24:24, is problematic, and it is possible that the word is the result of a corrupt text.²³¹ There is

²²⁸ And indeed, such has been suggested (Goldingay, *Daniel*, 273, 279).

²²⁹ See above, note 142.

²³⁰ See Hans Wildberger (*Isaiah 13–27*, 410) who even suggests that Kittim should be reconstructed in Isa 23:13, so that both words would actually be found in the same verse. Note that Isa 23:12–13 was found at Qumran in 4QIsa^c (4Q57 frg. 9 ii:17–18), with both words “Kittim” (כִּיִּים) and “ships” (כִּיִּים) preserved (Patrick W. Skehan and Eugene Ulrich, “Isaiah,” in *Qumran Cave 4 X - the Prophets*, Eugene Ulrich, et al., DJD XV [Oxford: Clarendon, 1997], 55).

²³¹ Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1–24*, trans. James D. Martin, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 124; Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24*, NICOT (Grand

good reason, therefore, to assume that the use of both of these rare terms in Dan 11 could have been inspired just as much by Isaiah as by Num 24, and that this would be yet another expression exclusive to Isaiah and Daniel.²³² In light of the contradiction between Num 24 and Dan 11 as to who was expected to be Israel's final eschatological enemy, especially when contrasted to the way Dan 11 makes a special effort to incorporate Isaiah material, it is more likely that these two rare words in Dan 11 were inspired by Isa 23:12–13 rather than Num 24:24.²³³

5.6.2. *Identifying the Kittim of the eschaton*: a Qumran innovation

In conclusion, the only one of the three non-sectarian compositions using the term Kittim that can fit the expectations and conditions of Num 24:24 is 1 Maccabees. By itself, this does not prove that its use of the word Kittim is in fact inspired by Num 24:24, but one must allow for that to be the case. Its narrowing of their identity to a single Mediterranean people is certainly consistent with such an agenda. As mentioned above, 1 Maccabees is dated to the end of the second century or the first half of the first century BCE,²³⁴ therefore only slightly before our other earliest non-sectarian allusion to Balaam's oracles. Of the other two texts, it is safe to affirm that *Jubilees* is not concerned with identifying the Kittim of the eschaton: neither do the Kittim in *Jubilees* fit the role, nor does *Jubilees* have the necessary messianic bent to be relating to Balaam's last two oracles. As for Daniel, its content seems to be particularly fitting to interpreting Num 24, yet apart from a passing mention of the Kittim, there is no such evidence that it is alluding to the passage. If, as the Septuagint translation of Num 24:24 suggests, the Kittim were supposed to be Israel's final eschatological enemy, Daniel is very clear

Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 160, n. 39.

²³² Alternatively, if one accepts the reading of "in ships" (בציים) in Ezek 30:9 as original, one could also suggest that these two rare words were inspired by Ezekiel, since Kittim (כתיים / כתיים) is found in 27:6.

²³³ For possible additional evidence that Num 24:24 did not contain any reference to ships, thereby further reducing the odds that Dan 11:30 is based on this verse, see below note 235.

²³⁴ See above, note 206.

that its Kittim are not it; instead, it expects the Seleucids under the leadership of the king of the north to fulfill that role. The evidence suggests, therefore, that like *Jubilees* Daniel was not preoccupied with Balaam's oracles. If so, then outside of Qumran, the earliest evidence we have of a preoccupation with the eschatological prophecies in Num 24 at the end of the second century BCE, either in the symbolism of the star on Alexander Jannaeus' coins, or in 1 Maccabees.²³⁵ Only among the Qumran sectarians did it take on additional significance earlier, already in the second century BCE,²³⁶ most likely because of their eschatological and messianic hopes.²³⁷ In fact, the evidence suggests that the Qumran sect was the first to apply Num 24 to their present situation as a harbinger of the eschatological age they anticipated. Only later was this imitated in other Jewish circles.²³⁸

²³⁵ It is interesting to note that if 1 Maccabees is indeed attempting to identify the Kittim of Num 24:24, that nowhere does it mention their ships. This is consistent with the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint, and may suggest that these texts preserve a less corrupt attestation of the verse than the Masoretic Text. This further supports the view that Dan 11 was not inspired by Num 24 in its use of the "ships of the Kittim" but by Isa 23:12–13.

²³⁶ But nonetheless after the composition of *Jubilees* and Daniel, as they slightly predate the middle of the second century BCE (see above, note 204), while M slightly postdates it (see above, note 191). It would not be surprising for Daniel, since it is contemporaneous with *Jubilees*, to be using the word "Kittim" in the same way, namely according to its geo-political definition.

²³⁷ Sociologically, this can be easily understood. If the majority of the people during the Maccabean period felt that the Hasmoneans were successfully bringing on a new era in Jewish history, and that the enemy was gradually being conquered, it makes sense that they were not concerned with "doom's day" scenarios. In contrast, for the sectarians who felt that the Hasmonean dynasty was the source of much evil in the land, it would only be normal for them to harbor more drastic aspirations of end time scenarios that could overthrow a situation they were powerless to change.

²³⁸ As we have seen, most of our texts quoting Balaam's oracles postdate Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem in 63 BCE. It would seem therefore that this event played an important role in focusing attention on them. It appears to me that Dan 11 played an integral role in this matter. If prior to the Roman conquest it was believed that the Greeks, beginning with Alexander the Great and continuing on with the Seleucids, were the Kittim of the eschaton from which God was going to miraculously deliver Israel, then to see them defeated but replaced by yet another foreign empire certainly did not fulfill those expectations. (Incidentally, it may be those hopes in particular that motivated Alexander Jannaeus to include the star motif

5.6.3. *The Kittim of Assyria*

The above survey of the use of Kittim in the Second Temple Period suggests that M is the oldest composition which used the term to designate Israel's eschatological enemy of Num 24:24.²³⁹ In fact, the conclusion reached above may help better understand how M identified the Kittim as being the Seleucids in spite of the problems mentioned earlier. First of all, it can be assumed that the Qumranites, like Josephus, realized that the term Kittim need not always have the

on his coins, as a propagandistic agenda demonstrating that he and his dynasty were in fact fulfilling such eschatological expectations. See Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 191. With Pompey's conquest, however, all such hopes were dashed.) However, the new foreign power was none other than the Kittim of the prophetic book Daniel, a composition which by then had already become authoritative. This turn of events only further confirmed its prophetic status. It was now very clear to everyone that they were living in the reality of Num 24:24 as interpreted through the lens of Dan 11. Notice how M, being entirely based on Dan 11 and composed prior to the Pompey's conquest, has nonetheless been thought by some scholars to be the product of the Roman period. This is only an illustration of how easy it must have been for those living in the Roman period to see both Num 24:24 and Dan 11 as applying to their own time. Assuming such to be the case, it may even have been during this time that Num 24:24 became corrupt, in an attempt to harmonize it with Daniel's prophecy, and the original reading reflected by the Septuagint "and they shall go out" (וַיֵּצְאוּ) became "and ships" (וַיֵּצִיאוּ). Phonetically, one can see how such a change could be made easily. This has the additional advantage of accounting for the misspelling of the word: it is neither in its singular form (צִי - cf. Isa 33:21) nor its expected plural form (צִיִּים - cf. Isa 23:13. Note that its unusual spelling has even caused scholars to wonder whether it is in the singular or in the plural; see Levine, *Numbers 21–26*, 206). In fact, so certain were people of this association between Dan 11:30 and Num 24:24 that from then on the Kittim became synonymous with the Romans. All translations from the Roman period on replace the word Kittim with Rome (Targum and Vulgate of Num 24:24, Old Greek and Vulgate of Dan 11:30; even the Targum to Ezek 27:6, although it is not directly related to Num 24:24). In contrast, note how the Septuagint of Num 24:24 retains the word "Kittim" (Κιτταίων), and how it may have specifically emended the beginning of the verse to adapt it to Alexander the Great (see above, note 198 and page 147). Finally, if as Goldstein claims, 1 Maccabees did not hesitate to show how the prophecies of Daniel had proven false (*I Maccabees*, 42–54), this could help explain why it was not included in the Hebrew canon of Scripture. The prophetic claims of the Hasmoneans proved to be in vain, while Daniel's perspective was shown to be correct.

²³⁹ As we shall eventually see (beginning on page 383), the citation of Num 24 in col. 11 may in fact date to the first century BCE and not to the second century BCE. However, two documents citing Num 24, D and *Messianic Apocalypse* (4Q521), are believed to be composed before the end of the second century BCE.

same connotation: at times it could be used in its geo-political sense only, while at other times it could specifically designate Israel's eschatological enemy, and the two need not be identical.²⁴⁰ Consequently, if it was known that Daniel was using Kittim in its geo-political sense only, as I have suggested above, then this would have had no implication for M's author as he sought to determine the identity of the Kittim of the eschaton of Num 24:24.

We have seen that if in 1 Maccabees the term "Kittim" was inspired by Num 24:24, it was believed that Alexander the Great was the one who, together with his army, fulfilled Balaam's oracle. There is little doubt that M's view is an extension of this perspective. The main difference is in which Greeks are to be called the Kittim. In 1 Maccabees, it is restricted to those of the Aegean world,²⁴¹ exactly as one would expect in light the term's accepted geo-political definition. It could also be that the author of 1 Maccabees uses the term "Kittim" interchangeably with "Greeks," as a way to differentiate between the Greeks of Greece from those of Asia.²⁴² The shocking innovation of M is in its suggestion that it is not the Greeks of the Aegean, but those of Asia, who are the Kittim. While this technically contravened the word's geo-political definition, one can nevertheless easily understand how such an interpretation came about. Since the Seleucid kingdom was considered to be Greek,²⁴³ by extension it too qualified as a candidate for the origins of the Kit-

²⁴⁰ While Josephus seems to have been aware of Balaam's oracles (*War* 6:312–313), it would be ludicrous to suggest that his definition of the Kittim in *Ant.* 1:128 implies that he believed that all those nations were thought to be the Kittim of the eschaton.

²⁴¹ Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 192; Uriel Rappaport, ספר מקבים א (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004), 94, 222.

²⁴² Rappaport, ספר מקבים א, 94.

²⁴³ See 1 Macc 1:10; 6:2; 8:18; 4QpNah frags 3–4 i:2–3; CD 8:11; 19:14; 4QH Historical Composition B (4Q248); 4QapJer C^a (4Q385a frg. 16a–b:4); *Ant.* 12:119. See also Charles C. Torrey, "'Yāwān' and 'Hellas' as Designations of the Seleucid Empire," *JAOS* 25 (1904): 302–11. *Pesher Nahum* is a particularly interesting because it references both the king of Greece and the Kittim, however these are now identified as the Romans as in Daniel. It would seem, therefore, that once the Qumranites realized that the Seleucid kingdom was not the Kittim of the eschaton, they switched calling the Seleucid ruler from "king of the Kittim" to "king of Greece" (I wish to thank Hanan Eshel for pointing this out to me).

tim, even in spite of its non western-Mediterranean characteristic. Like 1 Maccabees, M's author also used "Kittim" instead of "Greeks," albeit in the opposite way. Thus, the Kittim were the Greeks who had already conquered the Neo-Persian empire (Assyria of Ezra 6:22 and Num 24:24), before turning their attention to the Hebrews in the Land of Israel (Eber of Num 24:24) in a series of events described in Dan 11.

5.7. Summary and synthesis

By realizing that outside of Qumran it is only in 1 Maccabees that the Kittim are mentioned with any eschatological dimension as per Num 24:24, it is then possible to resolve the problems that result from collocating the Kittim with Assyria as mentioned above.²⁴⁴ First, since the Kittim in Daniel are not eschatological but geo-political only in meaning, the term had no implications in determining the identity of the eschatological Kittim for M. Second, while the Kittim in M are associated with Assyria, it is because they conquered Assyria and are now residing there, not because they are the historical Assyria. However, having conquered Assyria and become Judea's enemy, the sectarians felt justified in applying the biblical prophecies against Assyria onto them. Finally, since the Kittim are Greeks, by extension they satisfactorily met the geo-political definition of coming from the western Mediterranean world, even though at the time they were currently residing in Syria.²⁴⁵

Furthermore, it also allows one to understand all the texts mentioning the Kittim in harmony with one another. As we have seen, the alternative of assuming that every reference to the Kittim is eschatological implies that the texts contradict each other, requiring one to posit alternate readings of Num 24:24 in order to harmonize them. If Dan 11:30 is based on Num 24:24, it does not offer a valid interpretation of the verse, since it posits that the Seleucids, and not the Kittim, are Israel's eschatological enemy. While Ginsberg's sug-

²⁴⁴ See page 132.

²⁴⁵ In light of these considerations, it is now possible to see how the perspective of Eshel and Stegemann on the Kittim was correct all along.

gestion may harmonize the two texts, it requires unattested emendations to the text. Cecil Roth, noting that in M the Assyrians were the Kittim's partners rather than their victims as in Numbers, concluded that the Qumranites must have read Num 24:24 in the following manner: "And ships from the Kittim and Assyria will afflict Eber" (וצימ מיד כתימ ואשור יענו עבר).²⁴⁶ Like Ginsberg's suggestion, it too requires unaccounted for changes to the text. Furthermore, while it may be a satisfactory way to harmonize Num 24:24 with M, the emendation does not fit 1 Maccabees. However, if one assumes that only M and 1 Maccabees are influenced by an eschatological reading of Num 24:24, and that the Seleucids are identified as Greeks in Hebrew literature, then all the texts mentioning the Kittim can be harmonized. The Kittim in Dan 11:30 are nothing more than a seafaring warrior nation, and need not fulfill the role attributed to them in Num 24:24. The same can be said about *Jubilees*. In M and 1 Maccabees, we learn that the Greeks of Alexander the Great's kingdom are the eschatological Kittim. As per Num 24:24, the Kittim from the Aegean (Macedonians) first subjugate Assyria. Then the Kittim of Assyria (the Seleucids) subjugate Eber.

In summary, while the term Kittim originally designated those coming from a particular city on the Cypriot coast, its meaning expanded so as to include most of the Mediterranean world west of Israel, possibly already by the end of the First Temple Period, and certainly so during the Second Temple Period. All the while, its use remained free of any eschatological connotation. Consequently, there was the liberty to apply the term to various people groups as long as these emanated from the western Mediterranean world, as testified in *Jubilees*, Daniel, and Josephus. Eventually as Balaam's final oracles came to take on contemporary relevance, primarily due to Alexander the Great's conquest of the world, the term began being used with an eschatological bent, principally about Alexander the Great, but also about the Greeks that succeeded him, as testified in M and 1 Maccabees. Finally, when the Romans conquered both the Seleucid empire and Judea, the Greek identification of the Kittim was abandoned, and the term was henceforth associated with the

²⁴⁶ Roth, *Historical Background*, 78, n. 1.

Romans. However, having used the generic name “Kittim” rather than a nation’s specific name, the Qumranites’ eschatological compositions were able to keep their historical relevancy in spite of the changing political world around them. By a stroke of historical good fortune (for the sectarians), Rome’s annexation of the Seleucid kingdom prior to that of Egypt allowed them to continue entertaining scenarios in which the final war could still be played out in a way consistent with M. The debate among scholars today as to the identity of the Kittim only illustrates how easy it was for these texts to retain their applicability in spite of the political changes in the first centuries BCE and CE.

For the author of M, therefore, the Sons of Darkness were a coalition of enemies collated primarily from Dan 11 and complemented with Isa 11:14. At the head of this coalition was Daniel’s ultimate eschatological foe, the “king of the north,” renamed the “king of the Kittim.” For Daniel, this had been Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but the author of M knew that Antiochus IV’s death had not come about as prophesied by Dan 11, nor had it brought about the anticipated redemption. A major motivating factor behind this eclectic list of enemies, as with the entire introduction to M, was the desire to reinterpret the unrealized portion of Daniel’s vision in ch. 11, in order to show how these verses could still find fulfillment. The fact that M’s “king of the Kittim” is standing in for Daniel’s “king of the north” and that the Qumranites never called the Roman leaders “kings” supports the Seleucid identification of M’s “Kittim of Assyria,” and confirms that at least col. 1 of M was composed prior to Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁷ The events immediately after Judas Maccabaeus’ death seem particularly suitable. The Jews in Judea had just witnessed unprecedented military victory over its Seleucid overlords, and while they had suffered a set back with Judas’ death, hope was not lost. The period of the *intersacerdotium*, or, if one accepts the view that the Teacher of Righteousness was High Priest during that period (for a review of the arguments put forward by those who uphold such a position as for those who disagree with it, see James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004], 244–50), the period immediately thereafter seems particularly fitting for the situation portrayed by M. In the mind of the sectarians, the temple would still be led by illegitimate priests and would not have returned to rightful practice. Especially if composed during the *intersacerdotium*, it is easy to see how the sectarians could have still imagined strong support for such a war against the

6. THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE WAR

6.1. *The “wilderness of the peoples”*

Having identified both the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, M continues by pointing out that the war will take place after the Sons of Light leave the “wilderness of the peoples” (מדבר העמים) and encamp in the “wilderness of Jerusalem” (מדבר ירושלים - 1QM 1:3). The only other occurrence of the “wilderness of the peoples” is in *Peshar Isaiah*^a (4Q161 frgs. 5–6:2) in the midst of a peshar on Isa 10:24–27.²⁴⁸ What is extant of *Peshar Isaiah*^a as a whole preserves a commentary of Isa 10:22–11:4, a passage which deals with the Assyrian threat on Jerusalem, the way it was miraculously delivered by God, and which concludes with a description of the “shoot of

“violators of the covenant.” It is during this period that we read in 1 Macc 9:23 about the “transgressors of the law” (οἱ ἄνομοι) and the “doers of unrighteousness” (οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν). These are normally considered to be the supporters of the High Priest Alcimus (Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 376), yet it is impossible to know whether they could be referring to the same groups of people as the “violators of the covenant.” Nevertheless, it reflects the religious and political divisions present in Judea at the time, and it may be that the sectarians expected to gain more support for their cause from one or more of these factions. This would be all the more so if one accepts the view that 4QMMT was written to Jonathan before he became High Priest (Hanan Eshel, “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period,” in *Reading 4QMMT*, ed. John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996], 62–63; המדינה החשמונאית, 41–52), at a point when they still hoped for broad endorsement of their ideologies among the general population, that segment which in their estimation had not yet disqualified itself from being part of the “people of God” (עם אלה). This would help explain how they envisioned a major international confrontation in spite of the small numbers of the sect itself. See also note 288.

²⁴⁸ It has also been suggested to reconstruct the expression in *Peshar Isaiah*^e (4Q165 frg. 5:6), a peshar on Isa 21:11–15 describing peoples fleeing a battle (Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4. I*, 29). Unfortunately, only a few words of the peshar remain, making it impossible to reconstruct how the passage was interpreted (see Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 8 [Washington: CBQMS, 1979], 131). Thus, even should the reconstruction be correct, it is of no help in further understanding what the “wilderness of the peoples” may represent. References for 4Q161 follow those used in Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *Exegetical Texts*, The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 52–55. For initial publications on 4Q161 see Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4. I*, 11–15; Strugnell, “Notes,” 183–86; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 70–86. Other publications will be cited as needed.

David” (צמח דויד) and his role in the end of days. In this pesher, these eighth century events were actualized to the period of the Qumran community, and Joseph Amusin has suggested that it was written in the wake of Ptolemy Lathyrus’ failed campaign against Jerusalem in 103–102 BCE.²⁴⁹ As an aside, albeit significant, Bezalel Bar-Kokhba’s study of this specific battle has led him to the conclusion that the composition of M antedates it.²⁵⁰ This is yet another piece of data favoring a second century BCE composition date, and allows the possibility that *Pesher Isaiah^a* borrowed the expression “wilderness of the peoples” from it. The pesher is obviously messianic,²⁵¹ and its connection to the eschatological War against the Kittim is made explicit in frgs. 8–10 (esp. line 7). This is particularly significant in light of the fact that Isa 10:34–11:1 is also an important proof text for *Sefer haMilhamah*, another composition which deals with the eschatological War against the Kittim.²⁵² In fact, it is likely that both share the same interpretation of these verses.²⁵³ Consequently, if 4Q161 frgs. 5–6:5–13 describes a historical event, that of Ptolemy Lathyrus’ attempt to march on Jerusalem, it cannot be that all the pesharim of the Isaiah passage in *Pesher Isaiah^a* describe the same event. Both *Sefer haMilhamah* and *Pesher Isaiah^a* ascribe an important role to the messiah (the “prince of the congregation” [נשיא העדה] - 4Q161 frgs. 5–6:2; 4Q285 frg. 7:4; see also frg. 4:2,6) in the final victory over the Kittim, and there is no way the Qumranites would have assigned it to Alexander Jannaeus, nor would they have seen his miraculous deliverance from Ptolemy Lathyrus as the beginning of the eschatological war. That there are copies of both texts dating

²⁴⁹ Amoussine, “4Q161,” 381–92; Amusin, “Reflection of Historical Events,” 123–52. Extra evidence in support of this view can be found in Hanan Eshel and Esther Eshel, “4Q448,” 645–59, esp. 654.

²⁵⁰ Bezalel Bar-Kochva, “ושאלת, ובקעת הירדן, ינאי בבקעת הירדן, וזמנה של מגילת מלחמת בני אור אור,” *Cathedra* 93 (1999): 7–56.

²⁵¹ Judah M. Rosenthal, “Biblical Exegesis of 4QpIs,” *JQR* 60 (1969): 27–36; Richard Bauckham, “The Messianic Interpretation of Isa. 10:34 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2 Baruch and the Preaching of John the Baptist,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 202–16.

²⁵² See Bauckham, “Messianic Interpretation,” 202–16, esp. 202–6. It has even been suggested that *Pesher Isaiah^a* used 4Q285 as a source (Hanan Eshel, “Kittim,” 38).

²⁵³ Bauckham, “Messianic Interpretation,” 204.

to the first century CE, over one hundred years after the event in question, confirms that fact, especially in light of M's chronology which anticipates the eschatological war to last only 40 years.²⁵⁴

²⁵⁴ One must note, however, that the interpretation of Isa 10:28–32 explicitly mentions that it is related to the “end of days to come” (לאחרית הימים לבוא) - 4Q161 frgs. 5–6:10), and that someone is to “go up from the Valley of Acco to war against...” (... בעלותו מבקעת עכו ללהם ב... - line 11). This is particularly reminiscent of the introduction of M and its dependence upon Dan 11:40–12:3. In Dan 11:45 we read that the evil king will be camping between Jerusalem and the sea when he meets his end. In 1QM 1:3, we read that after the battle, the Sons of Light “will go up from there,” probably referring to their going to Jerusalem (see below, page 168). The scenario is strikingly similar to what is presented in *Pesher Isaiah*^a, especially if one considers that the plain of Acco could potentially be considered as being between Jerusalem and the sea. The end of line 11 can be read בִּי, and could potentially be reconstructed “against Israel,” “against Judah,” or even “against Jerusalem” (see the discussion in Amusin, “Reflection of Historical Events,” 125). The last option makes the most sense in light of line 13 (see Yigael Yadin, “הדשות מעולמן של”, in *המגילות*, ed. Jacob Liver [Jerusalem: Kiriat Sepher, 1957], 52). There may be yet another such parallel: *Pesher Isaiah*^a's “boundary of Jerusalem” (גבול ירושלים - frgs 4–6:13) and M's “wilderness of Jerusalem” (מדבר ירושלים - 1:3). Could it be, therefore, that the entire composition intended some still future event just as in M? Note Carmignac who cautioned against assuming that the text has any historical event in mind (“Interprétations de Prophètes et de Psaumes,” in *Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*, vol. 2, Jean Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée, *Autour de la Bible* [Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963], 71, n. 12). Alternatively, it may be that the events in 4Q161 col. 3 were interpreted not as contemporaneous with but subsequent to the events of col. 2, so that col. 3 would actually come after the transition from prophecy *ex eventus* to genuine prediction, and refer to the still anticipated future. Such a view is not new but based on the understanding that the referent of the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix in line 11 is the leader of the Kittim (see Yadin, “הדשות,” 50–52; Adam S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, SSN 3 [Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957], 180; Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 274.). Yadin believed it meant the king of Assyria; Dupont-Sommer suggested it should be the “king of the Kittim” as in M. Van der Woude hesitated to do the same, realizing that “king” was not an appropriate title for the Romans whom he assumed to be the Kittim, although there is no such problem if the Seleucids are intended. Amusin's two main arguments for relating this pesher to Ptolemy Lathyrus' campaign are the specific mention to the “plain of Acco” and the fact that he came to Jerusalem from the north east just as Sennacherib had done. However, the geography of the final war in M Material is based on Daniel rather than on Sennacherib's route, even though these texts also use Sennacherib's campaign as a major motif. Consequently, it does not seem certain to me that one should attribute too much geographical significance to Sennacherib's approach from the north east in Isa 10:28–11:32 (as quoted in *Pesher Isaiah*^a), especially if one accepts that the “plain of Acco” could be considered to be between Jerusalem and the sea. Not seeing any

The pesher to Isa 10:24–27 which contains the expression “wilderness of the peoples” is quite fragmentary, offering little help in better understanding to what it might refer. However, just as in M, it is used in the context of God’s miraculous deliverance, using Sennacherib’s campaign as the driving imagery. In both texts, the allusion is to “when they return from the wilderness of the peoples,” obviously carrying chronological implications, possibly intended to mark some kind of reference point leading up to the eschatological war. In M, the battle is to take place “when the exiles of the wilderness, the Sons of Light, return from the wilderness of the peoples to encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem” (בשוב גולת בני אור ממדבר העמים) (1QM 1:3). Similarly, in *Pesher Isaiah*^a, God’s deliverance will take place “when they return from the desert of the peo[oples...]” (בשובם ממדבר העמים...) (4Q161 frgs. 5–6:2). Unfortunately, it is unlikely that the pesharim in *Pesher Isaiah*^a are describing events in an ordered chronological fashion, since the “prince of the congregation” (frgs. 5–6:2), a messianic figure, is mentioned before the pesher understood to be relating to Ptolemy Lathyrus (frgs. 5–6:10–13). Consequently, little more can be gathered from *Pesher Isaiah*^a than what could already be determined in M, both geographically and chronologically.

As mentioned above, the expression is probably inspired from Ezek 20:35 where it refers to Babylon, and is understood as being the place of God’s judgment. It has already been vigorously debated whether or not “Babylon” in the Qumran Scrolls is to be taken literally or symbolically, and if the latter, whether as a cipher for an actual geographical location or simply as a figure of speech.²⁵⁵ In light of this debate, it is worthy of note that in D, “kings of the

historical background for *Pesher Isaiah*^a has the added advantages of allowing ‘geographical harmony’ between all the texts dealing with the eschatological War against the Kittim. But if so, one then needs to find the reason for the specific mention of the “plain of Acco” in the context of this future war. Since Acco-Ptolemais was a major port for both the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, as well as for the Romans later on, and since the Hasmoneans were never able to conquer it, could it not be that it was simply assumed to be the main entry point for the Kittim, especially if ships are to be involved? (See van der Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 181).

²⁵⁵ For a recent review of the literature on the matter, see Hempel, *Damascus Texts*, 56–60.

peoples” (מלכי העמים) are mentioned alongside the “kings of Greece” (8:10–11 // 19:23–24). At least one commentator has suggested that the two should be equated.²⁵⁶ Should this be correct, and should the “kings of Greece” mean the Seleucid monarchs, M would then seem to be referring to a return from Syria, and the allusion to Ezek 20:35 should be considered geographical, and not just ideological. However, in light of the uncertainty surrounding that particular passage in D, this interpretation must remain tentative. Unfortunately, neither *Pesher Isaiah*^a nor M offer any help in further clarifying the matter, although more can be ascertained when it is connected to the second expression, the “wilderness of Jerusalem.”

6.2. The “wilderness of Jerusalem”: a place of ongoing exile

One may be tempted to associate the “wilderness of Jerusalem” (מדבר ירושלים) to the Judean Desert and the Qumran settlement in particular. The settlement, however, is thought to have begun only at the very end of the second century BCE.²⁵⁷ This is incompatible with a composition date for M in the second half of the second century BCE, which we have seen to be most likely.²⁵⁸ Since the expression is otherwise unattested, its geographical identification remains a mystery. It may be connected to Isa 52:9,²⁵⁹ or may reflect the same kind of mentality that motivated the author of 1 Maccabees in 2:29 and 3:45,²⁶⁰ but it is impossible to tell. Nevertheless, it offers us a glimpse into one aspect of the sect’s perspective. The war is to begin when the Sons of Light return from the “wilderness of the peoples”

²⁵⁶ Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII, 3–19),” *RB* 80 (1972): 208.

²⁵⁷ Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 63–66. It should be pointed out, however, that to date no pottery coming from the foundations of the Qumran settlement have been published (Hanan Eshel, personal communication). It may be, therefore, that they are older than can be presently determined.

²⁵⁸ Alternatively, one could postulate that this expression was added to an earlier composition when the sectarians moved to Qumran, but this would remain speculative at best.

²⁵⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 257.

²⁶⁰ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 6.

to the “wilderness of Jerusalem.” Unquestionably, some kind of return is intended.²⁶¹ Yet there is also an emphasis on their being in the wilderness, one which seems to be directly related to a second reality, that of their being in exile: they are the “exiles of the wilderness” (גולת המדבר - 1QM 1:2), even if the “wilderness” in question changes.²⁶² It would seem, therefore, that while the Sons of Light may have changed their geographical location just prior to the war, they have not changed their status of being exiled.²⁶³

In addition, if those fighting this eschatological war are the “exiles of the wilderness” who have returned to the “wilderness of Jerusalem,” it is clear that the condition of being in exile is not one of being outside of the Land of Israel. Even if “Jerusalem” is to be understood symbolically, just as it has been suggested to read “Babylon” and “Damascus” in other sectarian documents, it makes little sense to use such an expression if the people are not already back in the land. A symbolic reading of “Babylon” and “Damascus” works only if the sectarians are located in the land, otherwise there would be no reason not to read these place names literally. Thus, “exile” in M is not a denial of the return to the land, but rather a description of some spiritual reality.²⁶⁴ This idea is found in other Second Temple Period literature, like Dan 9 and 1 En 93, “which sees the condition of exile as lasting beyond the return at the end of the sixth century and being brought to an end only in the events of a much later period.”²⁶⁵ Michael Knibb has suggested that in D, the rise of the sect marked the end of this spiritual exile.²⁶⁶ This is clearly not the case in M, as just before the beginning of the

²⁶¹ van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 58.

²⁶² See George J. Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 15 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 117–32, who argues that the withdrawal to the wilderness should be understood “both literally and metaphorically” (p. 132).

²⁶³ Devorah Dimant, “הפסוק אל ישעיהו מ 3 בספר,” *Meghillot 2* (2004): 21–36; Hindy Najman, “Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 99–113.

²⁶⁴ For Dimant, the “wilderness” is not even a physical location per say, but only a spiritual reality (“לא גלות שבמדבר,” 21–36).

²⁶⁵ Michael A. Knibb, “Exile in the Damascus Document,” *JSOT* 25 (1983): 110.

²⁶⁶ Knibb, “Exile in CD,” 113.

eschatological war, the group still refers to itself as the “exiles in the wilderness.” If Knibb’s view is correct, we may have here evidence of a development in the sect’s thinking between the composition of D and that of M. Alternatively, it may rather be that the rise of the sect was considered to be a sign that the exile was about to end, not that it had already ended. Whatever the case, in both compositions Israel’s full restoration was an event anticipated in the future.²⁶⁷ The *War Scroll* makes it clear that it will happen only with the onset of the eschatological war.

6.3. *The eschatological war and the end of Israel’s exile*

6.3.1. *The evidence from the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*

It appears that this view was not unique to Qumran. One composition, also found at Qumran, that reflects the same perspective on Israel’s exile, is the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*. We have already seen that for the Qumran corpus, the *Apocryphon* contains an unusual reference to the “sons of Judah and Benjamin,” an expression akin to the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin found in 1QM 1:2.²⁶⁸ Incidentally, it shares yet another unique characteristic with M, that of having the only other mention of the “violators of the covenant” (מרשיעי ברית) from Dan 11:32.²⁶⁹

Canan Werman’s study of the *Apocryphon* has the advantage of not taking 4Q390 into consideration, as opposed to the editor Devorah Dimant who did, since 4Q390 is most likely a different composition altogether.²⁷⁰ As a result, Werman was able to outline better the chronology of events in the *Apocryphon*, and the implications its author wished to make. This in turn allowed Werman to highlight how the text claims that the exile extended beyond the return of the

²⁶⁷ See John J. Collins, “Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, JSPSup 8 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 25–51, and more recently Najman, “Concept of Wilderness,” 104.

²⁶⁸ See above, page 114.

²⁶⁹ See above, note 112.

²⁷⁰ See above, note 66.

Jews to their homeland in the Persian period: instead of being in exile physically, it continued on a spiritual level, with God hiding his face from his people.²⁷¹ Unfortunately, the end of the composition is poorly preserved, so that it is impossible to determine exactly when and how the author expected the exile to end. Nevertheless, several clues are given. According to Werman, it was to be after the Maccabean revolt. Though the Hasmonean rulers are not mentioned by name in the composition, she assumes they are the ones meant by the phrase “the three priests who will not walk in the ways of [the] first [priests]” (כהנים שלושה אשר לא יתהלכו בדרכי [ה]ראשונים) but who “will be called by the name of the God of Israel” (על שם אלהי ישראל) (4Q387 frg. 3:4–5). Though from this one could assume that the author is giving unequivocal approval to the Hasmonean period, this is not case: immediately thereafter, the author describes it as a period of infighting among the Jews, and of a thirst for God’s law yet not being able to find it, just as prophesied in Amos 8:11 (4Q387 frg. 3:7–9). For Werman, this is a veiled reference to the Hasmoneans’ failure to follow proper *halakhah*, itself a direct result of God’s face being hidden.²⁷²

More importantly, the end of this spiritual exile is to be accompanied by some event relating to the “kings of the north” (מְלָכֵי הַצָּפוֹן - 4Q387 frg. 4 i:2). Both Dimant and Werman assume that these “kings of the north” are Seleucid monarchs.²⁷³ Werman interpreted it as implying that it would mean the end of the Greek-Seleucid empire (4Q385a frg. 16a–b:4)²⁷⁴ as God would fight these “kings of the north.”²⁷⁵ While this reading is certainly possible, neither is it required by the text. The lone biblical passage from which it might have been inspired (Jer 25:26) is too vague to be of any

²⁷¹ Werman, “Epochs and End-Time,” 233–38.

²⁷² Werman, “Epochs and End-Time,” 238.

²⁷³ Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 196; Werman, “Epochs and End-Time,” 239.

²⁷⁴ Dimant tentatively suggested that “Greece” (יוון) in this passage might refer to the Seleucid kingdom (Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 154), and was followed by Werman (“Epochs and End-Time,” 239).

²⁷⁵ Werman, “Epochs and End-Time,” 239.

help.²⁷⁶ In M, which contains the only other reference to the “kings of the north” (1QM 1:4) in the Qumran corpus,²⁷⁷ they are not necessarily from the Seleucid kingdom. In fact, they are to be attacked by a Seleucid monarch. The question, therefore, is whether both texts are using “kings of the north” in the same way. But even if not, it is important enough that both texts mention the “kings of the north” in the same context, that of Israel’s spiritual exile at the end of the Second Temple Period.

What is more, Dimant and Werman suggest the setting of 4Q387 frg. 4 is one of war, just as in M. Dimant postulates that it may be referring to the battles of the Maccabean revolt,²⁷⁸ but this seems unlikely in light of the imagery which is borrowed from Ezekiel’s description of the war against Gog, imagery that can hardly be appropriate to describe the Hasmonean battles. Consequently, Werman’s view is to be preferred, namely, that the battle in question is to come some time after the Hasmonean revolt,²⁷⁹ and that it is to bring about the end of Israel’s spiritual exile,²⁸⁰ just as in M.

These parallels between the two compositions are intriguing, all the more since one is sectarian and the other not.²⁸¹ Most importantly, both are in agreement that Israel’s spiritual exile will come to an end by means of a cataclysmic military encounter. It is also surprising that with their different foci, they are nevertheless the only two Qumran texts to mention both the “violators of the covenant” from Dan 11:32 and “the kings of the north” in this particular context. While these parallels do not warrant postulating a direct rela-

²⁷⁶ See, for example, Jack Lundbom, who seeks to identify which nations may have been intended, though even he admits that additional ones could have been implied as well (*Jeremiah 21–36*, AB 21B [New York: Doubleday, 2004], 265).

²⁷⁷ The “kings of the north” are mentioned only once in the Bible, in Jer 25:26, as part of all the nations in the world.

²⁷⁸ Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 100, 196.

²⁷⁹ Since there may be a reference in the *Apocryphon* to the first three Hasmonean rulers (see below), it would imply that this deliverance was thought to come sometime after Simon Maccabeus’ ascent to power. Because the text is too fragmentary, Werman maintains that it is impossible to know whether the anticipated redemption was to come during the Hasmonean period, or after (“Epochs and End-Time,” 239–40).

²⁸⁰ Werman, “Epochs and End-Time,” 239–41.

²⁸¹ Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 112.

tionship between the two compositions, it suggests that both texts drew upon ideas common in certain Jewish circles some time after the Maccabean revolt. If Werman's interpretation that the "three priests" in 4Q387 frg. 3:4 are Hasmonean,²⁸² then the *Apocryphon* could not have been composed before the rise of John Hyrcanus, in the last third of the second century BCE. This fits perfectly with Dimant's suggestion of the last quarter of the second century BCE.²⁸³ Interestingly, this is in harmony with a late second century BCE composition date for M, and provides some support for it, albeit limited.

6.3.2. *Jerusalem and the end of the exile*

This most unique expression, the "wilderness of Jerusalem," also alerts us to a second important detail: the battle is not launched from Jerusalem itself. This is all the more important when considering the next event described. At the end of the war, the Sons of Light are to "go up from there" (יעלו משם) - 1:3). This short sentence has confused the commentators.²⁸⁴ The suggestion of both Licht and Flusser makes the most sense, especially in light of col. 2: they are to go up to Jerusalem, the city which until then was in the hands of the "violators of the covenant."²⁸⁵ This is apparently why, up until the war, the Sons of Light are exiles in the "wilderness of Jerusalem."²⁸⁶ Somehow, because of the defeat of the Kittim, the Sons of Light will take over the city, and presumably its temple and the government. How this happens, however, we are not told.²⁸⁷

²⁸² Werman, "Epochs and End-Time," 240.

²⁸³ Dimant, *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, 116.

²⁸⁴ For a summary of the different interpretations, see Davies, *IQM*, 116–18.

²⁸⁵ Licht, "מטעת עולם," 69; Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 146–47. See also 4Qpap pIsa^c (4Q163) frg. 23 ii:10–11 which states that Jerusalem is in the hands of the "congregation of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things" (עדת דורשי ההלקות), 4QpIsa^b (4Q162) ii:6–7, 10 where we are told that the "men of scoffing" (אנשי הלצון) are in Jerusalem, as well as 1QpHab 9:4–5 and 12:7–9 which refer to the evil practices of the priests there.

²⁸⁶ In light of this, it does not make sense to suggest that the description of temple worship in 1QM 2 is a reference to the restoration of temple sacrifices under Judah Maccabeus in 164 BCE as does Gmirkin ("Allusions," 199), or that 1QM 1:5–6 are an allusion to the same event as claimed by Ibba (*Rotolo della Guerra*, 46).

²⁸⁷ Reference to this entrance into Jerusalem can be found in 4QCantena A

7. SUMMARY

In summary then, 1QM 1 describes a war that will be fought when the king of the Kittim, meaning the Seleucid monarch, will decide to launch out from Egypt, which he will have just conquered, on a campaign to the north that will take him through the Land of Israel. In his fury, he will want to completely devastate it.²⁸⁸ Assisting him will be a number of Judea's neighbors who will have previously aligned themselves with him, as well as some Jews, the "violators of the covenant." Opposing them will be the rest of the Jews from the three tribes who have returned from exile, including but not limited to the sectarians. The fighting will be fierce, even hurried, with seven rounds, each party successively gaining the upper hand, until finally in the seventh round, God's miraculous intervention will give the victory to the Sons of Light. This will allow them to gain control of Jerusalem, marking the end of Israel's spiritual exile. Such a scenario for the eschatological war, inspired by the unfulfilled portion of Daniel's prophecy in ch. 11, was most likely composed early on in the Hasmonean period.

(4Q177) frgs. 12–13 i:10.

²⁸⁸ While neither Daniel nor M give a reason as to the king's desire to violently conquer Judea, it is particularly surprising since the "violators of the covenant" are in league with him, and that one would expect this to result in some kind of favorable treatment. The fact that it apparently does not might therefore be an indication that the majority of the population opposed such an alliance with the Syrian ruler. If so, this would be another indication that the war was not expected to be fought by the sectarians only, but by a majority of the Jews in the land.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE WAR IN COLUMN 2

1. COLUMN 2 OVERVIEW

If M's introduction was restricted to col. 1, the foregoing description of the war would have been complete. However, a seemingly different scenario is put forward in col. 2: there it is question of a war that lasts more than 33 years (2:6), with no longer just Levi, Judah, and Benjamin fighting, but men "from all the tribes of Israel" (מכול שבטי) (ישראל - 2:7). The list of enemies is also totally different, with no mention whatsoever of the Kittim or Belial, Assyria being listed only in passing among many other nations and not as the major foe. Obviously then, when seeking to understand M in its final stage as it has reached us,¹ what was described in col. 1 cannot be the end of the eschatological war. In fact, col. 1 already hinted at such. In the scroll's opening line, it is already emphasized that the description immediately thereafter is only a beginning, an initial stage: "the first of the [Sons of Light's] dominion is to begin..." (... ראשית משלוח יד... להחל). And indeed, after the victory described in 1:5–7, we are told that the "sons of right[eousness]," obviously the Sons of Light, "will shine unto all the extremities of the earth, increasingly so until the completion of all the appointed times of darkness" (וּבְנֵי צְדָקָה יֵאִירוּ) (1:8 - לכול קצוות תבל הלוך ואור עד תום כול מועדי הושך). The implication is clear: while the king of the Kittim and all his allies may have been defeated, it does not mean the automatic end of evil in the world.

¹ This is not to deny that M may be a composite work of several sources put together by some redactor, even with several redactional stages. Rather, I am referring to our attempt to understand the scroll as a 'finished product' the copyist assumed it to be. Nor am I denying the possibility that M may have undergone even further editing and/or redacting over time, the evidence of which is unfortunately no longer extant (except possibly in some of the Cave 4 fragments).

Darkness still exists. What it does mean, however, is that finally now the Sons of Light can shine. A new dawn has finally begun, even though more still needs to be done. This first and very important victory therefore marks the beginning of the eschatological war which, as we learn from col. 2, will last another forty years.

2. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WAR IN COLUMN 2

Although there is no explicit mention of forty years anywhere in col. 2, the numbers listed in lines 6b–10a clarify the chronology of what is to come and how the forty years are implied.² First, the war will not be fought throughout the entire time: “And during the years of remission they shall not equip (them) to go out, because it is a Sabbath of rest for Israel” (ובשני השמטים לוא יהלוצו לצאת לצבא כיא שבת מנוה) (היאה לישראל 2:8–9). Thus, assuming that the war is to last forty years, there would be five such years, leaving only thirty-five years during which the war can actually be fought. In fact, these are the “thirty-five years of service” (חמש ושלשים שני העבודה) mentioned in line 9, the term “service” (עבודה) being used in opposition to the “years of remission” (שני שמטה). On this, there is unanimous agreement among scholars.

These 35 years of service are divided further into two portions, the first lasting six years (line 9) and the second lasting the remaining 29 years (line 10). The *War Scroll* is very clear about the last 29 years: they are dedicated to the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות) - line 10). Lines 10b–14 continue with the exact breakdown of the enemies to be fought during those 29 years, listing the years and their corresponding enemies, all of which are from the sons of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, a list obviously drawn from the Table of Nations in Gen 10:22–23. The peculiarity of this war is that it is to be fought by select men chosen specifically for that purpose (cf. lines 7–8), which is why it is called the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות).

² As already clearly explained by Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 20–21).

2.1. *The problem of the six years (1QM 2:9)*

2.1.1. *Yadin's view*

Less clear are the first six years, and opinions are divided. Yadin read lines 9b–10a as follows: “In the thirty-five years of service the war shall be waged. For six years the whole congregation shall wage it together, and the war of *separate* divisions *shall be waged* in the remaining twenty nine.” (בחמש ושלושים שני העבודה תערך המלחמה: שש) (שנים יעורכוה כול העדה יחד ומלחמה המחלקות ב/תש[ע] ועשרים הנותרות).³ In light of this he concluded that the first six years were those of the war described in col. 1, and in contrast to the “war of the divisions,” it is to be fought by the entire congregation together.⁴

2.1.2. *The alternative view*

However, most other commentators since disagree with him and suggest that these lines should be rather translated as follows: “During the thirty-five years of service, the war shall be prepared during six years, the whole congregation preparing it together. The war of the divisions (shall take place) during the remaining twenty nine (years)” (ובחמש ושלושים שני העבודה תערך המלחמה שש שנים ועורכיה כול העדה יחד).⁵ According to this understanding, the author is not contrasting the war described in col. 1 to the “war of the divisions” discussed in col. 2, but rather how what is left of the eschatological war is expected to be carried out. The emphasis is that while the 29 years of actual fighting will be

³ Translation from Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 264 (italics in the original); but the transcription is from the Hebrew publication (Yadin, מגילת מלחמת בני אור בבני, הרושך, 268) since the English translation did not preserve the punctuation he assumed. The same translation can also be found in Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 153, and in a slightly nuanced form in Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Allen Lane, 1997), 165.

⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 20–21. In this he is followed by Davies (*IQM*, 26, 114) and Flusser (“Apocalyptic Elements,” 146–47, 153–54).

⁵ Translation from Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 99. For a survey of the matter and a list of all the scholars who took this latter position, see Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 35; Jongeling, *Rouleau de la Guerre*, 92–93. It is also upheld by Ibba in his commentary (*Rotolo della Guerra*, 86).

carried out by men specifically selected for the task, getting ready for the war will be carried out by the entire congregation.

2.1.3. *The issue: the meaning of עָרַךְ*

The issue lies in the meaning of the verb עָרַךְ. Alone, there is no question that it means “to get ready, to set out in order, to set ready.”⁶ When collocated to the word “war” (מלחמה), however, it can mean to “wage war” as well as to “draw up a battle formation.”⁷ In the Bible, the combination is found 16 times.⁸ In all but three instances, it refers to what an army does before engaging the battle proper. This is especially clear in 1 Sam 17 in which Saul’s army sets up for battle but never engages it.⁹ In three cases, Gen 14:8, Judg 20:20 and 2 Chr 13:3, the expression could mean the actual waging of war, but every time the verb is followed by the preposition “with” (עִם, אִתּוֹ).¹⁰ Finally, in a number of verses, the collocation of עָרַךְ and “war” (מלחמה) can also be used to describe men who are either equipped or trained for war.¹¹ With respect to this last meaning, one must also note Jer 46:3, where עָרַךְ clearly means preparing the weapons for war.

In M, the root עָרַךְ is found another four times, but never together with the word “war” as here in col. 2, although in one case (9:10) it is specifically about “setting up the position” (לערוך המעמד) before engaging the actual battle.¹² The expression is attested, however, in 4Q491 frgs. 1–3:8, but the context is unclear, and it could mean either to prepare for battle or waging war. In line 16 where it

⁶ Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, 884–85.

⁷ Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, 884.

⁸ Gen 14:8; Judg 20:20, 22; 1 Sam 17:2, 8; 2 Sam 10:8; Jer 6:23, 50:42; Joel 2:5; 1 Chr 12:34, 36, 37, 19:9, 17; 2 Chr 13:3; 14:9.

⁹ See also 2 Sam 10:8–9; Joel 2:5; 1 Chr 19:9, 17; 2 Chr 14:9, where the meaning is clearly the arraying of the army for war, not the fighting itself.

¹⁰ It is less clear what the expression might mean in Judg 20:22: it could be either arraying in battle formation or waging war.

¹¹ Jer 6:23; 50:42; 1 Chr 12:9, 34–37.

¹² In 2:5 it is used in the context of temple worship and the offering up of incense, a context obviously not related to the present issue. In 7:3, it is used of the one who prepares the provisions. In the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the verb עָרַךְ is used only in the context of cult practice.

has been suggested to reconstruct it (לְבַעֲרֵךְ הַמִּלְחָמָה)¹³ and the context one of being already on the battle field, it clearly refers to what a combat unit must do before it joins in the fighting.¹⁴ In all the War Texts, therefore, we do not have a single occasion where לערוך מלחמה decidedly means the actual waging of war. Thus, while Yadin's reading is certainly possible, neither is it certain.

2.1.4. *Problems with Yadin's view*

Furthermore, by looking at the broader context of 1QM 2, Yadin's suggestion that the six years (line 9) refer to the fighting of the war described in col. 1 creates further difficulties. Column 2 begins by describing the procedure for proper representation at the temple when sacrifices are to be offered, apparently during a year of remission (lines 1–6a). Immediately thereafter, it switches to talk about the war itself (lines 6b–E). The opening sentence of this second topic is “And in the thirty three years of war that *remain*...” (ובשלוש... המלחמה הנותרות - 1QM 2:6b, emphasis mine), giving the reader the impression that from here on the discussion is about what is left of the war, not about that which has already been discussed in col. 1. Why then would the author suddenly revert back in his account to describing that which came before? Additionally, the statement that these six years are the responsibility of the “whole congregation” (כול העדה - line 9) seems contradictory to col. 1's claim that only the “sons of Levi and the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin” are fighting, and that there are certain ones from Israel, the “violators of the covenant” (מרשיעי ברית), who will be fighting against the Sons of Light.

2.1.5. *Other non-satisfactory solutions*

Others sensed these problems as well and sought to find some satisfactory solution. Carmignac suggested that both columns are discussing the exact same war, except that col. 2 does so in more detail.

¹³ Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 144.

¹⁴ See also 4Q496 frg. 4:2, but there the expression comes without the slightest context to help determine what it might have meant.

According to him, even the enemies are the same, although listed differently. In both columns they are meant to represent the entire world: col. 1 does it based on Ps 83:7–9, col. 2 on Gen 10:22–23.¹⁵ This solution is unacceptable, if for no other reason than in 2:6, the first reference to the number of years of fighting in M is to “the remaining years of war” (שני המלחמה הנותרות). Obviously, previous fighting, a portion of the total forty, have already been mentioned, and one should not assume that it was only in the last few lines of col. 1 that have not survived. Davies suggested that since those first years of the war have not been specifically mentioned before 2:6, this is a sign that col. 1 is a late replacement for what once preceded col. 2.¹⁶ For him, the conflict between cols. 1 and 2 is simply the result of poor redactional work as the text evolved.¹⁷ While this is theoretically possible, it would imply less than careful editorial work by a redactor unconcerned that his final text lacked coherency. Jongeling, who rejected the multiple source theory while agreeing that both columns discussed the same war, was not able to find harmony between the two columns either. He simply ended up abdicating: “nous ne devons pas nous soucier de préciser les données avec exactitude.”¹⁸

2.1.6. *IQM 2:9: six years of preparation*

In light of the considerations above, it is preferable to understand those six years as preparatory years, rather than years of fighting.¹⁹ The forty year war is thus divided in the following way: with the miraculous victory in the War against the Kittim, the forty year period begins with six years of preparations for the second stage of the war, followed by a sabbatical year during which time temple

¹⁵ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 35.

¹⁶ Davies, *IQM*, 25–26.

¹⁷ Davies agreed with Yadin that the six years during which תעריך המלחמה (2:9) were years of fighting. Van der Ploeg, who also sided with Yadin on תעריך המלחמה, similarly believed that the disharmony between the two columns was the result of redaction, except that he saw col. 1 as being the earlier, not later, stratum (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 13–14).

¹⁸ Jongeling, *Rouleau de la Guerre*, 100.

¹⁹ For an important implication of this interpretation, see below page 325.

worship will be carried out as described in the opening lines of col. 2. Only after this first seven-year cycle is the fighting renewed. It is for this reason that after the discussion of temple worship, the focus abruptly changes in line 6b to the process of choosing soldiers for the “remaining thirty-three years of war.” Only “men of war” (אנשי מלחמה - 2:7), also known as “men of valor” (אנשי היל - 2:8), chosen “from all the tribes of Israel” (מכול שבטי ישראל - 2:7), are to go out to war. Since the preparations are to be carried out by the entire congregation, there is no need to choose these men until the end of the first seven-year cycle. During the 33 years of war that remain (2:6), these men are not to march out during the years of remission (2:8b–9a). Consequently, the war is waged continuously for six years at a time, followed by a sabbatical year of rest, until after the fifth sabbatical year when only five more years of fighting are needed to finish off the last of Japheth’s sons, for a total of 29 years (2:10).

That the period between the victory over the Kittim to the beginning of the War of the Divisions is seven years (six years of preparations plus a sabbatical year) may not be coincidental. In Ezek 39:9, we read that after the apocalyptic war against Gog, a battle that is referenced explicitly later on in M (11:15–16),²⁰ it will take seven years to burn all the weapons left over from the war. One wonders if this detail from Ezekiel may have inspired the seven interim years before the beginning of the second stage of the eschatological conflict.

This chronology, which is not a new suggestion,²¹ removes many of the perceived difficulties in the text. An initial one is that after mentioning that there are only 33 years of war left (2:6), the author then talks about 35 “years of work” (שני העבודה). This can now be understood in light of the fact that after the victory over the Kittim,

²⁰ See also the possible allusions to Ezek 38–39 in 1QM 7:2 and 12:9. Van der Ploeg suggests that the war against Gog may even be a main inspiration for the author of M (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 26, 143).

²¹ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 35; van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 73; Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 172, n. 2. Florentino García Martínez has pointed out that such a chronology is possible, although without committing himself to it (“Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Vol. 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John J. Collins [New York: Continuum, 1998], 187).

another forty years are still expected. The reason our author mentions 33 instead of forty is because at that point in his narrative (2:6) he has just finished describing the first sabbatical year, after which only 33 years of actual waging war are left, not forty. Later he mentions the 35 “years of work” (2:9), because all of them in the forty year period, including the ones that preceded the sabbatical year he had just finished describing, are to be devoted to the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות - 2:10). This point is key. The author is not referring back to the war that came before the one that will take up all the “years that remain” (2:6), but to years of work that will be invested into that same “war of the divisions.” In this way, all of lines 6b–14 related to the war that will be fought during the 33 years of war that remain, even though its preparations take place prior. While Yadin correctly perceived that one of the contrasts being made in col. 2 was one of the “whole congregation” (כול העדה - 2:9) versus a selection from it (cf. 2:7–8), he wrongly associated the former to the War against the Kittim in col. 1 rather than realizing that the contrast being made is about the “war of the divisions” itself. As already pointed out, the entire congregation of Israel was not expected to participate in the War against the Kittim. Instead, the author is contrasting that while the “war of the divisions” is to be fought by a selected army from all the tribes of Israel (2:6–8), the preparations for that war is not just those men’s responsibility, but that of the entire congregation. Further evidence of this is that the 35 years are not called “years of war” (שני המלחמה) - cf. 2:6), but “years of service” (שני העבודה - 2:9). If according to Yadin the war was to be fought six years plus an additional 29 years, then all 35 years could have been considered “years of war.” The author’s precise choice of words makes it clear that he did not intend such, but that rather the war’s fighting is to extend over a 33-year period, even though the actual time investment into the war will be a total of 35 spread out over a forty year period.

This scenario in col. 2 is very different from the one encountered in col. 1, where only three tribes, apparently in their entirety,²² are

²² Not including those among them who have joined the Sons of Darkness as “violators of the covenant.”

listed as fighting in the war. Yet at the same time, it fits well with the opening column of M. As we have seen, col. 1 makes it clear that it is describing the initial battle only, not the entire war. And if this battle is expected to last only a short while, even if several weeks,²³ there is no way it could be incorporated into the chronological reckoning in col. 2, since it measures the war in terms of years. Furthermore, as we have just seen, it was not the purpose of the author to review what he had already described in col. 1, but rather what was expected to come thereafter. There are therefore two distinct yet related stages: the first is the “day of their war against the Kittim” (יום מלחמתם בכתיים - 1:12) and the second is the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות - 2:10).²⁴

2.2. *The inconsistencies of alternative chronologies*

Independently of col. 1, there are two possible ways to interpret the chronology in col. 2 (see Table 9), and a review of these options will confirm that the above conclusion as to the sequence of the war is in fact the only one possible. The first and most obvious way, Option A in the table, is to assume that the 29 years of waging the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות - line 10) are part of the “thirty-three years of war that remain” (line 6—these are bolded in the Table). In this way, after the battle in col. 1, or stage 1, there is to be a second stage, a 33-year long period of waging war, including sabbatical years. The actual fighting, however, will take place during 29 of those 33 years, the other four years being sabbatical years. However, this second stage also has six years of preparation (line 9).

²³ See above, page 97, and below.

²⁴ Yadin had originally suggested three stages to the war (*The Scroll of the War*, 18–33; see also Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 150), but as we have seen above, this was due to his misunderstanding of the use of Dan 11:40–45 in the introduction, and of the meaning of תעריך המלחמה. He was followed by Davies (*IQM*, 120). However, neither allowed for the six years during which the war could be prepared (תעריך המלחמה). Carmignac (*Règle de la Guerre*, 35), van der Ploeg (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 72–73), Jongeling (*Rouleau de la Guerre*, 100), as well as others, saw only one stage to the war. Flusser was the first to suggest a two stage war, but did not allow for the six years of preparation (Flusser, “Apocalyptic Elements,” 152–54).

TABLE 9: CHRONOLOGY OF IQM 2

		Option B												Option C
		Option A						Option B						Option C
		Assuming years in lines 6 & 9 overlap						Assuming the 33 years of line 6 and the 35 years of line 9 do not overlap						Assuming the 33 years of line 6b were thought to be the 35 years of line 9 minus the first and last Sabbatical years, and the 29 years of line 10 are the 33 years minus the 4 other sabbatical years
		Option Aa			Option Ab			Option Ba			Option Bb			Option C
		Assuming line 6 begins on year 8			Assuming line 6 begins on year 3			Assuming line 6 begins on year 8			Assuming line 6 begins on year 3			Assuming the 33 years of line 6b were thought to be the 35 years of line 9 minus the first and last Sabbatical years, and the 29 years of line 10 are the 33 years minus the 4 other sabbatical years
		Non-sabbatical years	Sabbatical years	Non-sabbatical years	Sabbatical years	Non-sabbatical years	Sabbatical years	Non-sabbatical years	Sabbatical years	Non-sabbatical years	Sabbatical years	Non-sabbatical years	Sabbatical years	Non-sabbatical years
(Column 1)		6	1	6	2	6	1	6	1	6	2	6	1	6
Line 6b (must have 33 years of war not counting the sabbatical years)		6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	4	6	1	6
		6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6
		6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6
		6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6
		5		5		5		5		5		5		5
Line 9? (must total 35)				7		7		7		7		7		7
				4 + 2		4 + 2		4 + 2		4 + 2		4 + 2		4 + 2
				6		6		6		6		6		6
				6		6		6		6		6		6
				6		6		6		6		6		6
				6		6		6		6		6		6
				5		5		5		5		5		5
Non-sabbatical years for war (line 10?)		29		25		24		24		24		24		24
								6 + 29		6 + 29		6 + 29		6 + 29
														35-2-4=29
Total stage 1		7		40		35		40		40		35		6
Total stage 2		33		35		35		35		35		35		35-2=33
TOTAL years		40		75		70		75		75		70		42

Obviously, these cannot be during the 29 years of fighting, nor during the four sabbatical years. Consequently, they can only be before the 33-year period. Thus, when not counting the sabbatical years, a total of 35 “years of work” (line 9), the six years of preparations plus the 29 years of fighting, will be invested into this second stage. The reason this appears confusing to the reader is because after the author has finished describing the first sabbatical year in the opening lines of col. 2, there are truly only 33 years of war left, although the preparations for that war, the stage 2 war, will have taken place prior to the first sabbatical year. Altogether, the entire stage 2 war will last a total of forty years, with the stage 1 war simply being that which marks the beginning of the forty year period.

The second, Option B, is to assume that the author intended to distinguish between “years of service” (שני העבודה - line 9) and “years of war” (שני המלחמה) - line 6) as separate entities. Since the 29 years are part of the “thirty-five years of service,” they would not be part of the “remaining thirty-three years of war.” In such a case, col. 2 would be describing two phases in the war: an initial one, the “years of war” which would include that which was described in col. 1 and lasting an indeterminate amount of time, plus the remaining thirty-three years (line 6b). This would then be followed by a second stage, the “years of service,” lasting thirty-five years (line 9), itself comprised of six years of preparation (line 9) and a remaining twenty-nine years for the “war of the divisions” (line 10). This would result in a total of sixty-eight years plus an indeterminate amount. One is tempted to suggest that this undefined amount should be two years, with the result that the entire war would last a total of seventy years (Option b), divided into two equal phases of 35 years each.

An initial and most obvious difficulty with this second scenario (Option B) is that it implies a contradiction in the text. Line 6 explicitly states that there are only thirty-three years of war left, seemingly not allowing for a second stage that would add an additional 29 years of fighting (lines 9–14). The only way around this would be if for some reason the 29 years of waging war (line 10) during the second stage, the 35 “years of service” (line 9), were not reckoned as being ‘war years’ to be included in the remaining 33

“years of war” (line 6b). But if so, the author would have used a most confusing nomenclature for the two stages of the war, in which he assumed that the reader would somehow know that his stage one called “years of war” (line 6), did not include the 29 years of waging war (lines 10–14) of his second stage which he called “years of service” (lines 9–10). Yet even if one should allow for such a remote possibility, such an understanding of the sequence of the war is nonetheless problematic.

First of all, while an eschatological war lasting seventy years is a most intriguing possibility, it creates an additional difficulty with the text. Line 6a ends with a mention of the “year of remission” (שנת השמטה),²⁵ after which the author refers to the remaining 33 years of war. It is most natural to assume that the “year of remission” is a seventh year, so that one is led to assume that the second stage begins on the eighth year (Option a), rather than on the third year (Option b) as required by the seventy year war scenario. Consequently, if the 29 years of line 10 are not included in the 33 years of line 6, then one would assume the war to last at least 75 years and not seventy (Options B1a and B2a).

A second difficulty relates to the sabbatical years. Since the army is commanded not to go to war on sabbatical years during the 33 “years of war” (line 8), one would naturally assume that it is not to do so during the 29 years of waging war of the second stage as well. However, that being the case, there are no longer 29 non-sabbatical years left during the 35 “years of service” with which to fight the enemies enumerated in 1QM 2:10–14 (Options B1a and B1b). The enumeration of the different years in lines 10b–14 confirm that the 29 years of line 10a must be years of actual fighting. For Option B to work at all, therefore, one has to assume that during the 35 “years of service,” the fighting does not pause during sabbatical years (Option B2). While ultimately possible, this seems rather unlikely. Such inconsistency is not characteristic of what we know of the Qumran sectarians. It is for this reason, coupled with the fact that line 6 explicitly mentions only 33 years of remaining war, that the

²⁵ Also called a “sabbatical year.”

distinction between “years of war” and “years of service” pertain to two different successive stages in the eschatological war.²⁶

Consequently, in light of the present text, only the first interpretation of col. 2 is possible (Option A). If one is to understand line 6 literally, there can only be 33 years of war left after the sabbatical year, and these are described in the lines that follow (lines 6–14). The total length of the war, therefore is forty years. As already pointed out above, reconciling lines 6 and 9 can be done in the following way: line 6 is counting the numbers of years left in the eschatological year after the initial year of remission, while line 9 is counting all the years of invested in the “war of the divisions” over a

²⁶ Hanan Eshel (personal communication) has suggested that maybe the author made a mistake in his calculation of the years of war (Option C). Could it be that the author perceived the 35 year period as beginning and ending with a sabbatical year, leaving him with a 33 year period? Since in that 33 year period there are four additional sabbatical years, this would be the 29 years of the “war of the divisions” (2:10). Assuming this to be the case, the 35 years would be five cycles of seven years, and would be preceded by an additional cycle of seven years, for a total of six cycles. If in addition to this, one assumes that the six years of “preparing the war,” when taken together with its sabbatical year, comprises a seventh cycle, there would then be seven cycles of seven years. There are clear advantages to such a way of reckoning the chronology of the eschatological war. First and most obvious is having the war last a full Jubilee, since calculating historical epochs in this unit of time was common in apocalyptic and eschatological literature (*Jubilees* and 4Q385 being two such examples, but see Jonathan Ben Dov, “מחזורי השמיטה והיובל בקומרון ויהסם אל,” *השנה בת 364 יום Meghillot* 5–6 [2007]: 49–59). Second, it means that all the years mentioned after 1QM 2:6, including the six years of preparations, come after the first sabbatical year, as one would naturally expect. However it implies that the author or editor of M made several assumptions, if not mistakes. First, it implies that the author mis-calculated the total number of fighting years during the 35 year period. Since it both begins and ends with a sabbatical year, it is really 36 years rather than 35. Similarly, instead of 29 years of fighting, there are 30. Furthermore, there would be a confusion of terms: the 35 years would not all be “years of work” (שני העבודה - 2:9), but rather the period of “years of war” (שני המלחמה) - cf. 2:6, as they would include “years of remission” (שני השמיטה) (2:6, 8). Finally, it assumes that the years of preparation are not part of the 35 years of service, as explicitly mentioned in 2:9, but that they precede it. (Hanan Eshel suggested that maybe the compiler misunderstood his sources and failed to realize that the 29 years of war and the six years of preparation were not intended to make up the 35 years, but were originally two unrelated figures.) Thus, while it is possible to see how the chronology of a full Jubilee for the eschatological war may have once stood behind our present text, it was not preserved, and with time it came to be interpreted as lasting 40 years only, as the extant text of M reveals.

forty year period, omitting the five sabbatical years it contains, but including the six years of preparation which are to be carried out before the first sabbatical year.

2.3. *The War Scroll's two stages*

Thus, M describes two distinct stages in the eschatological war. The first is the “day of their war against the Kittim” (יום מלחמתם בכתיים) (1:12), and the second is the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות) (2:10).²⁷ No specific chronological information about the first stage is given to us, but it can be deduced from what we know about the second stage. The “war of the divisions” is to be prepared for six years by the entire congregation during non-sabbatical years (2:9). It is to be fought for 29 years (2:10), also presumably during non-sabbatical years. Together, these make up a total of 35 years, comprising all of the non-sabbatical years during a forty year period (see 2:9). Consequently, the first stage, that of the “war against the Kittim,” if it is to be understood as part of this forty year cycle—and 2:6 certainly suggests that it should be—can only be expected to last a short time: days, possibly weeks, but hardly several months. The shortness of this stage is confirmed by 1:12, which mentions its “hastening towards the end” (מחוושה עד תומה), possibly also by the constant repeating of the word “day” (1:9, 10, 11, 12).

3. THE ENEMIES IN COLUMN 2

The two stages in the war also explain the difference in the enemies enumerated between the two columns. Whether or not one chooses to see any historical realities behind the list of enemies in col. 1, geographically they are Israel's immediate neighbors. In col. 2, the War of the Divisions is to take Israel beyond its borders to conquer nations in distant lands. These are divided up according to Noah's descendants, reflecting the Table of Nations found in Gen 10:1–32

²⁷ From here on, I will call the first stage the “War against the Kittim,” and the second stage the “War of the Divisions.”

and 1 Chr 1:5–33. During the first nine years, the sons of Shem are the target. The campaign against each son or their offspring is enumerated together with the number of years, one or two, that it is expected to last (2:10–13). The last year is reserved for the sons of Ishmael and Keturah.²⁸ In contrast, the only information given about the campaigns against the sons of Ham and Japheth is that they will last ten years each. Unlike for the sons of Shem, no any additional details are provided as to the order in which their sons are to be conquered, nor the number of years required for each of them.

3.1. *The appeal to the Table of Nations (Gen 10)*

This use of the Table of Nations is surely not accidental, especially when it is attested in other literature dear to the Qumranites, such as in *Jubilees*²⁹ and the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen ar).³⁰ In both these documents, the use of the Table of Nations has been shown to serve specific exegetical purposes. In *Jubilees*, the Table of Nations is modified and expanded in order to show how and by whom the world was divided, complete with descriptions of geographical boundaries, as a way to affirm Noah's divinely appointed role in this matter, and eventually to demonstrate Canaan's wrongful appropriation of Israel's God-given inheritance.³¹ These same themes are also

²⁸ Ishmael and Keturah (cf. Gen 25) are not listed in the Gen 10 genealogical list but are included at the end of the parallel passage in 1 Chr 1 (vv. 29–33).

²⁹ There were 14 or 15 copies of *Jubilees* found at Qumran (James C. VanderKam, "The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," in *The Madrid Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*, ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner [Leiden: Brill, 1992], 635–48; James C. VanderKam and Jozef T. Milik, "Jubilees," in *Qumran Cave 4, Vol. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, Harold Attridge, et al., DJD XIII [Oxford: Clarendon, 1994], 1–185).

³⁰ On the general relationship between these two texts, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20)*, 3d ed. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2004), 20–21.

³¹ G. Hölscher, *Drei Erdkarten: Ein Beitrag zur Erdkenntnis des hebräischen Altertums*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophische-historische Klasse 1944/48, 3 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1949), 57–73; Philip S. Alexander, "Notes on the *Imago Mundi* in the Book of Jubilees," *JJS* 33 (1982): 197–213; Francis Schmidt, "Naissance d'une

found in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.³² Unlike these two texts, M is not a rewriting or retelling of the Table of Nations, but an appeal to it. Nevertheless, it must have served some exegetical purpose, one which is key for understanding the author's purpose. In this respect, several issues are particularly pertinent. First, is M dependent upon Gen 10 // 1 Chr 1 only, or is it also using material from *Jubilees* and/or the *Genesis Apocryphon*, or some common source? Second, why is it that only the sons of Shem are enumerated with the corresponding years of battle, while Ham and Japheth are treated as single entities without listing their sons? And lastly, why is the order of the sons of Shem different than in all the other sources?

An initial problem faced when seeking to understand how an ancient author may have used the Table of Nations is discerning the manner in which the text and the names therein were understood. Regardless of what Gen 10 was intended to communicate when it was composed and/or redacted,³³ the importance here is how it was

géographie juive," in *Moïse Géographie: Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l'espace*, ed. A. Desreux and F. Schmidt, *Études de psychologie et de philosophie* 24 (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1988), 13–30; Francis Schmidt, "Jewish Representations of the Inhabited Earth During the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays*, ed. A. Kasher and U. Rappaport (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi / Israel Exploration Society, 1990), 119–34; Philip S. Alexander, "Early Jewish Geography," in *ABD*, vol. 2, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 980–82; James C. VanderKam, "Putting Them in Their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of This Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John C. Reeves and Kampen John, JSOTSup 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 46–69; Cana Werman, "ספר יובלים," *Zion* 66 (2001): 275–96; James M. Scott, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity*, SNTSMS 113 (Cambridge: University Press, 2002), 27–35.

³² Werman, "ספר יובלים," 278–82; Daniel A. Machiela, "Divinely Revealed History and Geography in the Genesis Apocryphon Columns 13–17," Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, Philadelphia (2005); "'Each to His Own Inheritance': Geography as an Evaluative Tool in the Genesis Apocryphon," *DSD* 15 (2008): 50–66.

³³ For a summary of those issues, together with the difficulties of identifying the various localities, see the discussion in Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, WBC 1 (Waco: Word Books, 1987), 213–32. For an attempt to make sense of the text from both a diachronic perspective as well as a geographical perspective, note the study by J. Simons in "The 'Table of Nations' (Gen. X): Its General Structure and Meaning," in *OtSt*, vol. 10, ed. P. A. H. de Boer (Leiden: Brill, 1954), 155–84.

read at the end of the Second Temple Period. Even the short list of the sons of Shem (Gen 10:22–23, 1 Chr 1:17), of particular concern to the author of M, presents its own challenges. Thus, for example, Josephus suggests that Arpachshad should be identified with southern Mesopotamia (*Ant.* 1:144), while the book of Judith hints that it should be associated with Ecbatana (1:1). Another issue is that while most of the sons of Shem can be located in the eastern half of the Fertile Crescent, Lud is traditionally located in western Asia Minor,³⁴ defying any geo-political unity to the list. Thus, without any sure understanding, the challenge to discern how Second Temple Period authors interpreted the Table of Nations and what motivated the changes they introduced to it is even more acute. This is not the place for an in-depth study of the toponymic issues, but a few basic points which can be discerned need to be highlighted. In *Jub.* 8–9, the addition of geographical data has allowed for a better understanding of the author’s perception of the world as he envisioned it. The consensus is that the data from Gen 10 was reframed and molded into an ancient, three part, Ionian map. This seems to be the rationale behind 1QapGen 16–17 as well, and if not somehow interdependent,³⁵ there may have been a common source behind both documents, either an actual map,³⁶ or a text, possibly even the *Book of Noah*.³⁷

3.1.1. *The Table of Nations in Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon*

It is generally agreed that, where it can be determined, the boundaries described in *Jubilees* and in the *Genesis Apocryphon* are nearly identical.³⁸ Thus Shem inherited all the land south east of the Tina

³⁴ So, for example, in Isa 66:19 and *Ant.* 1:144.

³⁵ See, for example, Cana Werman (“ספר יובלים,” 275–96) who suggests that *Jubilees* used the *Genesis Apocryphon* as a source.

³⁶ Machiela, “Geography as an Evaluative Tool,” 59. Machiela reconstructed the map which allegedly stood behind both *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* (see Plate 1).

³⁷ Scott, *Geography*, 28, 175.

³⁸ Note a recent article by Esther Eshel which suggests that the Lud’s allotment may be different in the *Genesis Apocryphon* from what it is in *Jubilees* (“Isaiah 11:15: A New Interpretation Based on the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” *DSD* 13



PLATE I: Map of the world according to *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. (I wish to thank Dan Machiela for granting me permission to use his map.)

(modern-day Don) river and north east of the Nile, including all of Asia Minor and the eastern Mediterranean coast (*Jub.* 8:12–16; 1QapGen 16:14–20). Ham’s territory included all of Africa south west of the Nile (*Jub.* 8:22), and Japheth was granted all of Europe north west of the Tina river, including most of the islands in the Mediterranean (*Jub.* 8:25–28; 1QapGen 16:9–11). In both texts, these descriptions are followed by a breakdown of each area according to the sons of Ham, Japheth, and Shem (*Jub.* 9:1–13; 1QapGen 17).

3.1.2. *The Table of Nations in Josephus*

While it is tempting to assume that this view of the world and their peoples was standard in the late Second Temple Period, this was not the case, as Josephus makes clear in his commentary on the Table of Nations (*Ant.* 1:122–147). In it he strives to remain faithful to the biblical text and does not betray any apologetic agenda. Rather, his primary concern is to give a non-ideological commentary on the toponyms in an attempt to relate them to the world as he knew it.³⁹ Josephus preserves quite a different division of the land. For him, Asia Minor is not part of Shem’s allotment but belongs to Japheth (*Ant.* 1:122). Most of the land south and west of the Euphrates belongs to Ham (1:130), and Shem is confined east of the Euphrates (1:143). After describing the boundaries of an allotment for one of Noah’s sons, he immediately describes its division among the next generation(s). Surprisingly, these subdivisions do not necessarily fit in the allotment to which he just finished claiming they belong. Thus for example, the Medes, descendants of Madai son of Japheth, are located in Shem’s allotment (1:122); similarly, the Lydians, descen-

[2006]: 38–45, esp. 42 and n. 20). Another difference is that in *Jubilees*, Yawan’s portion includes only the islands in the Aegean Sea (9:10), while in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, it apparently includes the land that is between the Aegean and the Adriatic Gulfs (17:17). Are we to see in this difference a stronger anti-Hellenistic rhetoric in *Jubilees*?

³⁹ Schmidt, “Jewish Representations,” 130–31; Alexander, “Early Jewish Geography,” 982–83; Louis H. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, vol. 3 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 42–43.

dants of Lud son of Shem, are placed in Japheth's allotment (1:144). Apparently, these contradictions crept in as a result of Josephus' desire to keep the allotments of Noah's sons consistent with the biblical text, even if they could not be born out by the ethnic identification of their respective sons.⁴⁰

3.1.3. *The War Scroll in light of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon*

Of these two world-views, that of *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* on the one hand, and of Josephus on the other, it is quite clear that M is closer to that of the former. There is no hint that the author considers the Land of Israel to be part of Ham's inheritance, and the fact that Aram-Naharaim, an area which straddles both sides of the Euphrates river,⁴¹ is counted among Shem's territory further highlights that fact. Nevertheless, when comparing M to *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, several differences stand out. An initial one is the order in which the descendants of Noah's sons are dealt.⁴² In Genesis (10:2–29), it is Japheth—Ham—Shem. In *Jubilees* (9:1–13) it is Ham—Japheth—Shem. However, in both the *Genesis Apocryphon* (col. 17) and M (2:10–14), the order of Gen 10:1 is followed: Shem—Ham—Japheth. When comparing the order of Shem's sons, one notes that in the *Genesis Apocryphon* it is different than in Gen 10:22–23, while both *Jubilees* and M are more faithful to biblical order, although *Jubilees* has switched the Masoretic Text's order of Lud and Aram.⁴³

3.1.3.1. The order of Shem's sons and Aram-Naharaim

With respect to M, determining the order in which the sons of Shem are listed depends on how one chooses to interpret the text (2:10–13):

⁴⁰ Schmidt, "Jewish Representations," 131.

⁴¹ Wayne T. Pitard, "Aram-Naharaim," in *ABD*, vol. 1, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 341.

⁴² I am referring here to the passages that deal with the division of the land among the descendants of Noah's sons, not those that list only Noah's sons and their inheritance.

⁴³ As did Josephus (*Ant.* 1:144).

... בשנה הראישונה ילחמו בארם נהרים ובשנית בבני לוד בשלישית ¹⁰
 ילחמו בשאר בני ארם בעוץ וחול תוגר ומשא אשר בעבר פורת ברביעית ¹¹
 ובחמישית ילחמו בבני ארפכשד
 בששית ובשביעית ילחמו בכול בני אשור ופרס והקדמוני עד המדבר הגדול ¹²
 בשנה השמינית ילחמו בבני
 עילם בתשיעית ילחמו בבני ישמאעל וקטורה... ¹³

- ¹⁰ ... In the first year they will wage war against Aram-Naharaim, and in the second against the sons of Lud. In the third,
¹¹ they will wage war against the rest of the sons of Aram, against Uz and Hul and Toger and Mesha who (are) beyond the Euphrates. In the fourth and fifth they will wage war against the sons of Arpachshad.
¹² In the sixth and seventh they will wage war against the all the sons of Asshur and Persia and the Kadmonites, until the great wilderness. In the eighth year they will wage war against the sons of
¹³ Elam. In the ninth, they will wage war against the sons of Ishmael and Keturah...

The primary question is whether or not the author intended the toponym Aram-Naharaim to designate the eponym Aram. Assuming that he did, as affirmed by Yadin,⁴⁴ the list would be Aram—Lud—Arpachshad—Asshur⁴⁵—Elam, exactly the opposite of how they are listed in Gen 10:22–23.⁴⁶ However, it may be possible that Aram-Naharaim was not intended to replace Aram, but is simply an added geographical name, just as Persia and the Kadmonites are also additions. It is noteworthy that these three extra place-names are not fronted with the designation “sons of.”⁴⁷ There is no doubt that the author associated Aram-Naharaim to the sons of Aram—he ends up calling Uz, Hul, Toger, and Mesha the “rest of the sons of Aram” (2:11) even though from other sources we know of no other sons of

⁴⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 26–33.

⁴⁵ Note that Asshur is the transliteration of the Hebrew word for Assyria. I have chosen to keep the transliteration wherever Assyria is mentioned in the context of the Table of Nations (Gen 10).

⁴⁶ Omitting the “sons of Aram” inserted between Lud and Arpachshad, and the sons of Ishmael and Keturah at the end of the list.

⁴⁷ While grammatically possible, it does not seem to me that the author intended to designate the sons of Persia and sons of the Kadmonites since such expressions are not found in the Bible.

Aram than these four. Yet the position of the “rest of the sons of Aram” in the list is strange. It may be that the author listed the names of Aram’s sons because he understood them to be Shem’s actual sons, rather than from the subsequent generation(s). Except for Abraham’s lineage and Aram’s sons, the Bible provides no other details of the generations beyond Shem’s sons. It may be, therefore, that the author of M decided to list Aram’s sons for no other reason than to remain consistent with the biblical text, and not to offer extra biblical information about that particular lineage. For him, including Aram meant automatically listing the sons, just as in the Bible.⁴⁸ This being the case, could it be that in M, only those marked with “sons of” were meant to mark the biblical eponyms? If so, Aram-Naharaim would then be an addition to the list, not a replacement for Aram as assumed by Yadin. Interestingly, this would also mean that the author viewed Aram’s primary allotment as being east of the Euphrates, just as in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*.⁴⁹

One can only surmise as to why the author would have deemed the addition of Aram-Naharaim at the beginning of his list necessary. One possibility is that the author purposefully reverted to the older biblical toponym Aram-Naharaim for what was then known as Syria or Coele-Syria. A parallel for such a practice can be found in the Septuagint of Genesis, in which “Aram” appears only in Gen 10:22–23, while everywhere else it is replaced by words that designate Syria or the Syrians.⁵⁰ Thus in Gen 22:21, instead of reading “of Aram” (Ἀράμ), the Septuagint has “of the Syrians” (Σύρων). Similarly, “Padan Aram” is most often called “Mesopotamia of Syria” (Μεσοποταμίαν Συρίας; see 28:6–7; 33:18; 35:9, 26; 46:15). The area intended may have that which is north of Judea and Galilee, between the Mediterranean shore and the Euphrates,⁵¹ since it was

⁴⁸ Note Carmignac who points out that the omission of the words “sons of Aram” in 1 Chr 1:17 had not yet happened when it was translated into the Septuagint (*Règle de la Guerre*, 37, n. 71).

⁴⁹ On Aram’s allotment in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, see below page 194.

⁵⁰ Marguerite Harl, *La Genèse*, La Bible d’Alexandrie 1 (Paris: Cerf, 1986), 146.

⁵¹ This is the meaning Coele-Syria seems to have had in 1 Esd 2:17, 24, 27 (and *passim*). For the different boundaries assumed by various authors using the term, see William S. LaSor, “Coelesyria,” in *ISBE*, vol. 1, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley

apparently distinct from “the rest of the sons of Aram” who are beyond the Euphrates. Noteworthy is the fact that this is the area from which the Jews faced some opposition during the second century BCE. There is good reason, therefore, to assume that in M, Aram-Naharaim is an addition to the eponyms of Gen 10, and that these are represented by the names fronted with the clause “sons of.” Consequently, M is listing the sons of Shem in the order of Lud—Aram—Arpachshad—Assyria—Elam, the exact reverse of what is found in *Jubilees*. Even if one rejects this reading, it is certain that the list of Shem’s sons begins close to the Land of Israel, and finishes with Elam, the furthest away.⁵² This is in contrast to Gen 10 and 1 Chr 1, *Jubilees*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon* which all begin with Elam.

3.1.3.2. Possible additions in the *War Scroll*

Apart from differences in order, other changes are unique to M. As we have seen, the toponym Aram-Naharaim is either replacing the eponym Aram or is an addition to the list (2:10); after mentioning Lud and referring to the “rest of the sons of Aram,” the author adds that they are beyond the Euphrates (2:11);⁵³ Persia and the Kadmonites are combined with Asshur (2:12), with the added precision that their territory extends “until the great wilderness.”⁵⁴ An initial observation is that all of the additions are geographical in nature. Even the name “Kadmonites,” which could be of an ethnic group, was most likely used in a geographical sense to mean those “of the east” (see Gen 15:19). Obviously then, geographical matters are important to the author,⁵⁵ in the same way that they are in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Thus, if M’s list is to be understood as beginning with Aram rather than Lud, geographical realities may

(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 728.

⁵² Excluding the appendix of the sons of Ishmael and Keturah.

⁵³ Note Josephus (*Ant.* 1:145) who places these sons in the area of modern-day Syria and Eastern Turkey, all the way into northern Iraq (Feldman, *Antiquities I–4*, 51–52), obviously a different tradition than what is preserved in M.

⁵⁴ The mention of the sons of Ishmael and Keturah could also be deemed additions or changes to Gen 10. However, they are included in the parallel passage in 1 Chronicles (1:29–33), and are therefore not an innovation of M only.

⁵⁵ As correctly pointed out by Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 27).

have been what stood behind the peculiar mention of Aram's sons between Lud and Asshur. The added geographical note documenting that they are located "beyond the Euphrates" may support this view. It should probably be understood in contrast to Aram-Naharaim which covered an area both east and west of the Euphrates.

3.1.3.3. Arpachshad

In addition to a difference in order and the unique additions in M, there is at least one significant difference in the geographical boundaries assigned to each of Shem's sons from what is described in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Generally speaking, Elam's allotment is all of Shem's eastern frontier (*Jub.* 9:2; 1QapGen 17:6–7). Asshur's territory stretched east of the upper Tigris river (around Nineveh) to the vicinity of India (*Jub.* 9:3).⁵⁶ Aram is located between the Tigris and the Euphrates, "as far as the vicinity of the mountain range of Asshur and the land of Ararat" (*Jub.* 9:5; cf 1QapGen 17:9).⁵⁷ These are probably the mountains from which the Tigris and its tributaries find their source, most likely the Zagros mountains, and the land of Urartu with Mount Ararat. Lud is centered around the Taurus mountains (1QapGen 17:10; cf. *Jub.* 9:6),⁵⁸ but its eastern border abuts Asshur (*Jub.* 9:6), implying that it must extend past Aram's northern edge. Arpachshad includes southern Mesopotamia and everything south of the Euphrates (*Jub.* 9:4 and 1QapGen 17:12–14). As is immediately visible, the big difference is that unlike M, the Land of Israel is located squarely in Arpachshad's allotment, and it would have to be conquered first if one was to access Aram and/or Lud.

In M, no geographical details about Arpachshad's allotment are given, but it can be inferred that it is equivalent to southern

⁵⁶ In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, too little of the description remains to provide any useful information.

⁵⁷ All translations of the book of *Jubilees* are from VanderKam, *Jubilees*.

⁵⁸ Alexander, "Imago Mundi," 208. The reference to the "mountains of Asshur" in *Jub.* 9:6 should probably be the Taurus mountains, and not the mountains of Asshur on Aram's northern front, as the original Hebrew text may have been הַר אֲשׁוּר rather than הַר אֲשׁוּר. I wish to thank Esther Eshel for pointing out that detail to me. Alternatively, it may be that Lud's territory stretched from the Taurus mountains to the mountains of Asshur (possibly the Zagros mountains).

Mesopotamia. While this fits Josephus' description of Arpachshad's territory as being that of the land of the Chaldeans (*Ant.* 1:144), there may be an alternate explanation for this striking difference. In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, this is the only portion of Arpachshad's allotment that was not inherited by Abraham. In 21:15–19, Abraham walks the circumference of the land promised him: it is all of Arpachshad's territory save for the land of the Chaldeans.⁵⁹ This is probably due to the fact that Abraham was called out of the land of the Chaldeans (Gen 15:7), so that it would not make sense for the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* to have Abraham inheriting the land out of which God had called him. Since M's allotment for Shem reflects that of *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* rather than Josephus, this may be a better explanation for the restricted territory it attributes to Arpachshad, rather than stipulating a dependence upon Josephus' alternate view.

There seems to be a second difference: in M, with Aram-Naharaim being counted with the rest of the sons of Aram, Aram's territory is extended from what it is in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* to include territory west of the Euphrates river. However, if Aram-Naharaim is an addition into the Table of Nations, this may not necessarily be the case. It is surprising that the author felt compelled to emphasize that the “rest of the sons of Aram” (שאר בני ארם) were “beyond the Euphrates” (אשר בעבר פורת) - 1QM 2:11, emphasis mine). What motivated the addition of this detail? Note that even the spelling of the Euphrates is different than expected (פרת rather than פורת), although it reflects the spelling found in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (17:12, 14; 21:12, 17, 21). Could this be another sign of its influence upon M?⁶⁰ Even if not, by adding this

⁵⁹ Machiela, “Geography as an Evaluative Tool,” 61–62. In 1QapGen 17:12, “all the land the Euphrates waters” (all translations of the *Genesis Apocryphon* are from Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon* unless otherwise stated) is most likely the area of Babylon (see Clyde E. Harrington and William S. LaSor, “Euphrates,” in *ISBE*, vol. 2, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986], 202–4). Thus it is the equivalent to *Jubilees*' “land of the Chaldean region to the east of the Euphrates which is close to the Erythrean Sea” (9:4).

⁶⁰ Joseph Fitzmyer does not think that there is an ‘aramaizing’ of the name in M as suggested by Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 266), however he also suggests that this spelling may have been more wide-spread than in just these two documents (see

detail the author of M is confirming that all of the sons of Aram known from the biblical text are indeed east of the Euphrates, exactly where we would expect them to be according to *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. As with Arpachshad, the disagreement between these two texts and M concerning Aram may be only superficial.

Earlier I tentatively suggested that if Aram-Naharaim is an addition to the Table of Nations rather than a replacement for the eponym Aram, it may have been as a cover name for Coele-Syria.⁶¹ Should the geographical boundaries of the allotments to Shem and his sons in M be consistent with that of *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, it may be possible to find additional support for this suggestion. The boundary between Arpachshad and Lud runs between the Amanus and the Taurus mountain ranges (*Jub.* 9:4, 6; 1QapGen 17:10–14). Between Arpachshad and Aram, it is the Euphrates river (*Jub.* 9:4–5; 1QapGen 17:9, 12–14 and 21:17). The problem with reading Aram-Naharaim according to its biblical definition is that it would not respect this division between Arpachshad and Aram. By straddling the Euphrates, Aram-Naharaim would be partly in Aram's territory and partly in Arpachshad's territory. This would not allow M to remain consistent with the geographical scheme it seems to have adopted, either directly from *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, or the source(s) which stand(s) behind them. Coele-Syria, on the other hand, does allow M to remain faithful to this geographical framework, as it can be contained within Arpachshad's (or Abraham's) inheritance. The added detail that Aram's sons are beyond the Euphrates then makes all the more sense. On the one hand it is respecting Aram's allotment as reflected in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and on the other hand it is highlighting the fact that Aram-Naharaim is to be understood principally as Coele-Syria. It would be Arpachshad's northern portion which borders Lud to the north and Aram to the east. This area, having never been conquered by the Jews after their return from exile, would have to be included in any list of eschatological conquests. At the same time, if

Genesis Apocryphon, 175).

⁶¹ See above, page 191.

M adopted the perspective of *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, it was land which already belonged to Abraham. Reverting to its biblical nomenclature may have been the way to incorporate it into the war's chronology without violating the idealized geographical scheme it had adopted.

3.2. *The use of Asshur/Assyria in the War Scroll*

This use of the Table of Nations is also important for understanding the apparently conflicting uses of "Asshur" (אשור) in cols. 1 and 2. In the first column, we have seen that the author used the term in a figurative way to mean Syria of the Seleucids, and as a synonym for the Kittim. This is most clear in line 6 where Asshur/Assyria is equated with the Kittim and consequently referred to as the "sons of Japheth," since in the Table of Nations, the Kittim are descendants of Japheth (Gen 10:4).⁶² In col. 2, however, Asshur/Assyria is rightfully listed among the sons of Shem just as in the Bible (Gen 10:22), and as we have just seen, it is used to designate a geographical area which is east of the Tigris rivers, and extending toward India. Just prior to its conquest by Alexander the Great and the Seleucid dynasty, the Neo-Assyrian empire had been conquered by the Persians. Interestingly, M associates Asshur with the Persians and the Kadmonites, adding that their territory extends as far as the "great wilderness" (המדבר הגדול - 2:11). Most likely, this is the salt-caked desert in Iran known as *Dasht-e Kavir* in the north and *Dasht-e Lūt* in the south.⁶³ The fact that the land of the Kadmonites extended to this great wilderness precludes that they are the same as those associated with Abraham in Gen 15:19 (cf. *Jub.* 14:18) whose land he inherits. This great desert is known to be the eastern frontier of Media,⁶⁴ and one wonders if this use of "the easterners" may have been a way to refer to Madai, a son of Japheth, who according to

⁶² For an alternate possibility, see below note 61 on page 388.

⁶³ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 32, n. 5; Roy E. Hayden, "Persia," in *ISBE*, vol. 3, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 777.

⁶⁴ Alan R. Millard, "Medes, Media," in *ISBE*, vol. 3, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 297.

Jubilees ended up near Asshur and Elam (10:35–36). By calling them “easterners” rather than Medes or Medians, the author of M could include them geographically in his conquest of Shem’s territory without introducing the confusion that they are technically descendants of Japheth. If correct, this phrase would be a reference to three major eastern nations, all coming from the same general area, that were significant in Israel’s history.

3.3. *Jacob: Abraham’s rightful and only heir*

To summarize, M, in its use of the Table of Nations, follows the world view of *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* as to the extent of Shem’s territory: over and against Gen 10 and Josephus which assign the Land of Israel to Ham, here it is part of Shem’s allotment. This is further reflected by the emphasis on the biblical sons of Aram (and not just Shem in general) being east of the Euphrates, just as they are in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Other similarities can be discerned. Only names preceded by “sons of” in M are reflections of the biblical eponyms, so that the order of Shem’s sons is the reverse of that in *Jubilees*. While Arpachshad’s territory is not described in M, it can be inferred as being restricted to southern Mesopotamia: this is the only portion that was not inherited by Abraham in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Although it is impossible to prove, there may have been an influence by the *Genesis Apocryphon* (or its source) on M in the spelling of “Euphrates” (פּוּרַת rather than פּרַת). In light of all these agreements, it seems likely that the author of M did not intend “Aram-Naharaim” to represent the area it encompassed in biblical times, since this would not respect the boundary between Arpachshad and Aram. More likely, it reflected contemporaneous geo-political dynamics, namely that of Coele-Syria. Another similar geo-political adaptation, this time to reflect biblical history, is the addition of Persia and Media to Asshur. There is little doubt, then, that M used a view of Gen 10’s Table of Nations consistent with that which is found in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, albeit in an adapted form, so as to better reflect his own purposes, the most obvious one being the progression from near-to-

far. The question this leaves unanswered, however, is why the emphasis on Shem's sons.

While both the book of *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* use stories surrounding the Table of Nations as an apology defending the rightful superiority of Shem's inheritance,⁶⁵ this is obviously not the principal concern in M: Shem's supremacy is assumed and needs no justification. It may be that the author of M wanted to point out that this conquest of the world by Israel is to begin from a position of legitimacy: as descendants of Shem, and of Abraham specifically, they will be launching their attack from their God-given inheritance, not from some land they violently usurped from Ham. But this fails to explain the need to describe the various campaigns against Shem's sons in detail when they are not likewise detailed for Ham and Japheth. Yet even in this respect, a common element to the context in which all three texts found at Qumran refer to the Table of Nations may prove helpful: that of God's final judgment on the world. In M, it is most obvious, since this is the overarching theme of the entire composition. In *Jubilees*, the recounting of the Table of Nations as Noah's dividing the earth concludes with:

So be it for them and their children until eternity during their generations *until the day of judgment* upon which the Lord God will punish them with the sword and fire because of all the evil impurity of their errors by which they have filled the earth with wickedness, impurity, fornication, and sins (9:15, emphasis mine).

Furthermore, James Scott has argued that *Jubilees'* ideology of putting Jerusalem in the center of the earth when the territories are divided by Noah is based on Ezek 38:12, a verse whose larger context anticipates the defeat of hostile invading nations.⁶⁶ In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the reference to divine judgment comes before the explicit reference to the Table of Nations in cols. 16–17, as part Noah's dream (cols. 13–15). These columns are badly damaged and

⁶⁵ In *Jubilees*, see especially 8:17–21, 30. In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Shem's superiority is reflected in the longer description of the division of his allotment to his sons (17:7–15) in contrast to the shorter description of Japheth doing the same (17:16–19; the division of Ham's allotment is not preserved, but note that in *Jubilees* [9:1] it is the shortest of all three).

⁶⁶ Scott, *Geography*, 34.

the text quite fragmentary, yet enough can be reconstructed to determine that it is a kind of the “Dream of the Garden” preserved in other Jewish literature, such as in the Manichaean *Book of Giants*, the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, and via a certain Rav Yoseph into *Bereshit Rabba* and *Yalkut Shimoni*.⁶⁷ While there are many similarities between the dream as it is preserved in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and these other texts, there are also significant differences. Most important to the present discussion is that Noah’s dream proceeds from a vision about dividing the land (col. 14) to “the final judgment of sinners by the Mighty Lord... [T]he imagery is couched in a much broader historical context—a context which focuses on the progeny of Noah until the end of time” (col. 15).⁶⁸ Thus, in both *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the use of the Table of Nations is intimately connected to God’s final judgment of the earth, just as it is in M. Therefore, the appeal to the Table of Nations in M is identical to that of other Jewish apocalyptic literature, namely “to express the expectation not only of eschatological divine judgment of the nations by fire and sword, but also of universal sovereignty for Israel.”⁶⁹

This last point concerning Israel’s universal sovereignty is key to understanding what is motivating the author of M. While *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* are primarily concerned with emphasizing Shem’s rightful allotment of Asia, including that of the Promised Land, M is emphasizing that of Shem’s descendants, only Jacob’s line is chosen by God. This is made explicitly clear by the precision that even the sons of Ishmael and Keturah, themselves rightful descendants of Abraham, will need to be destroyed during the ninth year. Traditionally, the descendants of Ishmael and Keturah are believed to have lived in the Arabian peninsula. For example, Kedar, the second son of Ishmael, represents a group of tribes in northern Arabia.⁷⁰ Similarly, the city of Dedan, one of Keturah’s son, (Gen 25:3) has been identified with the ruins of Kuraybah in

⁶⁷ Machiela, “Divinely Revealed History.”

⁶⁸ Machiela, “Divinely Revealed History.”

⁶⁹ Scott, *Geography*, 38–39.

⁷⁰ Ernst A. Knauf, “Kedar,” in *ABD*, vol. 4, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 9–10.

north west Arabia.⁷¹ Note also Havilah, the area in which Ishmael's descendants are said to have settled (Gen 25:18), and which is believed to be in southern Arabia.⁷² This area between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf is also where Ishmael and Keturah's descendants are located according to *Jub.* 20:12–13 (cf. Gen 25:6): “Ishmael, his sons, and Keturah's sons, and their sons went together and settled from Paran as far as the entrance of Babylon.” Two interesting points about this passage in *Jubilees* need to be highlighted. First, by dealing with both families as a single entity, it stands in contrast to Gen 25 which treats the two families separately. Here too M reflects the world view of *Jubilees*. Second, *Jubilees* is careful to put the descendants of Ishmael and Keturah squarely in Shem's allotment, in contrast to the biblical tradition found in the Table of Nations which sees both Havilah and Dedan as descendants of Cush, a son of Ham (Gen 10:7). In fact, not only are they located in Shem's allotment, they are also within the land inherited by Abraham according to the *Genesis Apocryphon*, as one would expect them to be as his descendants. In M, therefore, they are the second group within Abraham's inheritance against whom Israel will have to go to war after Aram-Naharaim.

That the sons of Ishmael and Keturah are located in the Arabian peninsula raises another issue. In M, they are listed last, after Elam, so that the geographical progression of near-to-far followed during the first eight years of the War of the Divisions is hereby broken. While there is too little data to draw any certain conclusions as to why this might be, it is interesting to note that this shift takes place when the author changes his focus from foreigners to those elements within Abraham's line which he does not consider as legitimate heirs of God's promise. There is little doubt that this is the motivation which stands behind this final year of the campaigns against the sons of Shem.⁷³ This being the case, it is surprising that other people groups associated to Abraham are not mentioned, such as the

⁷¹ David F. Graf, “Dedan,” in *ABD*, vol. 2, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 121–23.

⁷² W. W. Müller, “Havilah,” in *ABD*, vol. 3, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 81–82.

⁷³ Yadin called it a “political purpose” (*The Scroll of the War*, 32).

Ammonites and the Moabites, descendants of Lot (Gen 19:36–38), or the Edomites, descendants of Essau (Gen 36).⁷⁴ But these do not need to be included here, for they are to be already conquered during the first stage of the war (1QM 1:1–2). Without this coherence with col. 1, the ninth and final year of campaigning against the sons of Shem, if only against the sons of Ishmael and Keturah, would make little sense. From a geographical perspective it leaves all of Transjordan unconquered, while from a political perspective it leaves challengers to Israel's claim of being God's chosen line. Together with col. 1, however, Jacob's line gains full supremacy over all of Shem's territories and peoples.

In the same way that there was an exegetical rationale behind the unique listing of the Sons of Light's enemies in the first column of M, so also in col. 2. This time it is based on Gen 10 / 1 Chr 1. The appeal to the Table of Nations is not directly from the Bible however, but is dependent upon its interpretation and reworking as reflected in the book of *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*.⁷⁵ The emphasis given to Shem's line is to demonstrate the outworking of what is implied in these other compositions, namely, that Israel only, as the rightful heir of God's promise through Noah's son Shem, is to have supremacy over the rest of the world. This is done by carefully listing all of Shem's descendants, including those from Abraham who do not lead to Jacob. For the first eight years, the War of the Divisions against the foreign nations is to be carried out in a geographical order from near-to-far, and only thereafter, during the ninth year, will Sons of Light focus on those illegitimate elements of Abraham's line that were not conquered during the first stage of the eschatological War against the Kittim. Finally, the last twenty years will be devoted to the other two of Noah's sons, Ham and Japheth.

⁷⁴ As pointed out by Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 39.

⁷⁵ In light of the similarities between *Jubilees*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and M with respect to the Table of Nations, it seems unlikely to me that *Jubilees* is directly dependent upon the *Genesis Apocryphon* (or vice versa), but that they rather had access to a common source. Similarly, M seems to be drawing from both these texts, so it too may have been drawing from that common source rather than directly from these two compositions.

3.4. *Implications*

Thus, in the two phases of the eschatological conflict, M presents two different sets of enemies. These are not overlapping as at times suggested, but are rather complimentary. In the first stage, the primary target is the Kittim of Assyria, the author's epithet for the Seleucids, and all who have aligned themselves to them: Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, but also Jews who have violated the covenant. By including this last group, the author is informing us of how the sect's belief that they will be the ones to pass judgment on the evil ones within Israel (1QpHab 5:4–5; 1QS 9:23; 10:19–20) will come to pass.⁷⁶ Once these are defeated, the second stage of the war is concerned with a conquest of the rest of the world, one which will bring final redemption to Israel. It is to begin with Shem's allotment, and includes the rest of Shem's geographical allotment, as well as all the genealogical lines descending from him which do not lead to Jacob, that were not conquered in the first stage. It concludes with the conquest of Noah's other two sons, Ham and Japheth.⁷⁷

The list of enemies in 1QM 2:10–14 reveals yet another big difference between the two columns, the War against the Kittim in col. 1 and the War of the Divisions in col. 2. While the War against the Kittim in col. 1 will be a time of unparalleled tribulation (1:11–12), in the War of the Divisions, the fighting almost seems like a formality, a process Israel has to go through in order to appropriate the victory which they know is theirs already. Indeed, for the sons of Shem, the numbers of years (one or two) for all the campaigns are already listed, as if the magnitude of the opposition was already determined. What is more, in one case, when fighting the Assyrians, the Persians, and the Kadmonites (2:12), a campaign that is to last two years, it happens to be interrupted in the middle by a sabbatical year. This is obviously of no consequence to the author who is unconcerned by the military implications this could have upon the

⁷⁶ Licht had already noticed that the rest of the eschatological war was not concerned with the evil-doers in Israel and suggested that they were to be defeated in this first stage (“מטעת עולם,” 66).

⁷⁷ Egypt, being one of Ham's sons, is conquered at this point, and not during an intermediary stage as suggested by Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 19).

fighting. Unlike col. 1, there is no hint of any possible defeat or setbacks.⁷⁸ Although never said explicitly, it is certainly inferred: the possibility of defeat no longer exists. And with these last campaigns, it will finally be the “end of all appointed times of darkness” (תום כול - מועדי הושך - 1QM 1:8).

Finally, such a two-stage eschatological war is the perfect fulfillment of Micah’s prophecy (5:4–5 [E:5–6]) which together with Isa 31:8 inspired the War against the Kittim described in col. 1.⁷⁹ Without col. 2 and the second stage, much of the prophecy would have been left unaccomplished, as it includes the prediction that Israel is not only to conquer the invading Assyrians, but also to rule over Assyria (5:5 [E:6]). If as suggested above, Aram-Naharaim is representational of Coele-Syria with the Seleucid capital, and the campaign is to end with conquering Asshur east of the Tigris river, than not only will the ‘political Assyrians’ (the Seleucids) be conquered, but all of historical Assyria. Furthermore, now it can also be understood why the War of the Divisions seems to be won ahead of time. Micah specifically says that once Assyria will have been repelled from the land, Israel will be like a lion from whom there is no deliverance (5:7 [E:8]). As one commentator summarized it:

The imagery of Israel as a lion is an ancient one, which stands for irresistible conquest of all opposition. The prophet is recalling a traditional role associated with holy war. There is no mention of God in this stanza, but the prophet’s theme is highly theological. The final phrase “and none will be able to deliver” is used frequently in connection with Yahweh’s punishment of his enemies. Here there is a shift of application to Israel as the earthly representative of the divine Victor. God’s cause, with which Israel is identified, must triumph.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Noticing this prompted Carmignac to say that the author “suppose un ennemi sans réaction, qui joue placidement son rôle de bétail à massacrer” (*Règle de la Guerre*, XI). Davies summarizes the situation well: “The scene is very reminiscent of II Chron. xx, where the leadership of the battle is in the hands of the Levites and the victory is assured through the direct action of God, the human participation being entirely liturgical. Likewise, this description of the battle is removed from reality. The enemy are objects of slaughter” (*IQM*, 45).

⁷⁹ See above, page 130.

⁸⁰ Allen, *Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, 354. On the problems of interpreting this passage in its broader context, see the discussion in Andersen and Freedman, *Micah*, 484–87. Vargon suggests that Mic 5:6–7 (E:7–8) preserves two opposite

This is precisely what the War of the Divisions is all about, and the spirit with which it is described fits the Micah prophecy perfectly.⁸¹ On the one hand, it is surprising that the prophecy itself is not alluded to anywhere in M. Yet that it is characteristic of the sectarians' view of the eschaton is clear from the *Rule of the Benedictions* (1QSb, Sb). There, the last extant blessing, to be said about the Prince of the Congregation, is that he may be the fulfillment of Mic 5:7 (E:8).⁸² There is little doubt, therefore, that the sectarians believed these verses would find their fulfillment, and it is only natural to assume that M is describing how.

4. THE SONS OF LIGHT IN COLUMN 2

We have just seen that the enemies listed in col. 2 are different than those in col. 1, with the second stage of the war building off of the accomplishments of the first stage. Parallel to this, the composition of the Sons of Light also changes, as was already pointed out when examining the chronological differences between the first two columns of the scroll: in the second stage, the “men of war” (אנשי מלחמה - 2:7) are chosen “from all the tribes of Israel” (מכול שבטי ישראל - 2:7), not just from the tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin who fought in col. 1. As we have seen, the designation of “Levi and Judah and Benjamin” is a clear reference to those tribes from the Kingdom of Judah who have returned from exile, in contrast to those

visions of Israel's future, one peaceful and one militant (ספר מיכה, 155). Should this be the case, there is no doubt which one the sectarians believed would come to fruition.

⁸¹ It is also particularly interesting that this role of being a mighty conquerer is assigned specifically to the “remnant of Jacob” (שארית יעקב - 5:6–7 [E:7–8]). As we shall see, the War of the Divisions is to be fought by Israel's remnant: see below, pages 295 and 297.

⁸² Thus, Licht, מגילת הסרטים, 289. Jozef Milik, for his part, preferred connecting it to Gen 49:9, although he also referenced Mic 5:7 (Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik, “28b. Recueil Des Bénédictiones [1QSb],” in *Qumran Cave I*, Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik, DJD I [Oxford: Clarendon, 1955], 129; see also Jean Carmignac, “Le Recueil des Bénédictiones,” in *Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*, vol. 2, Jean Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée, *Autour de la Bible* [Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963], 42).

from the Northern Kingdom who have not. Obviously then, for such a change in the composition of the Sons of Light to have transpired between the end of the War against the Kittim and the beginning of the War of the Divisions implies that these northern tribes have returned to the Land of Israel: Israel's restoration will have taken place.

This restoration is also assumed in the opening lines of col. 2. These give instructions for temple worship during the "appointed time of the year of remission" (מועד שנת השמטה - line 6). There, we read that twelve priests and twelve Levites, together with chiefs of the tribes (ראשי השבטים - 2:1-3) are to serve in the temple precinct, in order to "atone on behalf of the entire congregation" (לכפר בעד כול) (2:5). Flusser, who realized this difference as he posited a two stage war, concluded as follows:

Clearly, the author of the War Scroll believes that after the Kittim War, perhaps in the beginning of the first year of release, the remaining tribes of Israel will return as functioning members of the nation already in the course of that year. Perhaps there was a reference to the ingathering of the tribes of Israel in the now lost end of the first column.⁸³

Indeed, this is the only conclusion possible if one is to see any cohesiveness between cols. 1 and 2. Flusser, on the basis of Yadin's understanding that the six years of המלחמה in 2:9 meant the fighting of the war described in col. 1, was left with only a single year during which the other tribes could return to the land: the seventh year, or in other words, the first sabbatical year (שנת השמטה) of the forty year war. While it is certain that M is not primarily concerned with practicalities, the question remains: how can the three tribes recuperating from a violent war suddenly accommodate and assimilate the return of thousands when the land is in its sabbatical rest? Even on an ideological level, there seems to be some kind of contradiction between the land resting and what needs to be done in order to receive and assimilate the exiled.⁸⁴ More probable is the

⁸³ Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 153.

⁸⁴ It is for similar ideological reasons concerning the sabbatical year that Flusser preferred not to suggest that the seventh "round" (גורל) took place during the seventh year (Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 153-54).

scenario based on understanding תערוך המלחמה as six years of preparations after the end of the short War against the Kittim, a period during which the rest of the tribes are expected and enabled to return to the Land of Israel and join in the preparations. Accordingly, all the tribes will have already been reunited in the land and will be able to worship in the Jerusalem temple by the very beginning of the first sabbatical year. This is in fact what is implied in 1QM 2:4, where instructions are given for the people's role in the temple service "for all the days of the year" (לכול ימי השנה), that year being the "appointed time of the year of remission" (במועד שנת השמטה - 2:6). Thus, all twelve tribes are to be present right from the onset of the sabbatical year, implying that their return cannot take place during that year, but that it must happen prior to it. This is only possible if the first stage of the war does not last the entire preceding six years as assumed by Yadin and Flusser. This is yet another piece of evidence favoring reading תערוך המלחמה as meaning "to prepare for war" rather than "to wage war." It is during these initial six years that the final restoration of all the tribes of Israel will take place.⁸⁵

One of M's recensions, 4Q491, preserves text not paralleled in our extant copy of M. One such passage is relevant to the current discussion (frg. 16):⁸⁶

]ת[1
]ובין כול העדה א[2
ע]ם קודשו ממלכות כו[הנים	3
יקב]צו כול ישראל ירו[שלי]ם[4
ה[ורוממו את גבורות]	5

1]t [
2]and between the entire congregation a [
3]his holy [peo]ple, a kingdom of pr[iests
4]all Israel will [gath]er (in) Jeru[sale]m
5]h and they will exalt the mighty deeds of[

Of particular interest is line 4, which, if the partial reading and the reconstruction which is dependent upon it can be trusted, refers to a

⁸⁵ Thus, should one think of each seven years as a cycle, the first cycle in the eschatological war is comprised of the War against the Kittim *and* the return of the exiles.

⁸⁶ Transcription from Duhaime, "War Scroll," 162.

gathering of all Israel in Jerusalem. Unfortunately, not enough of the fragment has survived to decipher its broader context. Duhaime has tentatively suggested that it relates to actions to be performed after the victory, relating it to 1QM 3:10–11.⁸⁷ While this is not impossible, it must nevertheless be noted that in col. 3, it is not a matter of gathering in Jerusalem, but of going to Jerusalem. While the difference may seem slight, it may nonetheless be significant. Related to this is the fragment's emphasis on the "entire congregation" (line 2) and "all Israel" (line 4), an emphasis which does not seem relevant to the army's return to Jerusalem after victory. The mention of the nation being a "kingdom of priests" (line 3) is also out of character with the instructions given for the battle field in M. However, all aspects of the fragment's contents fit well with what is implicit in col. 2 of M: a renewal of temple worship by the Sons of Light, accompanied by the return of the exiles from all the tribes of Israel, after which all segments of the population participate in the temple rituals. While it cannot be proven that 4Q491 frg. 16 is relating specifically to the events of 1QM 2, it is important to note that in no way can it be reconciled with the War against the Kittim as described in col. 1.⁸⁸

The restoration of Israel's tribes and their return to Jerusalem is discussed in at least one other Qumran text, commonly known as the *Florilegium* (4Q177), but at times also as 4QMidEschat^B.⁸⁹ This sectarian composition is dated to the first half of the first century BCE.⁹⁰ The text, which contains a third of all references to the "end of days" (אֶחָרִית הַיָּמִים) found in Qumran's extant library, is

⁸⁷ Duhaime, "War Scroll," 163, n. 23.

⁸⁸ Hanan Eshel (personal communication) suggested that maybe 4Q491 frg. 16 preserves that which is no longer extant at the bottom of 1QM 1, describing the transition from the War against the Kittim to the War of the Divisions during which the return of the exiles takes place.

⁸⁹ Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4. I*, 67–74; Strugnell, "Notes," 236–48; Annette Steudel, "4QMidrEschat: « A Midrash on Eschatology » (4Q174 + 4Q177)," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11,2 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 531–41; Annette Steudel, *Der Midrash zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})*, STDJ 13 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 56–124.

⁹⁰ Steudel, *Midrash zur Eschatologie*, 202.

undoubtedly eschatological in nature.⁹¹ Of particular interest are the concluding lines of its col. 11 (frgs. 12–13 i:10–11):⁹²

[מלאך אמתו יעזור לכול בני אור מיד בליעל] 7
 [] 8
 [] 9
 [] 10
 [] 11

- 7 []his angel of truth will help all the Sons of Light from the hand of Belial
 8 []to scatter [them] in a dry and desolate land. It is the time of affliction that *m*[
 9 []always. The righ[teou]s will flee and the great hand of God (will be) with them to help them from all the spirit[s] of [
 10 [and fe]arers of God will sanctify his name and they will come to Zion with gladness and (to) Jerusalem[
 11 [Be]l[ia] and all the people of his lot, and [] for ever, and all the Sons of L[ight] will be gathered[

There are several parallels with the first stage of the eschatological war as presented in col. 1 of M: the primary opponent is Belial (line 7; 1QM 1:1); the Sons of Light are scattered “in a dry and desolate land” (line 8), reminiscent of their being “exiles of the wilderness” (1QM 1:2); it is a “time of affliction” (עת ענות - line 8) or a “time of tribulation” (עת צרה - 1QM 1:11–12); “the great hand of God” (יד אל הגדולה) will intervene (line 9; 1QM 1:14). In *Florilegium*, two events are subsequently described: first, the Sons of Light are to enter Jerusalem with gladness (line 10), and second, they are to be gathered (line 11). With respect to the first, it is probably reflected in M with the phrase “and after the war they will go up from there” (ואחר המשם - 1QM 1:3). This is further confirmed in the first lines of col. 2 which deal with their worship in the temple, obviously implying their presence in Jerusalem, and that they have left their encampment in the “wilderness of Jerusalem” from where the first stage of the war was launched (1QM 1:3).

⁹¹ Steudel, *Midrash zur Eschatologie*, 161.

⁹² Transcriptions for 4Q174 and 4Q177 are from Parry and Tov, *Exegetical Texts*, unless footnoted otherwise. All translations are mine unless stated otherwise.

⁹³ Following Strugnell’s reading (“Notes,” 246), which was also followed by Horgan (*Midrash zur Eschatologie*, 74).

A problem with properly understanding the second event, that of their being gathered, is that the end of the line is missing, so that it is impossible to determine the nature of this gathering or its purpose. Some help may come from a similar idea found in the opening line of Sa: “This is the rule for the entire congregation of Israel in the end of days when they are gathered [into the *Yahad*...]” (וזה הסרך לכול) ... ליחד] <א>ספם] ליחד... 1:1).⁹⁴ While it remains possible that these two references relate to separate incidents, they are nevertheless unique in that they are the only two in the Qumran corpus dealing with some kind of gathering (אסף) of the Sons of Light. Additionally, in both texts the event is still in the future. While there is no inherent reason to restrict these texts to meaning only a return from exile, the idea should not be excluded as part of the broader picture implied by the use of the verb אסף.⁹⁵ The *War Scroll* may be providing support that it is indeed implied, for, as we have seen, one of the differences between the first two stages of the war are its participants, the latter requiring an actual return from exile. Should this be the case, it is interesting to note that *Florilegium* lists the entrance into Jerusalem before the ingathering, just as in M.

Among the non-sectarian texts at Qumran, the same idea of Jerusalem needing to be restored and the exiles gathered back to it can be found in the *Animal Apocalypse*, a vision which surveys both biblical and post-biblical history using animals to represent various personalities and their actions (*1 Enoch* 85–90).⁹⁶ In this composition, possibly dating to as early as the third century BCE,⁹⁷ history comes

⁹⁴ This reconstruction might be bolstered by 4Qpap cryptA Serekh ha-Edah^s (4Q249g) in which the opening line has been read as “[when they be]gather[ed] to the Y[ahad]” (בה]אסף]ם [ג]י[הד] - frgs. 1-2:1; see Steven J. Pfann, “249g. 4Qpap CryptA Serekh Ha-Edah^s,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, Stephen J. Pfann, et al., DJD XXXVI [Oxford: Clarendon, 2000], 566). However, the extreme fragmentary state of preservation of this text limits its usefulness; see page 354 note 87. On the special relationship between Sa and M, see Chapter 6.

⁹⁵ Such as in Ezek 11:17.

⁹⁶ On the attestation of the *Animal Apocalypse* at Qumran, see Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 41–47, 204–6, 222–25, 238–45.

⁹⁷ For the arguments in favor of such an early date of the bulk of the *Animal Apocalypse*, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Books*

to a end when God builds a new Jerusalem (90:29) and gathers all the “sheep,” meaning the Jews, who have been dispersed (90:33):⁹⁸

- ²⁹ I went on seeing until the Lord of the sheep brought about a new house, greater and loftier than the first one, and set it up in the first location which had been covered up - all its pillars were new, the columns new; and the ornaments new as well as greater than those of the first, (that is) the old (house) which was gone. All the sheep were in it...
- ³² Those sheep were all snow white, and their wool considerable and clean.
- ³³ All those which have been destroyed or dispersed, and all the beasts of the field and the birds of the sky were gathered together in that house; and the Lord of the sheep rejoiced with great joy because they had all become gentle and returned to his house.

As in *M* and *Florilegium*, the restoration of Jerusalem takes place prior to the ingathering of the exiled. Also significant is that these events take place after an eschatological war between Israel and its enemies, with its conclusion being described in vv. 18–19:

- ¹⁸ I kept seeing till the Lord of the sheep came unto them and took in his hand the rod of his wrath and smote the earth; and all the beasts and all the birds of the heaven fell down from the midst of those sheep and were swallowed up in the earth, and it was covered upon them.
- ¹⁹ Then I saw that a great sword was given to the sheep; and the sheep proceeded against all the beasts of the field in order to kill them; and all the beasts and birds of heaven fled from before their face.

of *1 Enoch*, Chapters 1–36; 81–108, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 361. However, if one does not see 90:13–18 as containing late interpolations, the date of the *Animal Apocalypse* has also been dated to the 60’s of the second century BCE (see James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16 [Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984], 161–63).

⁹⁸ All translations of *1 Enoch* are taken from E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch (Second Century B.C. –First Century A.D.),” in *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 5–89.

Thus, also in the *Animal Apocalypse* do we have the chronology of an eschatological war followed by the restoration of Jerusalem and an ingathering of the exiles.

Another aspect of the eschatological war in the *Animal Apocalypse* is particularly noteworthy: it is carried out in two stages. The first is one which is won by God himself (the “Lord of the sheep”) with his “rod,” followed by a second during the course of which the Israelites themselves (the “sheep”) go out to war with a sword that is given to them. George Nickelsburg summarized these verses in the following way: “The present text appears to envision the participation of the righteous in militant judgmental action against a broader contingent of the Gentiles than those with whom they had been in immediate conflict.”⁹⁹ This is almost the exact scenario found in M. There we have seen that col. 1 describes an eschatological war that is primarily against Israel’s enemies in and around the Land of Israel, and that this first stage is won only because of God’s intervention in the seventh round (1QM 1:14). It is then followed by a second stage in which his people march out to war against the rest of the world (1QM 2:6–14). There is one significant difference, however. In the *Animal Apocalypse*, Jerusalem’s restoration and the ingathering of the exiles takes place after both stages of the war, while in M, these two events take place in between the two stages. This difference notwithstanding, both texts portray an eschatological scenario comprised of a final conflict, the restoration of Jerusalem and its temple, followed by the ingathering of the exiles.

Outside of Qumran, the most striking parallel to these ideas is found in the *Psalms of Solomon*. This collection of pseudepigraphic psalms is thought to have been composed by a sectarian group residing in Jerusalem in the 60’s of the first century BCE.¹⁰⁰ Of particular interest is Ps 17. After an introduction, the author summarizes recent history, the main point of which is that Jerusalem is under foreign rule (vv. 11–20). In spite of the fact that the foreign rule in question

⁹⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 401.

¹⁰⁰ Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*, 211.

is much later and different than in M,¹⁰¹ elements of the setting are nonetheless strikingly similar to that which is found in M (vv. 17–18):¹⁰²

¹⁷ They wandered in deserts to save their souls from evil, and their saved soul was precious in the eyes of those who lived abroad.

¹⁸ They were scattered over the whole earth by lawless men.

Immediately striking is the mention of the faithful being in the desert, reminiscent of the Sons of Light who are “exiles of the wilderness” (1QM 1:2). Also interesting is the highlighting of the relationship of respect between those outside the Land of Israel, and those in the land who have kept themselves pure. If such was also the case in the period during which M was composed, it is all the more understandable why after the initial victory of the Sons of Light and their taking control of Jerusalem, one would expect a massive return of the Jews to the land.

Parallels also exist with respect to the messianic age (vv. 21–46). The role of this messiah is summarized in vv. 22–26:

²² And gird him with strength to shatter in pieces unrighteous rulers, to purge Jerusalem from nations that trample her down in destruction.

²³ In wisdom of righteousness, to drive out sinners from the inheritance, to smash the arrogance of the sinner like a potter’s wheel

²⁴ So that he should shatter all their substance with an iron rod, [and] should destroy the lawless nations by the word of his mouth,

²⁵ So that at this threat nations should flee from his presence, and he should reprove sinners with the thoughts of their hearts.

²⁶ And he shall gather a holy people, whom he shall lead in righteousness, and he shall judge the tribes of the people that have been sanctified by the Lord his God.

The chronology of events is clear: to get rid of evil Jewish rulers and their Gentile supporters, to purge the land of the unfaithful and foreigners, to gather the exiles so as to constitute a holy nation entirely

¹⁰¹ The foreign rule in question is Roman, the result of Pompey’s conquest (Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*, 135–39).

¹⁰² All translations are from Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*.

faithful to their God, and finally to sit as judge. Here again it is interesting to note that the purging of Jerusalem from its evil leaders precedes the expected return from exile of Israel's tribes.¹⁰³

While the above texts are not all contemporaneous, they reveal that throughout the Second Temple Period, there existed among some Jewish circles similar expectations about the end of days: it is to include a time of suffering and affliction of the faithful, at times described as being a sojourn in the desert; an eschatological war in which God will intervene miraculously by his "hand" or his "rod"; the deliverance of Jerusalem from the unfaithful and foreign elements which rule in it; and finally, the ingathering of the faithful. The *War Scroll*, by describing temple practice at the beginning of col. 2, complete with participation of all 12 tribes, reveals that it too shares the same basic expectations as in these other texts. While adopting the two-stage scenario for the eschatological war as in the *Animal Apocalypse*, it nevertheless modifies the sequence, putting Jerusalem's restoration and the ingathering of the exile in between the two stages, rather than after them.

4.1. *Temple worship and the Sons of Light*

Initially, it could appear that a description of temple worship as at the beginning of col. 2 is unrelated to a document dealing with the specifics of carrying out an eschatological war. It certainly does not seem to be a logical continuation of what is described in col. 1, and this has helped strengthen the notion that the two columns were initially unrelated and only artificially joined together.¹⁰⁴ We have already seen that it implies the Sons of Light's capture of Jerusalem

¹⁰³ See also the extra hymn of praise in the Hebrew manuscript of Ben Sirah at 51:12 which praises God for being the redeemer of his people and, in the next verse, for being the gatherer of his people. On the authenticity of this psalm in Ben Sirah and the possibility that it may have been composed at Qumran, see Alexander Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach; a Text-Critical and Historical Study* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966), 78–105; Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sirah*, AB 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 568–71.

¹⁰⁴ This is most clearly seen in Davies' evaluation of the composition of M (*IQM*, 20–21, 113–21).

during the first stage of the war, as well as the return of Israel's exiles. It may well be that the former is in large part the cause of the latter. From col. 1 we were able to deduce that until the beginning of the eschatological war, it is the "violators of the covenant" who rule in Jerusalem and over its temple. From the rest of the Qumran sectarian scrolls we know that the community had rejected temple practice of its day, separating themselves from it until such a time when rightful worship, as they considered it, could be restored.¹⁰⁵ Now, however, after the "day of their war against the Kittim," with Jerusalem and the temple in the hands of the Sons of Light, proper ritual can finally be restored. It is the sign *par excellence* that the exile, both spiritual and physical, has truly ended. As Hindy Najman has pointed out:

The final redemption will occur only at the point where two different understandings of redemption merge: when exile is overcome not only through the recovery of intimacy with the divine..., but also through the reconstitution of the temple in accordance with the correct understanding of the law, [and] appropriate sacrifice...¹⁰⁶

With the Sons of Light's victory in the War against the Kittim, Jerusalem is no longer in spiritual exile. This point is crucial for properly understanding M and the eschatological war it describes.

Simply put, the renewal of temple worship, with all of its implications, is a prerequisite for beginning the second stage of the war, the War of the Divisions. It is a war that is intended only for that time when restoration has *already* taken place. This was discerned by Licht who saw in M a text which was not focused on the beginning or the end of God's deliverance, but with that which is to take place

¹⁰⁵ For a collection of references preserving the various complaints the sect had about the Jerusalem temple and its leadership, see Maier, "Temple," 923–24. Among the extensive literature on the matter, see Bertil E. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament; a Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*, SNTSMS 1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), 16–46; Daniel R. Schwartz, "The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium," *RevQ* 10 (1979): 83–91; Davies, "Ideology of the Temple," 287–301; Devorah Dimant, "לאור השקפות כת" (צ' חנוך החבשי פה-צ) "מדבר יהודה *Shnaton* 5–6 (1982): 177–93.

¹⁰⁶ Najman, "Concept of Wilderness," 104.

in the meanwhile, the process itself.¹⁰⁷ Proper temple practice is the background against which this War of the Divisions must be carried out. It is a kind of spiritual sign that allows for the initial practicalities of the war to be carried out. The lack of sense division between the description of temple service and of the conscription in M (as in 4Q496)¹⁰⁸ is a clue as to the intimate connection between the two. Without proper temple practice, even conscription cannot happen.

Further evidence of this close relationship between the eschatological war, the temple, and conscription for war can be found in 4Q491, one of M's recensions. Frgs. 1–3:6–10 is a rule for when the army is encamped (סרך בחנותמה).¹⁰⁹ Before going out to war, the soldiers are to pass before a delegation made up of priests, Levites, and lay leaders, somewhere “towards the house of mee[ting]” (אל בית מו[ע]ד - line 9). Obviously then, this connection between the temple and the army was an integral aspect of the war.

4.2. Interpreting IQM 2:1–6a

With respect to the description of temple ritual, we are fortunate to have several parallel texts (4Q471, 4Q494, 4Q496). Because of the textual variants between them, they have been used as a window into the compositional history of M. As such, it is necessary to review the evidence. Before doing so, however, a detailed examination of the relevant lines in col. 2 of M is in order:

אבות העדה שנים וחמישים ואת ראשי הכוהנים יסרוכו אחר כוהן הראש	1
ומשנהו ראשים שנים עשר להיות משרתים	
בתמיד לפני אל וראשי המשמרות ששה ועשרים במשמרותם ישרתו ואחריהם	2
ראשי הלויים לשרת תמיד שנים עשר אחד	
לשבת וראשי משמרותם איש במעמדו ישרתו וראשי השבטים ואבות העדה	3
אחריהם להתיצב תמיד בשערי המקדש	

¹⁰⁷ Licht, “מטעת עולם,” 64.

¹⁰⁸ See below, page 221.

¹⁰⁹ It has been suggested that these lines relate to IQM 7:3–7 (Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 142). Interestingly, IQM 7 relates to the War of the Divisions, not to the War against the Kittim (see Chapter 5).

וראשי משמרותם עם פקודיהם יתיצבו למועדיהם לחודשים ולשבתות ולכול ⁴
 ימי השנה מבן חמישים שנה ומעלה
 אלה יתיצבו אל העולות ועל הזבחים לערוך מקטרת ניחוח לרצון אל לכפר ⁵
 בעד כול עדתו להדשן לפניו תמיד
 בשולחן כבוד את כול אלה יסרוכו במועד שנת השמטה ⁶

- ¹ fathers' (houses) of the congregation, fifty two. They shall arrange the head priests behind the Head Priest and his deputy, twelve chiefs [lit. "heads"] to be serving
- ² always¹¹⁰ before God, with twenty six heads of courses (who) shall serve in their courses. After them, the heads of the Levites (are) to serve continuously, twelve (of them), one
- ³ per tribe with the heads of their courses (who) shall serve, each in his position. The heads of the tribes and of the fathers' (houses) of the congregation (will be) behind them, to take position continuously at the gates of the temple,
- ⁴ with the heads of their courses and their officers (who) shall take position for all the appointed times, the new moons, the Sabbaths, and all the days of the year, from the age of fifty and over.
- ⁵ These will take position at the holocausts and at the sacrifices, to prepare soothing incense for God's pleasure, in order to atone on behalf of his entire congregation, and to grow fat before him continuously
- ⁶ at the table of honor. All these they will arrange at the appointed time of the year of remittance.

There are two initial ambiguities in the opening line of col. 2. First is the mention of the "fathers of the congregation" (אבות העדה) followed by the number 52. This expression, which in its entirety is "heads of the fathers' (houses) of the congregations" (ראשי אבות) ¹¹¹ is borrowed from Num 31:26, where it refers to lay leaders. Most commentators, following Yadin, ¹¹² agree that these belong to the end of a sentence begun in the non-extant bottom portion of col. 1, especially since it makes good sense to begin a new sentence immediately after that phrase. An additional question is whether or not the 52 designate only the heads of the fathers' houses of the con-

¹¹⁰ Alternatively, "at the *Tamid* (offering)."

¹¹¹ So it is preserved in its entirety in 1QSa 1:23–25, 1QM 2:3, 7; 3:4. The only place it is not so is in 4QMysteries^a (4Q299 frg. 76:3).

¹¹² Yadin, מגילת מלהמת בני אור בבני חושך, 265.

gregation,¹¹³ or is a total for a list of people enumerated previously, the last one being the heads of the fathers' houses of the congregation. The second ambiguity pertains to who is the subject of the arranging (יטרוכו) being done. It would be most natural to assume that it is the immediate precedent, that of the heads of the fathers' houses of the congregation. However, they are mentioned again in line 3, and are most likely included in the summary statement in line 6, implying that they too are being arranged. Consequently, most assume that the verb is impersonal.¹¹⁴

4.2.1. *Yadin's interpretation*

Ignoring these two issues for the moment, it becomes clear that the first four lines follow a distinct pattern. First comes the "heads of..." (ראשי - meaning 'leaders') a certain group followed by the heads of that group's "courses" (משמרות - also known as 'divisions'). Thus in lines 1–2 we have the heads of the priests followed by the heads of their courses. In lines 2–3, we have the heads of the Levites and the heads of their courses. In lines 3–4 we have the heads of the tribes¹¹⁵ and the heads of their courses. There is therefore a tripartite division of Israel into priests, Levites, and laymen, listing for each their heads and the heads of their divisions. Consequently, as Table 10 shows, it is possible to determine who are the participants in the temple cult. They include:

¹¹³ This view is followed by most scholars, as pointed out by Jongeling (*Rouleau de la Guerre*, 79).

¹¹⁴ An exception is Dupont-Sommer who suggests that the subject is "the heads of the priests" (ואת ראשי הכוהנים) - 2:1; see "'Règlement de la guerre des fils de lumière': Traductions et notes," *RHR* 148 [1955]: 34; *Essene Writings*, 172). Note as well that Chaim Rabin's translation of Yadin is quite vague, thereby allowing for the heads of the priests to be the subject of the verb rather than its object (*The Scroll of the War*, 262). However, since Yadin himself offers no commentary on this matter, it may not have been what he intended. In any case, such a view has been effectively refuted by Carmignac (*Règle de la Guerre*, 24–25).

¹¹⁵ Together with the heads of the fathers' houses of the congregation.

TABLE 10: TEMPLE RITUAL ACCORDING TO IQM 2									
Scroll data & Yadin's view					Eshel's view				
	Number	Role		When		Group	When		
		Number	Role	When	When				
A. Priests			Offering the <i>Tamid</i> (בתמיד)	Permanently	Permanently	Heads of the fathers' families of the congregation	Permanently		
1. Head Priest	1		Always (תמיד)	Permanently	Permanently				
2. Head Priest's deputy	1			Permanently	Permanently				
3. Heads of priests	12			Rotation	Permanently				
4. Heads of the (priestly) courses	26				Rotation				
B. Levites			serving (לשרת)	Permanently	Rotation	The <i>Ma'amad</i>	Rotation		
1. Head of Levites	12								
2. Head of the (levitical) courses	[26]		take position (להתיצב)	Rotation	Permanently				
C. Laity									
1. Heads of tribes	[12]			Permanently	Permanently				
2. Heds of the fathers('s houses)	[52?]			Permanently	Permanently				
3. Heads of the (tribal) courses	[26]			Rotation	Rotation				
4. Their officers	?			Rotation	Rotation				
TOTALS:	52+[64]+[52?]+?								

Unfortunately, the scroll does not give the numbers of all the people it lists. For some, they can be reconstructed, such as the number of the heads of tribes, assuming there is only one per tribe as for the priests and the Levites. Similarly with the heads of courses: since there are 26 priestly courses, it can be assumed that there are also 26 courses for the Levites and the laity. Should the 52 at the beginning of the first line be of the heads of the fathers' houses of the congregation only, then it could be added as well, so that the reconstructed total would be 116 rather than 64, for a minimum overall total of 168 rather than 116.¹¹⁶ Still, there is no way of knowing how many "officers"¹¹⁷ there were with the chief of courses for the laity.

Yadin has pointed out that inherent in this structure is the reference to those of all three categories who are expected to serve "continuously" at the temple, in contrast to those who are to serve in rotation.¹¹⁸ Thus, the High Priest¹¹⁹ and his deputy, the twelve heads of the priests, and twelve heads of the Levites, the heads of the tribes and the heads of the fathers' houses of the congregation are to serve continuously. In contrast, the chief of the priestly, Levitical, and lay courses, together with the latter's officers, are to serve in rotation.

Immediately thereafter is line 5: "these will take position..." (אלה ...יתיצבו). Scholars have debated whether this refers to just the laymen mentioned immediately before or to some combination of several of the aforementioned groups.¹²⁰ The confusion stems from

¹¹⁶ For an alternate perspective, see below, page 228.

¹¹⁷ For the translation of פקודיהם as "their officers," see Davies, *IQM*, 27, n. 8.

¹¹⁸ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 202.

¹¹⁹ The "Head Priest" (כֹּהֵן הַרִּאשׁוֹן) is the expression used at Qumran to designate the High Priest (see Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, 462). The usual designation for the High Priest (הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל) is found only in the *Copper Scroll* and the *Temple Scroll*. See also the discussion in Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 164–71 and Yshai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 260–63, both of which point out that such a title implies a High Priest for the eschatological period.

¹²⁰ For example, Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 264), Jongeling (*Rouleau de la Guerre*, 85), and Ibba (*Rotolo della Guerra*, 81) thought it referred to all three groups; Carmignac (*Règle de la Guerre*, 30) to the priests and Levites only; Eshels ("4Q471 Fragment 1 and *Ma'amadot* in the War Scroll," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, ed. Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, *STDJ* 11,2 [Leiden: Brill, 1992], 618) to the Levites and the laymen; and Davies (*IQM*, 27) to the

the fact that line 5 lists the various holidays during which one would expect the priests and the Levites to be serving in the temple, and not just the laymen, the group mentioned just prior to the pronoun. I suggest the solution can be found in the author's precise verb usage, highlighting yet another division among all those at the temple. Both the priests and the Levites are said to "serve" (לשרת) during the sacrifices, implying that both groups have some intimate role in the actual process of sacrificing. The laymen, on the other hand, are only to "take position" (להתיצב), suggesting that they are passive observers to the sacrificial process. Therefore, there seems to be a distinction made between the priests and the Levites on the one hand, and the laymen on the other. The confusion of line 5 is that those who are standing appear to be the ones sacrificing.

There are two possible ways of reconciling the apparent contradiction. First, is to understand that "these" (אלה) refers to all three groups, and that the author could not use the verb "to serve" (לשרת), since not all three groups participate in the actual sacrificing. Nevertheless, all three groups are present, or in their position, when the sacrifices are being offered, so that the use of the verb $\sqrt{\text{יצב}}$ is appropriate for designating all three. Alternatively, the author may have had only the laymen in mind, and was emphasizing that while it is expected for priests and Levites to be present during the times of sacrifices at the temple, the laymen must also be in attendance, although not physically participating in the act of sacrificing itself. In this case, line 5 would be emphasizing that without the laity's presence, the sacrifices are not to take place. If one chooses to see the "these" (אלה) of line 5 has being a smaller or more restrained group than the "all these" (כול אלה) in line 6, then this second interpretation is preferable. But this last distinction is slight, and may not have been intended by the author. It seems to me that line 5 is a kind of summary statement, synthesizing what had been instructed up until that point. It is followed by a concluding statement in line 6 "All these they shall arrange..." (כול אלה יסרוכו...), framing the entire section had begun in line 1 with "They shall arrange..." (יסרוכו).

laymen only.

Finally, there is yet another potential distinction made by the author. In line 1, the priests are to be “serving always” (משרתים בתמיד - lines 1–2). Yet because of the preposition *bet* (ב) before the adverb “always,” it may be that the reference is rather to the *Tamid* offering to be offered daily every morning and evening (cf. Num 28:10ff).¹²¹ The translation would then read “serving in (offering) the *Tamid*.” In contrast, the Levites are to “serve always” (לשרת תמיד - 2:2) without that precise mention of the *Tamid* offering. For its part, the laity is said to be “taking position at” (יתיצבו על) the holocausts and sacrifices, just in the same way that Balak was to stand by Balaam’s sacrifice (Num 23:3). In this way, the author of M is making a distinction between all three groups and their specific roles in offering the sacrifices. The High Priest and the heads of the priests are specifically responsible for the *Tamid* offering; the Levites are involved with all other aspects of the offerings, while the laity is to be sure to take position as the priests and Levites carry out their duties.

4.2.2. *The evidence from the Cave 4 material*

4.2.2.1. 4Q496

There are two copies of M which preserve portions of the description of temple cult: 4Q496 frgs. 5–7 and 4Q494. Fragment 7 of 4Q496 is badly damaged, yet if the Baillet’s reading is correct, the transition between the description of temple cult and the conscription of the army for the War of the Divisions is preserved, here too without any sense division between the two seemingly different topics. Fragments 5–6 continue with the description of the War of the Divisions according to the Table of Nations. Apart from these basic details, little more can be said about this text.

4.2.2.2. 4Q494

4Q494, on the other hand, is better preserved. Lines 3b–6 seem to reflect 1QM 2:1–2, although with one significant difference. While

¹²¹ van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 69; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 262–63; Davies, *1QM*, 27.

it is possible to reconstruct lines 3 to 5 on the basis of 1QM 2:1–2, line 6 can only be reconstructed by either omitting a portion of the M text, or by making line 5 some 20 letters longer than line 4.¹²² An alternate solution is to assume a *vacat* after line 5.¹²³ Baillet's reconstruction suggests that 4Q494 fails to mention the "courses of the Levites" (משמרות הלויים) after the "heads of the Levites" (ראשי הלויים - contra 1QM 2:2–3). As we shall see shortly, this situation would be analogous to the one in 4Q471, where the Levites are mentioned, but where there is no room to reconstruct their "courses." If on the other hand one accepts the possibility that there was a *vacat* at the end of line 5, then 1QM 2:2–3 can be reconstructed in its entirety.¹²⁴ Also, lines 1–3 seem to be preserving portions of the non-extant portion at the bottom of 1QM 1. Unfortunately, little is preserved except for the general mention of priests and Levites (lines 2–3), heads (meaning leaders - line 2), courses (line 3), and possibly tribes (line 1). If one chooses to accept Baillet's reconstruction of line 3, then it may be that the courses of the laity, called here the "courses [of the heads of the fathers' (houses) of the congregation]" (ומשמרות [ראשי אבות העדה]), numbered 52 and not 26 as assumed above.

4.2.2.3. 4Q471

Another text which has been related to 1QM 2 is 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471 frg. 1).¹²⁵ The text itself is quite fragmentary, but several key words are preserved enabling the editors, Esther and Hanan Eshel, to suggest a likely reconstruction.¹²⁶

¹²² Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 54.

¹²³ Abegg, "War Scroll," 78.

¹²⁴ A solution which is preferable for reasons explained in note 144.

¹²⁵ Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "4Q471 and *Ma'amadot*," 611–20; Abegg, "Mistaken Identity," 136–47; Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "4QWar Scroll-Like Text B," 439–45; "Recensions," 351–63.

¹²⁶ Both the transcription and the translation is taken from Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "4QWar Scroll-Like Text B," 442–43. Note that Abegg does not agree with the link between 4Q471 frg. 1 and 1QM 2; instead he has suggested linking it to the *Temple Scroll* ("Mistaken Identity," 136–47). While his arguments for linking 4Q471 to the *Temple Scroll* are not entirely convincing, some of the points he raises about the Eshels' reconstruction have merit. Nevertheless, in the absence of a better suggestion, I shall follow the Eshels' reconstruction, although I will be

הַ מִּכָּל אִישׁ	1
כֹּל אִישׁ מֵאֶחָיו מִבְּנֵי	2
[אהרון ואת ראשי הכהנים יסרוכ]ו והיו עמו תמיד וש[רתו]	3
[לפניו וראשים שנים עשר ל]כול שבט ושב[ט] אִישׁ	4
[אחד וראשי המשמרות ששה ועש[רים ומן] ה[ל]וים שנים	5
[עשר אחד לכול שבט ושב[ט] וישר[תו] לפניו] תמיד כ[ו]ל	6
[הימים ויבחרו להם אנשי חיל ל]מען יהיו מלמדי ה[רב]	7
ומלחמ[ת] מחלקו[תם]	8
מלח[מה]	9

- 1]from all tha[t
 2]each man from his brothers from the sons of[Aaron]
 3 [and the chiefs of the priests,] they [shall dispose] and will be
 continually with him, and they will s[erve]
 4 [before him. And (there shall be) twelve leaders, one for] each
 trib[e,]
 5 [And the chiefs of the courses twen]ty-[six] and twe[lve]
 Levites,
 6 [one to each tribe. They shall] serve continually [before Hi]m
 all
 7 [the days. They shall choose for them warriors in] order to
 have them sw[ord]-trained
 8 [to enter the army And the w]ar of [their] divisio[n]s
 9 wa[r]

Based on this reconstruction, the Eshels have concluded that in contrast to M this text mentions only 12 heads of the priests, 26 heads of the priestly courses and 12 Levites, and concluded that 4Q471 is probably a source for M.¹²⁷

The reconstruction of line 3, however, poses a difficulty. The suggested reading is that the heads of the priests are to dispose in order to be “with him” always and to serve “before him,” “him” implying God.¹²⁸ However, never in the Bible nor in the Qumran

careful to draw conclusions from the extant text first, before considering what may be implied from the reconstruction as a whole.

¹²⁷ Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “Recensions,” 360 For an alternate possibility, see below, note 39 on page 379.

¹²⁸ More precisely, they specifically assumed their reconstructed “before Him” in line 4 to be a reference to God, while leaving the extant “with him” in line 3 ambiguous (see their translation in “Recensions,” 359). However, if “with him” in line 3 is not a reference to the same third masculine singular referent as in “before him,” they fail to discuss why it should be relating to a different individual, nor who

corpus are priests or Levites said to be with God while serving in the tabernacle or in the temple.¹²⁹ It seems likely, therefore, that a different referent was intended. If the subject of lines 1–5a is the priests, it may be more reasonable to assume that the referent of “with him” (עמו) is actually the High Priest, as we read in 1QM 2:1: “they will arrange the heads of the priests behind the Head Priest.”¹³⁰ This reading finds support in the rest of M. For example, in 1QM 13:1 we read “and his brothers the priests, and the Levites, and all the elders of the rule with him” (ואחיו ה[כ]וּהַנְּיִם וְהַלְוִיִּים וְכֹל זִקְנֵי הַסֵּרֶךְ) (עמו). Although the bottom of col. 12 is not preserved, it can still be determined that the referent of “with him” must be one of the priests. This is further confirmed by 1QM 15:4, a statement which is almost identical to the one in 13:1, where the referent is clearly the High Priest: “The Head Priest will stand, and his brothers the pr[ie]sts], the Levites, and all the men of the rule (together) with him” (ועמד כוהן) (הראש ואחיו ה[כ]וּהַנְּיִם וְהַלְוִיִּים וְכֹל אַנְשֵׁי הַסֵּרֶךְ עִמּוֹ). In light of the above, there is little doubt that the “with him” (עמו) in 4Q471 refers to the High Priest. Thus an alternate reconstruction for lines 2 and 3 could be something similar to the following:

] ²
 כֹּל אִישׁ מֵאַחֵיו מִבְּנֵי [³
 [אהרון ואחר כוהן הראש יסרוכ]ו והיו עמו תמיד וש[רתו]

- ²] each man from his brothers from the sons
³ [of Aaron. And behind the Head Priest they shall dispos]e.
 They will be with him continuously and shall s[erve]...

that other individual may be.

¹²⁹ In the Bible, it is almost always God who is ‘with’ man, not man ‘with’ God. An exception is Exod 34:28, where Moses is said to be with God while on the mountain. Note Neh 10:39 (E:38) which is in the context of temple worship: “and the priest, the son of Aaron, shall be with the Levites” (והיה הכהן בן אהרון עם הלויים).

¹³⁰ See Abegg, “Mistaken Identity,” 143, where this possibility is raised. However, Abegg then attempts to link 4Q471 to the *Temple Scroll* and “with him” to the king, rather than to a High Priest. In 1QM 2:1, the deputy accompanies the High Priest, but it is easily conceivable that he would not always be mentioned systematically.

From the extant text, the following can now be identified as having a role during temple cult: sons of Aaron (line 2),¹³¹ a High Priest (line 3, the referent of “with him”), 12 individuals, presumably leaders (literally “heads” according to the reconstruction), one for each tribe (line 4), and 12 Levites (line 5). The identity of the 12 individuals, of whom all we know is that there is one per tribe, is the least explicit. Are they priests, Levites, or lay people? From the context as well as comparison with M and 4Q494, I suggest that it is most consistent to understand them as being the heads of the priests. It is clear that in lines 2–3, priests are intended. In line 6, Levites are mentioned, apparently for the first time, and being 12 in number, it seems unlikely that the 12 listed before them would also be Levites. One is therefore left with either priests or laity. Obviously, it would be rather strange to have the laity listed in between the other two groups. In both M and 4Q494, the order is always priests, Levites, and laity. In addition, it may be that line 2 is an introductory statement, suggesting that the entire passage is dealing with the Sons of Aaron, namely priests and Levites. Furthermore, in M the 12 head priests are listed as coming after the heads of the priests. It is only natural that to expect the same in 4Q471 as well. For all these reasons, therefore, I would suggest reconstructing line 4 as follows: “[... and the heads of the priests (are) twelve, one for] each tribe...” (...וראשי הכהנים שנים עשר ל]כול שבט ושב[ט] איש [אחד...]). Thus it is most likely that 4Q471 has only two groups present at the temple during the sacrifices: priests (including the High Priest) and Levites.¹³² Lacking is any extant reference to the division of the Levites into their courses, as well as to all laity, although these are all found in M.¹³³

¹³¹ If one accepts that “with him” in line 3 is referring to the High Priest, then “his brothers” in line 2 must by definitions be “sons of [Aaron].” See 1QM 13:1 and 15:4 mentioned earlier as parallels, and also 1QSa 2:12–13 as reconstructed by Licht (מגילת הסרטים, 269).

¹³² Assuming that Eshels’ reconstruction of line 5 is correct, meaning that there are 26 heads of priestly courses listed, then the total number of individuals comes to 51.

¹³³ As the reconstruction shows, it is possible that the heads of the priestly courses were mentioned in line 5. At this point, however, I wish to restrict my observations to the extant text only. There is also the possibility that the 12 Levites

The “courses” in question was a way of dividing up the priests, Levites, and the laity into divisions which served at the temple in rotation, a week at a time.¹³⁴ According to rabbinical tradition, all three groups were divided into such divisions, called “courses” (משמרות),¹³⁵ each course serving its week at the temple on behalf of the entire nation. This representational cross-section of the people which served at the temple was called the *ma’amad* (מעמד).¹³⁶ This system resolved two problems. The first was the practical impossibility of physically having all the priests and Levites fulfilling their religious responsibilities all at the same time at the temple. The second was a way of resolving the question of how to offer the *Tamid* offering on behalf of all Israelites even though all cannot be present at the temple.¹³⁷ While the *ma’amad* can refer to all three sections of the population present at the temple service,¹³⁸ its meaning is often restricted to designate the laity only.¹³⁹

According to the Eshels’ reconstruction of 4Q471, the heads of the priestly courses would be mentioned (line 5), but not the heads of the Levitical courses, since there is no room to include them in line 6. Eshels’ explanation for this incongruity between the priests and the Levites is that the Levitical courses were part of the *ma’amad*,

were not permanently at the sacrifices, but part of the “courses.” The phrase “...and from[the]Levites, tve[lve]” (ומן[ה]לויים שנים [עשר]) - lines 5–6) implies that these Levites are part of the priestly courses mentioned at the beginning of line 5. If this were the case, it would be different than in M where there are “heads of courses” in addition to 12 Levites (1QM 2:2–3), the latter serving permanently and the former in rotation (see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 202).

¹³⁴ See 1 Chr 23-26; Neh 12; *y Ta’an*. 4:2 68a. For a discussion of the priestly courses, see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, vol. 2, new revised ed., ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 245–50.

¹³⁵ In the Bible, these are at times referred to as מזלקות (as in 2 Chr 23:4–8).

¹³⁶ Schürer, *History*, 292–93.

¹³⁷ See also *y. Ta’an*. 4:2, 67d and *y. Pesah* 4:1, 30b

¹³⁸ Even all the priests and Levites of a particular course could not all be present at the temple, so that only a cross segment of each would actually fulfill the required temple duties on a given day (see D. Sperber, “Mishmarot and Ma’amadot,” in *EncJud*, vol. 12 [Jerusalem: Keter, 1971], 90–91).

¹³⁹ It is important to note that there is much confusion in the use of the two terms “courses” (משמרות) and “*ma’amad*” (מעמד) in rabbinical literature. See Hanoch Albek, *סדר מועד*, vol. 2 of *ששה סדרי משנה* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1952), 495–96.

which they suggest was an innovation to the temple service by a redactor of M.¹⁴⁰ In fact, the only mention of a *ma'amad* in M is in connection to the heads of the Levitical courses: they “shall serve, each in his position [*ma'amad*]” (אִישׁ בְּמַעְמָדוֹ יִשְׁרָתוּ) (2:3). Interestingly however, the *ma'amad* is not mentioned in connection to the laity, as would have been expected from Rabbinic literature, although it is the introduction of the laity into the temple ritual that brought about the institution of the *ma'amad*. Furthermore, it may well be that the term *ma'amad* at Qumran never has the same meaning as in Rabbinic literature, but that when it is connected to the Levites, it is simply a way to refer to their Levitical duties.¹⁴¹ If therefore the heads of the Levitical courses are not linked to the *ma'amad*, it is difficult to understand why 4Q471 would not list them, especially since the division of the Levites into courses dates back to the biblical period.¹⁴² One possibility may be due to their declining role towards the end of the Second Temple Period.¹⁴³

Whatever the case may be, the absence of the heads of the Levitical courses in 4Q471 is analogous to 4Q494 as reconstructed by Baillet. Yet there remains a vital difference: in Baillet's reconstruction of 4Q494, the laity is already included in the temple ritual. In other words, if 4Q494 does not include the heads of the Levitical courses, it already contains the institution of the *ma'amad*, even if not by name.¹⁴⁴ However, if one chooses to reconstruct 4Q494 with

¹⁴⁰ Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “4Q471 and *Ma'amadot*,” 618.

¹⁴¹ Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 260; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 28–29.

¹⁴² A mention of the Levitical courses has been reconstructed in Sa (2:1–2): “and the Levites, a[mong the divi]sion of his service” (והלוויים בתוך מחלקת עבד[ותו]) - translation and transcription from Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 32–33. See also his note 23 on page 33).

¹⁴³ For a summary of the conflict between priests and Levites during the late Second Temple Period, see Menahem Stern, “Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and Other Classes,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century - Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, Volume 2, ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern, CRINT (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 596–600.

¹⁴⁴ It is for this reason that I prefer reconstructing line 5 of 4Q494 as having a *vacat* at the end, so that line 6 begins by talking about the Levites and their roles, presumably about the permanent twelve Levites followed by the heads of their courses. In this way, the reconstruction of 4Q494 remains entirely consistent with 1QM 2, with the exception of the *vacat*, but it could conceivably be marking the

a *vacat* at the end of its line 5, then there is no longer any reason to assume that the heads of the Levitical courses were not mentioned. Consequently, the *ma'amad* is lacking only in 4Q471, but was always present in copies of M, even if not by name.

In light of the above, it is necessary to slightly revise the Eshels' suggested development in M's description of temple ritual. They had suggested three stages, the first which listed the 12 heads of the priests, the 26 heads of the priestly courses, and 12 Levites. The second stage saw the addition of the High Priest and his deputy for a total of 52, meaning those that make up the 52 fathers of the congregation mentioned at the beginning of 1QM 2:1. The third was the inclusion of the *ma'amad* with the Levitical heads of their courses and all the laity.¹⁴⁵ Since it is now clear that the High Priest is indeed implied in 4Q471, the Eshel's three stages now need to be slightly redefined:¹⁴⁶ first comes 4Q471 which does not include any of the laity, the heads of the Levitical courses, nor apparently the High Priest's deputy. This is adopted by M, modifying it only slightly with the addition of the High Priest's deputy, for a total of 52 individuals. The last stage is M's present text: to the original 52 priests and Levites have been added the heads of the Levitical courses and the laity.

4.2.3. *Eshels' view of 1QM 2 and its implications*

4.2.3.1. The heads of the fathers' families of the congregation

The Eshels suggested that the 52 mentioned at the beginning of 1QM 2 were comprised of the High Priest and his deputy, the 12 heads of the priests, the 26 heads of their courses, and 12 Levites.¹⁴⁷ Indeed, it is striking that all the numbers specifically given in 1QM 2 do indeed add up to 52. As I have pointed out above, this number must

transition from priest to Levites. Baillet's reconstruction not only forced him to omit some of 1QM 2's text, but also to introduce a variant at the beginning of the section dealing with the laity.

¹⁴⁵ Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "Recensions," 360.

¹⁴⁶ Personal communication with Hanan Eshel.

¹⁴⁷ Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "Recensions," 360. This had been formerly suggested by Karl Kuhn in "Beiträge zum Verständnis der Kriegerrolle von Qumrân," *TLZ* 1 (1956): 25.

also relate to what precedes it, namely, the heads of the fathers' houses of the congregation, or a group including them that adds up to a total of 52 individuals. Eshels' position appears as if it assumes that they are priestly and Levitical leaders only, and not lay leaders as in Num 31:26. Accordingly, the "heads of the father's families" would be of the priests and Levites only (see especially 1 Chr 24:6, 31; but also Exod 6:25, Josh 21:1, and *passim*). However, M is quite clear that it is the "heads of the fathers' (families) of the congregation," (emphasis mine) implying that it is not restricted to just priests and Levites, but refers to the entire nation (see Num 32:28; Neh 8:13). At times, the Bible also uses the designation "heads of the fathers' (families)" as a way to contrast these lay leaders from the priestly and Levitical leaders (2 Chr 19:8; 23:2; Ezra 1:5; 3:2).¹⁴⁸ Consequently, it is unlikely that the expression designates priests and Levites only.

In fact, the Eshels agree. For them, the 52 "heads of the fathers' families" listed in 2:1 are not all the "heads of the fathers' families," but only the priestly and Levitical ones. To these should be added the ones mentioned in line 3, who are unequivocally lay leaders. The implication is that both groups together, comprised of priests, Levites, and lay leaders, form as a whole the body responsible for the spiritual leadership of the congregation.¹⁴⁹ One immediate implication of this view is that the "heads of the fathers' families" in line 3 need not number 52 as assumed above. Although the scroll is completely silent on the matter, one should probably assume that it is a multiple of 12, to allow for equal representation of all Israel's tribes. Thus, in 4Q471, the "heads of the fathers' families" were only priests and Levites, totalling 52 individuals, in M they total 52 plus the lay "heads of the fathers' families," however many they may have been.¹⁵⁰ An immediate implication of such a view is that the 52

¹⁴⁸ See Carmignac, who suggests that the "heads of the fathers' families" refers to lay leadership only (*Règle de la Guerre*, 24).

¹⁴⁹ Personal communication with Hanan Eshel.

¹⁵⁰ Just because the High Priest's deputy is not preserved in the extant text of 4Q471 does not mean he was not included. Furthermore, even if he was not mentioned, I do not think that it carries any significance, as his presence could simply have been assumed. It may even be that he is mentioned by name in 1QM 2 simply because there the author is wanting to give a precise total count, something that does

mentioned in line 1 is not in any way related to the numbers of weeks in a solar calendar as has been widely assumed,¹⁵¹ but simply a coincidence. Finally, should the Eshels be correct, this would imply that the “heads of the fathers’ families of the congregation” are not lay people as it has been hitherto assumed, both in M and in Sa.¹⁵²

4.2.3.2. Temple service

Another distinction pointed out by the Eshels is that these first 52 heads of the fathers’ families of the congregation listed in 1QM 2, those also listed in 4Q471, are to be perpetually present at the temple, while the others are to be there on a rotating basis, although they too must always be represented in the temple for the sacrifices to take place.¹⁵³ Unlike the more common view presented above in which there are members of all three segments of the population (priests, Levites, laity) who are both permanently serving in the temple as well as serving in rotation, the Eshels suggest that only the 52 are to be serving in the temple permanently, or in other words only priests and Levites (1QM 2:1–2). The rest (1QM 2:3–4), namely those not mentioned in 4Q471, are to serve on a rotation basis. This includes not only all the laity, but also the heads of the Levitical courses whose role is to “serve, each man in his position” (ותרו - איש במעמדו ישרתו - 1QM 2:3). While it is tempting to assume that the use of “position” (מעמד) in this sentence is to designate the same office as the rabbinical *ma’amad*, this may not necessarily be the case. In fact, the Eshels do not think that the terms “courses” (משמרות - 1QM 2:2, 3, 4; reconstructed in 4Q471 frg. 1:5), “*ma’amad*” (במעמדו - 1QM 2:3), and “always” (תמיד - 1QM 2:2–3;

not seem to be an issue in 4Q471.

¹⁵¹ See Jongeling, *Rouleau de la Guerre*, 79. Note Petrus Boccaccio who suggested that the 52 “heads of the fathers’ families of the congregation” related to the number of weeks in a year, while the 12 priests and Levites related to the number of months in a year (“Recensiones: Review of E. L. Sukenik שבדי הגנוזות העברית האוניברסיטה העברית,” *Bib* 37 [1956]: 230).

¹⁵² Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 24; Jongeling, *Rouleau de la Guerre*, 79; Licht, מגילה הסרכים, 266–67; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 150–51.

¹⁵³ Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “4Q471 and *Ma’amadot*,” 618–19; “Recensions,” 360, 362.

4Q471 frg. 1:3, 6) have yet become technical terms as in later Rabbinic literature. Rather, what we may be seeing here is the development in the use of these terms that led to their eventual inheriting specific technical meanings as the Sages eventually assigned to them.¹⁵⁴

4.2.3.3. The addition of the *ma'amad* in the *War Scroll*

Even so, the Eshels were right in alerting us to the fact that 4Q471 fails to include the *ma'amad*, comprised of Levites and lay participants, but that this is an addition in M and 4Q494. Similarly, their suggestion that 4Q471 may have been a source for M remains valid. Nevertheless, it is in my opinion too tentative to use 4Q471 as a witness to an early stage of M's composition. This argument hangs on the Eshels' reconstruction of line 8 as "the wa[r] of [their] divisio[ns]" (ומלחמ[ת] מִחֲלָקוֹתֵם). If correct, this would unequivocally link 4Q471 to 1QM 2, for it too would then preserve a connection between temple practice and the War of the Divisions. However, in light of it being a reconstruction,¹⁵⁵ for my part I prefer not using it as foundation upon which to draw conclusions about the development of the description of temple ritual in M Material. Thus, while it remains possible that there was an earlier stage in which M had no lay leadership, but which was included at some later point as suggested by the Eshels, I do not think that it can be affirmed.

¹⁵⁴ Personal communication with Hanan Eshel.

¹⁵⁵ While it is certain that the line includes some form of the word "divisions" (מחלקות), the reconstruction of the word "war" is based on remains of a letter which have been interpreted as a *tav* (ת[...]). Even so, some caution is called for, as the expression "war of their divisions" is not found in any of M Material. Since the word "division" can be used in other circumstances (note especially the *Temple Scroll*, 11QT 15:5 and 11Q20 1:14, where it relates to priests outside of a war context), I prefer not seeing the present reconstruction as definitive.

4.3. Peculiarities of the temple worship in column 2

4.3.1. Twenty six courses

Two aspects in particular stand out in this description of temple service in col. 2 of M. First, in line 2, we read that there are to be 26 priestly courses, rather than the usual 24 that are known from all other Second Temple period sources.¹⁵⁶ This difference in the number of courses was immediately recognized as reflecting the fact that the Qumran sect did not follow the lunar calendar with the rest of Jewish society, but rather a 52 week solar calendar.¹⁵⁷ The 24 priestly courses, with each being required to come to the Temple for a week of service once in a six month period, resulted in a 48 week system that could be easily fitted into the lunar year.¹⁵⁸ With the mention of 26 courses in M, it was originally believed that the Qumranites had changed the biblical number of priestly courses in order to fit the solar year with its 52 weeks. However, the eventual publication of 4QCal. Doc. Mishmarot B (4Q321), which, among other things, lists the priestly courses over a six-year period, showed this not to be the case.¹⁵⁹ Even the Qumran sectarians, in spite of their different calendar reckonings, retained the biblical number of 24

¹⁵⁶ Schürer, *History*, 245–49; Stern, “Priesthood,” 587–96.

¹⁵⁷ Paul Winter, “Twenty-Six Priestly Courses,” *VT* 6 (1956): 215–17; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 204–6; Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed., ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, *ScrHier* 4 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965), 162–99.

¹⁵⁸ The balance of the lunar year was accounted for by having all the priestly courses present at the temple for the three pilgrimage festivals. Even so, it is impossible to figure out exactly how the system worked, especially with respect to how it accommodated leap years in which there was the extra month of Adar.

¹⁵⁹ Shemaryahu Talmon and Israel Knohl, “(4Q321) B^a של מגילת לוח 4 בקומראן - משמרות - מקומראן,” *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 505–21; “A Calendrical Scroll from a Qumran Cave: *Mišmarot* B^a, 4Q321,” in *Pomegranates & Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 267–301; “(4Q321^a) B^b של מגילת לוח ממערות 4 בקומראן - משמרות,” in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*, ed. Michael V. Fox, et al. (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 65*–71*; Shemaryahu Talmon, “A. Calendrical Documents and Mishmarot,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XVI - Calendrical Texts*, Shemaryahu Talmon, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessner, *DJD XXI* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 1–166.

priestly courses. They simply adapted its application to their solar year with an additional four weeks by requiring four courses to serve an extra turn per year than what they would have had to under a lunar reckoning. The system meant that twenty courses served twice a year, a week each time, while four courses served three week-long terms. Over a six year cycle, all the courses served thirteen times. On the basis of 4Q321, therefore, it was concluded that the reference to 26 courses in 1QM 2 was not to the number of *priestly courses*, but to the number of *weeks of courses* that were counted in a given six month period, just like the 24 priestly courses under the lunar system represented 24 weeks of courses over half a year. Both systems were then doubled to make up the entire year, be it solar or lunar respectively.¹⁶⁰ At the same time, even though the priests were apparently not divided into 26 courses in order to fit a half year perfectly, it may be that the general populace was divided into 52 courses (26 x 2) for the entire year, as indicated by the 52 heads of fathers' houses of the congregation (ראשי אבות העדה) in 1QM 2:1. Instead of having the laity come to the temple twice in a given year (once in each six month period) as was expected of the priests, the laity would come only once, with the result that there would be a different course every week of the 52 weeks of the solar year.¹⁶¹ What is certain, however, is that the description of temple practice in 1QM 2:1–6 reflects the adoption and application of a 52 week-long year, based on a 26 week cycle rather than a 24 week cycle as was practiced for a lunar year.

¹⁶⁰ An alternate possibility is that specifically during the sabbatical year in question at the beginning of 1QM 2, the priestly courses did not serve just one week each time, but two consecutive weeks, so that each priestly course came to Jerusalem only once per year rather than twice (except for two courses that had to come twice, since there were only 24 priestly courses for the 26 courses during a given year). Thus the mention of the 26 courses in M would then testify to the number of times the priestly, Levitical, and lay courses rotated during that sabbatical year. I wish to thank Hanan Eshel for this suggestion.

¹⁶¹ Talmon and Knohl, "Calendrical Scroll," 295–96, n. 44.

4.3.2. *The role of the Levites*

The second aspect that stands out in the prescribed structure for temple service in 1QM 2:1–6 is the role of the Levites. In 1QM 2:2, we learn that they serve with the High Priest when he fulfills his duties in the temple. This is in contrast to the laity which remains at the gates of the temple (1QM 2:3), a position once held by the Levites.¹⁶² This distinction in M between laity and the Levitical priesthood is made explicit further by the verbs used to describe the roles of each group when at the temple: the priests and the Levites are to ‘serve’ (משרתים, ישרתו, לשרת) while the laity is to ‘stand’ (להתיצב, יתיצבו). As we have seen, the structure for temple worship in 1QM 2 reflects the institution of the *ma‘amad*. However, it seems as though it was in a slightly modified form than what was practiced during the Second Temple Period and that the Levites enjoyed a higher standing among the Qumranites in that they had an active role together with the priests in offering up of the sacrifices.¹⁶³ This reading is very different than that of Davies, who suggests instead that the Levites had been replaced by the laity.¹⁶⁴ His conclusion is based on the fact that the laity, and not the Levites, had an active role during the offering of the sacrifices, and that they are represented in higher number than the Levites. He posited that the laity were not originally part of the description of temple worship, but that their introduction was the result of revisionistic work. While this may be true—it fits well with the Eshels’ reconstruction of 4Q471 and its relationship to 1QM 2—it seems rather that in the process of the laity being added to the temple rituals, the Levites ended up being promoted rather than demoted, returning, so to speak, to a role more

¹⁶² Stern, “Priesthood,” 598–99.

¹⁶³ On the role of Levites in the Second Temple Period, see Schürer, *History*, 250–56 and Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, trans. F. H. & C. H. Clave (London: SCM, 1969), 207–13. For a summary of the conflict between priests and Levites during the Second Temple period, see Stern, “Priesthood,” 596–600. One incident is worthy to be noted in relationship to M. Josephus (*Ant.* 20:216–218) relates that the Levites sought to gain the right to wear linen clothes similar to the priests. In M, only priestly war garments are described (1QM 7:10–11), with no mention of special garb for the Levites.

¹⁶⁴ Davies, *1QM*, 27.

similar to what they held in the First Temple Period.¹⁶⁵ Davies' argument that lay leaders are more numerous than of the Levites is irrelevant; they are also more numerous than the priests, yet this does not warrant suggesting that the laity is more important than the priesthood. It seems rather that the structure and number of the laity present for temple worship was structured in such a way as to best reflect the leadership philosophy of the movement.

There is one instance, however, where the role of the Levites (and possibly of the priests) appears to have been taken over by the laity. In 1QM 2, 4Q496 frg. 7, and as reconstructed in 4Q471, the description of temple service is followed by the procedure of choosing soldiers for the War of the Divisions.¹⁶⁶ In 4Q471, the text is too fragmentary to know who may have fulfilled this role, although there is nothing that suggests it is anyone else but the priests and Levites. In M, however, it is the laymen, specifically the "men of renown" (אנשי השם) and the "heads of the fathers" (families) of the congregation" (ראשי אבות העדה) who choose the soldiers. The only other Qumran text in which these two expressions appear, independently or together, is Sa.¹⁶⁷ Jacob Licht already pointed out the complementarity of these two texts for understanding how the sect envisioned to operate at the "end of days" (אחרית הימים).¹⁶⁸ He suggested that M focuses on the procedures specific for going to war, while Sa describes what is expected to take place on the home front. Thus Sa, in effect immediately after the initial victory against the Kittim,¹⁶⁹ presents the details of the convocation that takes place when conscription is needed (1QSa 1:25–27).¹⁷⁰ In both texts, it is called "a convocation of war" (תעודת המלחמה) - 1QM 2:8; 1QSa 1:26).¹⁷¹ Although the Levites are present at this convocation (1QSa 2:1) and even responsible for maintaining its proper procedure (1QSa 1:23–

¹⁶⁵ Schürer, *History*, 250–55.

¹⁶⁶ On conscription issues themselves, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 65–86.

¹⁶⁷ Note that "fathers (houses) of the congregation" (אבות העדה) is found in 4Q299 frg. 76:3.

¹⁶⁸ Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 248–49.

¹⁶⁹ This explains why in Sa the final victory over evil is still a future event.

¹⁷⁰ Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 31.

¹⁷¹ These are the only two occurrences of this expression in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

25), they do so only under the authority of the “heads of the fathers’ (families) of the congregation” (ראשי אבות העדה).¹⁷² This intimate relationship between M and Sa will be picked up again in Chapter Six, as it is essential in understanding the two stages in the eschatological war and how integral it was in the sectarians’ thinking. But before doing so, it is necessary to examine the remaining columns in M, the subject of the following chapter, but only after first summarizing what has been learned about the eschatological war from 1QM 2, and drawing some initial conclusions.

5. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLUMNS 1 AND 2 AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

In contrast to 1QM 1, a very different scenario of the eschatological war has emerged in col. 2. It is now launched from Jerusalem and the temple whose proper worship will have been reinstated. Participating will be all 12 of Israel’s tribes who will have been restored both physically to the land and spiritually to God. Everybody will be required to help prepare for the war during an initial six year period, with the actual fighting to be carried out afterward by elite troops, chosen specifically by the country’s leadership during convocations of war which will be assembled as needed. The war itself will be waged over a 33 year period, excluding sabbatical years, in a series of campaigns lasting a year or two, that will conquer the entire world. Such a schedule is obviously idealistic and implies that victory for the Sons of Light in each battle is considered inevitable.

Save for those scholars who argued for a single authorship of M, the view that cols. 1 and 2 are not part of the same compositional process is almost unanimously accepted, and the differences between the two columns have been explained from the perspective of source criticism, redaction criticism, or a combination of both.¹⁷³ The present study suggests that there is more unity and coherence between these two columns than is currently assumed. Rather than each

¹⁷² Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 28, 35.

¹⁷³ For a summary of the different theories proposed so far, see Duhaime, *War Texts*, 45–53.

column describing the same war from different perspectives which have only been poorly harmonized, M describes an eschatological war comprised of two stages, the “day of their war against the Kit-tim” (יום מלחמתם בכתיים) and the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת ההחלקות).¹⁷⁴ The two-stage scenario is not entirely new, as it has already been suggested by Flusser,¹⁷⁵ although he had not fully grasped all the intricacies of the first stage nor of how it would lead into the second. These have now been more fully explained.

The present reading of M does not negate the possibility that much of cols. 1 and 2 may have been drawn from separate sources or traditions. What it does highlight, however, is that at least some of the differences between the two first columns need not be the result of separate sources nor of a long drawn-out redactional process, but rather of a particular ideology concerning a single and same eschatological war played out in two stages. Unfortunately, the focus on source and redaction criticisms has resulted in a lack of effort to seek out the text’s inherent coherence, with the result that M has been labelled as being more disunified than it really is.

That these two stages are integral to M is confirmed by the way its first two columns are complementary in spite of their differences. This is best seen in the chronology given in col. 2 which implies that it is describing only the latter part of the eschatological war, and not its beginning, in the same way that col. 1 makes it clear that the battle it is describing is only the beginning of a much longer war. It is also evident in the way both columns supplement each other in the list of peoples and territories the Sons of Light are to conquer, col. 1 providing that and only that which is lacking in col. 2, to complete world conquest as seen through the lens of the Table of Nations. Finally, these two stages ought to be expected in light of Micah’s prophecy (5:4–7 [E:5–8]). These two stages, and their implications, find further support in other Second Temple Period literature as well. At Qumran, *4QFlorilegium* confirms that full restoration, meaning a restoration of proper worship at the temple and the end of exile, can

¹⁷⁴ That the war contained these two stages will be further confirmed by an examination of the rest of M, the subject matter of the following chapter.

¹⁷⁵ Flusser, “Apocalyptic Elements,” 152.

only come with the onset of the eschatological war. Similarly, in the *Animal Apocalypse* and *Ps. Sol.* 17, it is only once the temple is restored, that Israel will be ingathered. Consequently, descriptions of wars which involve the entire nation must be subsequent to Jerusalem's restoration. More interesting, the eschatological war described in the *Animal Apocalypse* is to be carried out in two stages, the first by God himself, and the second through the involvement of his people, echoing a similar distinction between the wars fought in cols. 1 and 2. The same basic scenario is also reflected in Mic 5:4–7 (E:5–8), where the confrontation against Assyria will not be a single battle, but a two staged process, the first in the Land of Israel, and the second on Assyria's territory. Similarly, as we shall see in Chapter Six, Sa also anticipates Israel's restoration to have taken place before the wars it envisions. These extra texts all confirm that this two-stage eschatological war, beginning with the War against the Kittim and followed-up by the War of the Divisions, is not a unique phenomenon limited to M, but one that is drawn from similar ideas common in the late Second Temple Period.

In summary, M describes an eschatological war cycle which will last forty years total.¹⁷⁶ The forty years will begin with a battle of only three tribes, Levi, Judah, and Benjamin, against Belial, the Kittim, and their allies, these being Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, and Jews who are in charge of the Temple in Jerusalem but who, in the eyes of the sectarians, have violated their covenant with God and are in league with the enemy. This battle is the “day of war against the Kittim” (יום מלחמתם בכתיים - 1QM 1:12). It shall have seven rounds, each side alternatively gaining the upper hand, until the seventh round when the Sons of Light, faced with impending defeat, will miraculously receive divine help, through God's own hand and the intervention of his archangel Michael. This glorious victory will put an end to the rule of the Kittim, and allow God's chosen to regain control of Jerusalem and the temple. It also marks the end of Israel's exile and signals that redemption has arrived. This will enable the return of the exiled tribes over the next six years, during which time

¹⁷⁶ Alternatively, as explained above (see note 26), the forty year scenario may be the corruption of an original 49/50-year chronology.

the entire nation will prepare for the second phase of the war. Also during those six years, proper temple worship will be reestablished, one which will introduce a new system of representation for the priesthood and laity alike, with new roles being assigned principally to the Levites and the lay-leadership. After the first sabbatical year, on the eighth year, the second stage of fighting will be launched, the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות - 1QM 2:10). This time, instead of the entire nation going out to war, only chosen men of war will be sent, each division in turn, year by year, for the next 33 years until all of Israel’s enemies will have been conquered, until “evil has no more remnant” (להכניע רשעה לאין שארית) - 1QM 1:6) and “until the end of all appointed times of darkness” (עד תום כול מועדי חושך) - 1QM 1:8).

CHAPTER FIVE

THE WAR IN COLUMNS 3–19

Having properly understood the relationship between cols. 1 and 2, as well as the sequence of the war, one must then consider the rest of M in an effort to understand what it seeks to communicate about the forty year eschatological war. Is M primarily interested in the “day of their war against the Kittim” (יום מלחמתם בכתיים) or in the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלקות)? Is it describing both? And if both, is each stage dealt with separately, or is the rest of M equally applicable to both stages of the war?

In the previous chapter, the differences between the two stages of the war were highlighted: since they are key for the rest of the investigation, I summarize here the most important points. The War against the Kittim will be waged by only three of the twelve tribes of Israel. It will take place before the full restoration of all the tribes of Israel, and before the Sons of Light have control of Jerusalem and its temple. As we have seen, the Kittim are associated to Assyria, and as such both are classified as the sons of Japheth. But the war will be against other enemies as well, such as Moab, Edom, Ammon, and Philistia whom, as we have seen, are in league with the Kittim. It will be short, possibly only a day long.¹ It will include seven rounds, during three of which the Sons of Light suffer reversals. It will be a time of unparalleled tribulation, hurried unto its climax, and ending only because of God’s intervention and his archangel Michael. Yet the ensuing victory does not mean that evil will be totally exterminated, but it will allow for its power and rule to gradually shrink until it is no more. During that time, God’s people will be able to rule unhindered.

¹ See below, note 8.

In contrast to this first stage, the War of the Divisions will begin only once the entire nation of Israel will have been restored and in full control of Jerusalem and the temple. Instead of sending out the entire nation to war, there will be a conscription for each campaign, so that the army will be made up of chosen soldiers only. The enemies enumerated are no longer the Kittim and their coalition, but the sons of Shem, Ham and Japheth, with Assyria now being listed as one of the sons of Shem. The war will be long and drawn out, extending over a 33 year period, with campaigns lasting at least a year or two, possibly more. Nevertheless, at all times victory appears to be guaranteed, as there are no hints of any possibility of defeat or even setbacks. And when the fighting is over, Israel will be free from all its enemies and evil will have been exterminated. The age of fully realized redemption will have finally arrived.

1. COLUMNS 15–19: THE WAR AGAINST THE KITTIM

In light of these key differences, it is now possible to approach the rest of M to determine with what it may be dealing. One of the most obvious contrasts between the two stages is the presence and absence of the Kittim as the main enemy. Save for a single mention of the Kittim in 11:11, all other references to them are in cols. 15–19. Found five times in col. 1, the word appears twelve times in cols. 15–19 and is found at least once in each of those columns. This is one of the main reasons why scholars have linked these columns to col. 1.² In 1QM 15:2 we read of “the king of the Kittim” (מֶלֶךְ הַכִּיִּים), an expression which appears only here in the entire Qumran corpus,³ although there seems to be little doubt that it was also found

² Scholars are unanimous that cols. 15–19 relate in a special way to col. 1. For a survey of the different theories put forward explaining why, see Duhaime, *War Texts*, 46–49.

³ But note the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (4Q247 frg. 1:6) where there is a slightly different form of the expression: “kin[g] of Kittim” (מֶלֶךְ כִּיִּים). It has also been suggested to reconstruct “the king of the Kittim” in *Pesher Psalms* (1Q16 frags 9–10:1 - Jozef T. Milik, “II. Textes Non Bibliques, 16: Commentaire de Psaumes,” in *Qumran Cave I*, Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef Tadeusz Milik, DJD I [Oxford: Clarendon, 1955], 82), although where Milik read “kin[gs] of the Kittim” (מְלָכֵי)

in 1QM 1:4, where on the basis of Dan 11 we would have expected to find “the king of the north” (מֶלֶךְ הַצִּפּוֹן), the one described as marching out of Egypt in great fury to wage war against northern kings and to cut off Israel’s horn. Instead the text preserves an alternate construct for the expression: “[...]of the Kittim” (הַכְּתִיִּים[...]), thereby undoubtedly referring to “the king of the Kittim” (מֶלֶךְ הַכְּתִיִּים).⁴ In 1QM 15:2–3, the army of the king of the Kittim is called “the army of Belial” (חֵיל בְּלִיעֵל). The only other occurrences of this expression in the Dead Sea Scrolls are in col. 1 of M, lines 1 and 13. Column 1 uses yet another term to refer to the enemies of the Sons of Light. In lines 5–7, when describing the extent of God’s victory over Israel’s enemies, these are listed as being the whole lot of Belial (כּוֹל גּוֹרֵל בְּלִיעֵל), the sons of Japheth (בְּנֵי יַפֶּת), and Assyria (אַשּׁוּר). The only other place where these three entities appear together as a way to designate the enemies of the Sons of Light is in 18:2–3. If it was not explicit enough in col. 1, in col. 18 it is made clear that Assyria is synonymous with the “sons of Japheth,” in direct opposition to col. 2 where Assyria is listed among the sons of Shem (line 12). With such exclusive lexical parallels between these columns, there is no doubt that the subject matter of cols. 15–19 is the same as that of col. 1: the War against the Kittim.

There are still more similarities between these columns. The reference to “time of tribulation” (עַת צָרָה) is found only in cols. 1 (line 12) and 15 (line 1).⁵ In fact, the very idea that the Sons of Light could suffer casualties is found only in cols. 1 and 15–19,⁶ especially in cols. 16–17 where the text deals with the calling out of the reserves, needed to replace the Sons of Light who have fallen on the

הַכְּתִיִּים), Horgan has read “ru[lers of the Kittim” (מְשָׁלֵי הַכְּתִיִּים) - *Pesharim*, 67, Part I p. 14; “Psalm Peshar 2 [1Q16 = 1QpPs],” in *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls - Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002], 27–28). More importantly, it has also been reconstructed in *Sefer Milḥamah*: “the king of the]Kittim” (מֶלֶךְ הַכְּתִיִּים) - 4Q285 frg. 4:5 - see Alexander and Vermes, “4QSefer Ha-Milḥamah,” 235–36).

⁴ See also pages 94 and 131.

⁵ See Dan 12:1.

⁶ On a possible literary development of these columns, see below, page 387.

battle field. In 15:9 there is even a specific encouragement not to flee from the battle field.⁷ In col. 1, this time of tribulation is described as being worse than ever previously experienced, due to its hurrying unto the end: “there will be nothing like it because of its hurrying unto the end for eternal redemption” (לא נהיה כמוה מחושה עד) (ועתה היום אץ לנו - line 12). This theme of being hurried is never picked up again in the rest of M until 18:12: “And now the day is hastening for us” (ועתה היום אץ לנו).⁸ In this last example, the idea of ‘hurrying’ and ‘day’ are linked together. We have already seen how frequently the word “day” is used in the description of the first stage of the war in col. 1, as a hint to its shortness, especially in contrast to the second stage which is described in terms of years. Stage one is the “day on which the Kittim will fall” (יום נפול בו כתיים) - line 9), the “day appointed from long ago” (יום יעוד מאז) - line 10), a “day of calamity” (יום הוה) - line 11),⁹ the “day of their war against the Kittim” (יום מלחמתם בכתיים) - line 12). Line 18:5 is undoubtedly referring to that specific day when it says “on that day” (ביום ההואה), as confirmed in the rest of cols. 15–19. “Today” (היום הזה) - 15:12) is a “day appointed for war” (יום מועד מלחמה), and a “day appointed to humiliate and bring low” (יום מועד להכניע ולהשפיל) - 17:5).¹⁰ In addition, we read that the ‘rushing of the day’ (1:12; 18:12) is towards “everlasting redemption” (פדות עולמים) (1:12). The only other occurrences of this last expression in the rest of the Qumran corpus are in 1QM 15:1 and 18:11.

⁷ A real threat, as 1 Macc 9:6 makes clear.

⁸ In 18:10–11 we read that “the day has shone for us” (היום הופיע לנו); in 18:12, “and now the day is hastening for us” (ועתה היום אץ לנו); in 19:9 “[to the ca]mp[on] that n[i]ght to rest until morning” (ב[ל]י[ל]ה ההוא למנוח) - see also 4Q492 frg. 1:8 which helps confirm this reading). Thus cols. 18–19 seems to portray the battle as transpiring over the course of a day and needing to be concluded before nightfall, reminiscent of Joshua’s battle in the Aijalon Valley (Josh 10).

⁹ Note the reference to “all creatures of calamity” (כול יקום הוותם) in 15:11. These are the only two references to “calamity, doom” (הוה) in M.

¹⁰ When not referring to holidays, the expression combining יום with the root $\sqrt{\text{עד}}$ is only found in the three instances listed above and nowhere else in the Qumran corpus. All three are in M and refer explicitly to a time of war. Similarly, a search for the root $\sqrt{\text{עד}}$ combined with מלחמה in the Qumran corpus results in the same three references. Not only is the expression unique to M, it is unique to its cols. 1 and 15–19.

As mentioned above, Flusser suggested that the “hand of God” (יד אל) in 1QM 1:14 should be linked to the “sword of God” (חרב אל) of Isa 31:18.¹¹ Both these terms appear in cols. 15–19, thereby confirming such a correlation. While in 1:14 we learn that it is the intervention of the “hand of God” that wins the seventh “round” (גורל) against the army of Belial, in 15:3 we find out that his defeat is brought about by the “sword of God.” A more detailed description of this defeat is found in 18:1–3. Here it is the “hand of God,” as in col. 1, which is responsible for the defeat. Finally, on the morning after the victory, the Sons of Light are to gather to see the slain of the “sword of God.” Nowhere else in M are these expressions used, further confirming this link between cols. 1 and 15–19.¹²

Column 1 makes it clear that the War against the Kittim will not just be an earthly endeavor: the battle will also rage in the heavenly realm (1:10–11, 15–16). We have seen that on the basis of Dan 12:1 the Qumranites anticipated the intervention of the archangel Michael. Here again, the only references to him are in cols. 15–19.¹³ In 17:6–7, we learn that Michael will be sent to help out God’s people, so that Israel will be given dominion on earth and Michael authority over the heavenly beings.

With so many lexical and thematic affinities, all of which are heavily concentrated in cols. 1 and 15–19, if not unique to them, the intimate relationship between these two sections of M is certain. We have already determined that col. 1 is describing the “day of their war against the Kittim” (יום מלחמתם בכתיים) - 1:12). It is therefore the first stage of the eschatological war cycle that cols. 15–19 are detailing, and not the “war of the divisions” (מלחמת המחלוקת) of col. 2.

¹¹ See page 129.

¹² “Hand of God” is found in 1QM 3:8, but as part of an inscription on one of the trumpets.

¹³ Michael appears twice in 1QM 9:15–16, but in both cases as part of inscriptions found on shields, and not as having some kind of role in the war.

2. COLUMNS 3–9

With the Kittim appearing only once in cols. 3–14, it would seem that these columns are not dealing primarily with the first stage of the war, the War against the Kittim, but with the second stage, the War of the Divisions. This would imply an interesting dynamic whereby most of the scroll is dealing with the final stage of the war, while the end of the document would be focusing on the beginning of the war. For this to hold true, however, it would need to be supported by other evidence. Thus it is necessary to examine these columns in greater detail to see if it can be determined why they fail to mention the Kittim. In my outline of M, I have divided these columns into three large units: the general description of the army (2:16–7:7), tactical issues (7:9–9:E), and a liturgical unit dealing with prayers (9:E–14:E). The last unit, being primarily ceremonial, is quite different than the previous two, and will consequently be dealt with separately from the first two.¹⁴

2.1. *All Israel*

In his study of M, Davies noted that while cols. 15–19 discussed the war in terms of Sons of Light versus the Sons of Darkness, such was not the case in cols. 2–9 where it mentions the tribes of Israel confronting the Sons of Darkness.¹⁵ Indeed, the ‘Rule of the Banners’ (3:13–4:E) is said to be for the “whole congregation” (כֹּל הָעֵדָה - 3:13; cf. 4:15).¹⁶ The main banner is described as being at the head of the “whole people” (כֹּל הָעָם - 3:13). The implication is that all twelve tribes are present. This is further supported by the inscription on the main banner which contains the names of the 12 tribes (3:14), and that there are banners for each of the tribes, with the name of its

¹⁴ In fact, this reflects Yadin’s division of these columns into a “Battle Serekh Series” and a “Ritual Serekh Series” (*The Scroll of the War*, 8–10). This division also reflects the literary ones posited by Davies (*IQM*, 24–67, 91–112) and Duhaime (*War Texts*, 14–20).

¹⁵ Davies, *IQM*, 14.

¹⁶ In fact, the word “congregation” specifically implies a restored Israel. See the discussion below on the sectarian use of the word, beginning on page 353.

tribal leader (נשיא - 3:15; cf. also 4:10). Similarly, at the beginning of col. 5, we hear about a “prince of the whole congregation” (נשיא כול העדה - 5:1)¹⁷ and another inscription which contains the names of the 12 tribes of Israel as well as the names of the 12 commanders of the tribes (שרי שבטיהם - 5:2). There are also banners for the “chiefs of the camps of the three tribes” (ראשי המחנות אשר לשלושה השבטים) (3:14), similarly implying that all 12 tribes are present. Finally, we are told that the cavalry is to be 6,000 horses strong, with each tribe providing 500 (6:11), clearly assuming that all 12 tribes are present. Obviously then, these dynamics cannot apply to the War against the Kittim during which only three tribes take part (1:2), but assume a restored nation of Israel, just as it is implied in col. 2 when describing the War of the Divisions.¹⁸

2.2. Jerusalem

Another detail further supports the idea that these columns were intended for the War of the Divisions only: the mention of Jerusalem. In 3:11 we read that the army is to “come to the congregation (in) Jerusalem” (לבוא אל העדה ירושלים) and in 7:3–4, instructions are given for when the army “leaves Jerusalem to go to war” (בצאתם מירושלים ללכת למלחמה). Such comings and goings from Jerusalem are incompatible with col. 1 where the battle takes place when the Sons of Light are still exiles in the wilderness and come to Jerusalem only after their victory (lines 2–3). Also connected to Jerusalem is one of the trumpets, used for gathering the “chiefs of the fathers’ (houses)

¹⁷ Note that the author specifically states that it is the *whole* or *entire* congregation.

¹⁸ It is not surprising that the restored nation of Israel is also called the “people of God” (עם אל - 1QM 3:13), just as those who were expected to fight in the War against the Kittim (see above, page 124): those returning from exile are simply joining themselves to the “people of God” who fought the Kittim. The use of the expression “people of God” in both 1QM 1:5 and 3:13, and only in these two instances in all of the Dead Sea Scrolls, may be another sign of the unity of cols. 1–9, and that one should not seek to separate col. 1 from cols. 2–9. It is unlikely these are a late harmonistic editing, as one would have expected the sectarian editor/redactor to have used an expression more commonly employed to designate his community.

of the congregation” (ראשי אבות העדה - 3:4). In col. 2, these men are mentioned in the context of temple worship and conscription, elements that relate only to the second stage of the war. The description of their gathering in col. 3 is consistent with col. 2, since it is to take place in the “house of the meeting” (בית מועד - 3:4), probably meaning the temple. All such references to Jerusalem and its temple are additional evidence that cols. 3–9 describe the army of the Sons of Light assuming that they are fighting the War of the Divisions.¹⁹

2.3. Exemption from war

In col. 7, rigorous rules are given for preserving the purity of the camp. These echo the regulations found in Deut 23:10–15 (E:9–14), but are stricter still, notably with respect to the exclusion of women and young men, an aspect which also relates to the laws of exemption from war (Deut 20:2–9; 24:5). Yadin, commentating on the laws of conscription and mobilization, was careful to highlight the rabbinical position concerning a “war of duty” (חובה or מלחמת מצוה) which is fought within Israel’s boundaries, versus a “war of choice” (מלחמת רשות) which is waged beyond Israel’s borders (*m. Sotah* 8:7): during a war of duty, all are to participate and none are exempt, contrary to a war of choice when the biblical exemptions are to be applied meticulously.²⁰ Yadin correctly pointed out that the War against the Kittim belonged to the first category, while the War of the Divisions was of the second. Assuming that col. 7 is dealing with the War against the Kittim, and therefore a war of duty,²¹ Yadin concluded that the sect chose to apply the exemptions nonetheless, just as it had been practiced by Judah Maccabeus before the battle of Emmaus (1 Macc 3:56).²² On the basis of both 1 Macc 3 and M,

¹⁹ Davies also suggested that Jerusalem is specifically connected to the forty year war (*IQM*, 42).

²⁰ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 65–75.

²¹ Yadin’s discussion also includes 1QM 10. It will be dealt with separately below (beginning on page 254).

²² Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 68–69.

Yadin concluded that the halakhic distinction between the two kinds of war had not yet been made, but that it was a later development.²³

However, we have seen that the reference to Jerusalem in 7:4 makes it unlikely that this column is dealing with the War against the Kittim. One restriction is against young men, women, and the handicapped leaving their homes to go to the army's camp, from the time the army has set out from Jerusalem until its return (7:3–4). Such a commandment is relevant only when soldiers have left their homes, are already out on the battlefield, and are expected to return home after the war. In other words, it presupposes that the army has already been conscripted and constituted.²⁴ In fact, it suggests that those excluded cannot even fulfill the duties assigned to them in the Mishnah (*Sotah* 8:2), that of providing the army with food and water, since this would imply that they would need to enter into the camp (*contra* IQM 7:3). It does, however, assume that these individuals do in fact have free access to and from the army's encampment(s), but that they are not to avail themselves of it. Such dynamics hardly seem compatible with what we know of the War against the Kittim, fought in the Land of Israel, during which the enemy's goal is to cut off Israel's horn (1:4–5), and throughout which the Sons of Light will suffer three near-defeats (1:13), to the point that the war is described as a time of unprecedented tribulation (1:12). It was expected to be a time of near panic for the Sons of Light, with the war being precipitated and hurried to its end. This scenario hardly seems compatible with the conditions implied by the above regulations, casting further doubt on the restrictions being meant for the War against the Kittim.

On the other hand, the restriction seems to make much more sense when understood in the context of the War of the Divisions, which is defined rabbinically as a war of choice. In col. 2 we learn that the soldiers are to be chosen during a meeting in Jerusalem from where they will march out to war (2:7–8). This is the exact background presupposed in col. 7, right down to the mention of Jerusalem as the

²³ Bezalel Bar-Kochba, however, suggested that neither 1 Macc 3 nor M can be used to determine that such was indeed the case (*Judas Maccabaeus*, 494–99).

²⁴ See also the discussion in Davies, *IQM*, 93–94.

starting and ending point of the army. Thus, if the context for col. 7 is indeed that of the War of the Divisions, it would make sense that there could be free travel between Jerusalem and the army camps, at least in those areas already conquered by the Sons of Light. This could in fact give rise to the need of formulating the aforementioned restriction. The exemption is to preclude the involvement of women and young men even in a support role,²⁵ such as shuttling supplies from the home front to the army's camp. Even though this would have been an attractive and efficient policy, it was apparently considered as potentially endangering the purity of the camp, and was therefore disallowed. Everyone on the battle front, from support troops to the fighting units had to be "men of war" (אנשי המלחמה - 2:7), "volunteers for war... prepared for the day of vengeance" (נדבת - 7:6), chosen to march out for that specific campaign (2:6–8). This being the case, it must be noted that the exemption of young men and women in this column does not contravene the rabbinical position regarding who is responsible to go to war, since it does not deal with a war of duty as assumed by Yadin.²⁶

2.4. *Description of the war*

In these three matters, the 12 tribes of Israel, Jerusalem, and exemption laws, all of which pertain directly to the Sons of Light, the evidence suggests that cols. 3–9 describe the War of the Divisions only, and not the War against the Kittim. It is true however, that this is less evident when looking at other aspects of the eschatological war in these columns, especially the description of the war itself. An initial illustration is the way these columns refer to the enemy. When

²⁵ As David did in 1 Sam 17. This is *contra* Yadin who suggested that the exemption restricted them from the "duty to fight, not from being present on the field of battle" (*The Scroll of the War*, 71). In my opinion, the same is true for those afflicted with various handicaps (7:4–5). I do not think that the text is saying that these are permitted to be in the camps but not to go to the battle front, but that they too are not to march out of Jerusalem to go to war, just like the young men and women.

²⁶ See also the discussion below on the implications of why and how Deut 20:2–8 is quoted in the prayer "And You, God" (1QM 9:E–12:5), beginning on page 260.

they are mentioned, and not simply called the Sons of Darkness (3:6, 9), they are described as the “nations of vanity” (גויי הבל - 4:12; 6:6; 9:9; cf. also 11:9). There is nothing that precludes this expression from designating the enemies enumerated in col. 1. Even so, such a description is nevertheless more consistent with the War of the Divisions that seeks to destroy all the nations of the world, rather than just a coalition of a few people groups as in the War against the Kittim. This is certainly what seems to be implied in 4:12 and 6:6 where the reference is to “all nations of vanity” (כול גויי הבל).

2.4.1. *The day of war*

Less clear for identifying which of the two stages of the eschatological war is meant is the way these columns call the war itself. When it is mentioned, it is always in very general terms, unlike cols. 1 and 2 where the stages in the eschatological war are given specific names, such as a “day of calamity” (1:11) or the “day of their war against the Kittim” (1:12) for the first stage, and the “war of the divisions” (2:10) for the second stage. On one occasion in cols. 3–9, however, the war is given a specific name: the “day of vengeance” (יום נקם - 7:5). The use of the word “day,” as we have seen above,²⁷ certainly fits well with the War against the Kittim, and would seem to be inappropriate for the War of the Divisions. Could it be in fact that this is just another name for the first stage of the eschatological war, complementing its other names which also incorporate the word “day?” For example, Yadin chose to reconstruct this last expression in 15:3 and 15,²⁸ a column which we have seen to be specifically about the War against the Kittim. While it is tempting to assume such, this must be weighed against its use in S, the only other place where the expression “day of vengeance” appears in the Qumran Scrolls (1QS 9:23; 10:19). There, the *maskil* (משכיל) is instructed not to meddle in matters of the “men of the pit” (אנשי השחת) until the “day of vengeance” for which he is to be prepared. One must also

²⁷ See page 97.

²⁸ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 330–35. At the same time, he is careful to point out that the reconstruction could just as well be “day of calamity” (יום הויה) as in 1QM 1:11.

consider its use in the Bible. In Isaiah (34:8; 61:2; 63:4) it is a day when God will bring about vengeance for Zion, also called the year of the Lord. In Jeremiah (46:10), the “day of vengeance” is associated to a battle which took place near the Euphrates between the armies of Egypt and Babylon. In M, it is undoubtedly related to Est 8:13, describing a day during which the restraints upon the Jews were lifted and they were given the right to defend themselves.²⁹ This seems to be the scenario envisioned in S as well.³⁰ Consequently, this day of vengeance is not so much referring to a specific battle or stage in the eschatological war, but to a time when the Sons of Light will cease from their passivity and take on an active role in bringing about God’s justice on earth. In that sense, it relates to the entire eschatological war and should not be constrained to a certain portion of it.

2.4.2. *Battle narratives (1QM 7:9–9:E)*

Apart from these minor details, all other aspects of the war are ignored in cols. 3–9. Alone, the fact that there are no elements characteristic of the War against the Kittim exclusively is not meaningful, but in light of the other features I have listed above which are specific to the War of the Divisions, this can hardly be viewed as accidental. Indeed, further support that cols. 3–9 relate to the second stage of the war can be found by comparing those passages that are paralleled in cols. 15–19, where the War against the Kittim is described. The parallels are found principally in those passages that deal with tactical issues (7:9–9:E).

2.4.2.1. The absence of the Kittim

Davies summarized what he believed to be the most significant differences between the battle narratives in these two sections (cols. 7–9 and 15–19).³¹ The three main ones are: 1) wherever the word

²⁹ Yadin, מגילת מלחמת בני אור בבני חושך, 301.

³⁰ Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 198.

³¹ Davies, *IQM*, 74–75. Davies’ summary was not intended to be comprehensive, but to highlight those aspects which he felt contributed to a better understanding of the history of composition of M. Other differences will therefore need to be

“enemy” (אויב) appears in cols. 7–9, its counterpart in cols. 15–19 is “Kittim” (כתיים),³² 2) that the battle in cols. 7–9 appears to have only one encounter, while in cols. 15–19 there are indications that the seven rounds are mentioned,³³ and 3) the absence of a reserve unit in cols. 7–9.³⁴ He concluded from this that there was no direct literary dependence between these two accounts, but that both developed independently from a common source.³⁵ While his conclusion is theoretically possible, it is necessary to highlight that the main points he used to discern the compositional history behind these two battle accounts need not be related to a diachronic development of the text, but can be explained by the author wishing to preserve the distinctives of the two stages of the eschatological war.³⁶ As we have seen, the Kittim are absent because they are no longer relevant to the War of the Divisions. Thus the enemy cannot be called the “Kittim,” which is why the more generic word “enemy” or “nations” is used. There are no hints of the seven rounds in cols. 7–9, because they are a distinctive of the War against the Kittim only. They are not anticipated in the War of the Divisions, because there is no expecta-

highlighted, as the purpose of the present study is to see if the two stages of the eschatological war may possibly offer a better rationale for all such differences. I am omitting those related to the use of trumpets, as well as some of the intricacies of the battle narratives, as they require a more elaborate treatment than what is appropriate here (but see my discussion of these matters below, beginning on page 305).

³² Contrast col. 8 to col. 16, both of which describe the exact same point in the battle. In col. 8, the Sons of Light are to approach the “line of the enemy” (מערכת האויב - 8:8) to “cause the slain to fall” (להפיל חללים - 8:11) while in col. 16 they are to approach the “line of the Kittim” (מערכת כתיים - 16:6) to “cause to fall among the slain of the Kittim” (להפיל בחללי כתיים - 16:8).

³³ See especially 17:16 with its mention of the “th[ird] round” (ובגורל השל[ישי]).

³⁴ Davies makes the odd statement that the encounters in which the Sons of Light fall are not described in cols. 15–19 (*IQM*, 75). The round during which the reserves are needed is exactly that, and not an interpolation as he suggests.

³⁵ Philip R. Davies, “Review of *Gott und Belial*,” *RB* 78 (1971): 74–75.

³⁶ This is not to deny that there may have been some development in the composition of M, but that the evidence listed above certainly does not demand it, nor even explains it. Although he does not express it in this way, Davies’ final conclusion is that the chronology of the war is the circumstantial result emanating from the merging of different documents about the eschatological war (*IQM*, 113–24). This is hardly a tenable position, especially when one realizes the care put into crafting col. 1 so as to provide a feasible scenario for the fulfillment of the unrealized prophecy of Dan 11:40–12:3.

tion of suffering any setbacks.³⁷ Similarly, if there are no setbacks, there is no need for reserves. In these matters, therefore, the description of the battle narratives in cols. 7–9 reflect the War of the Divisions, especially when contrasted to the War against the Kittim in cols. 15–19.

2.4.2.2. The presence of the cavalry

There are other differences still, two of which are important to note at this time.³⁸ The first relates to the cavalry. In 6:8–18, it is described, and in 9:17 we learn that it will play a special role in keeping the enemy's soldiers from fleeing. Furthermore, we know that there are to be 6,000 horses (1QM 6:10–11; 9:5), and that this number of horses is to be provided by all the tribes, 500 horses per tribe. It has been already pointed out that this is a hint that the cavalry is in some way connected to a restored Israel with all of its 12 tribes. This is borne out in the battle narratives. The account in cols. 7–9, which relates to the War of the Divisions, makes reference to the cavalry. Thus, for example, it is to provide support for the skirmishers as they move into position (8:4). It is also to keep the enemy from fleeing as they are being defeated, so that they can be completely annihilated by the Sons of Light (9:7). In cols. 15–19, however, where the War against the Kittim is described, the cavalry is not mentioned.³⁹ Obviously, if only three tribes are participating in this war, it would be impossible for them to muster such a large

³⁷ See the discussion above, beginning on page 202.

³⁸ Other differences will be dealt with below in the section on trumpet use and battle cycles, beginning on page 305.

³⁹ John Zhu-En Wee suggests that the absence of the cavalry in cols. 15–19 results from the liturgical focus of these columns (“A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns XV–XIX of the *War Scroll* [1QM],” *RevQ* 21 [2003]: 263–83, here 282). While I agree with him that there seems to be an increased emphasis on liturgy in cols. 15–19, this does not, in my opinion, explain why the cavalry is not part of the account as in cols. 7–9. One needs to note, however, that there may have possibly been a reference to the cavalry in the prayer for victory found in 1QM 18:E–19:8. When reconstructing this prayer on the basis of 1QM 12:7–16, the end of line 1 would read “...and the ar[my of his spirits with our infantry and our cavalry” (וצב[א רוחיו עם צעדינו ופרשינו]). On this possibility, see note 113.

cavalry force, assuming they would have any at all. Rather, it seems as though no cavalry is involved in the War against the Kittim.

2.4.2.3. The absence of encouragement speeches

A second difference in the battle narratives of cols. 7–9 is that there is no evidence of any speeches to be given by either the High Priest or any other priest after the battle has been launched.⁴⁰ This may be directly related to the fact that there are no reversals expected during the War of the Divisions. In cols. 15–19,⁴¹ the speeches always come right after the next set of troops is called to the front, but after the previous round has suffered a setback. In contrast, the war in cols. 7–9 is expected to progress without any reversals: three waves of skirmishers followed by a final pursuit of the entire infantry.⁴² Both of these differences in the battle narratives between cols. 7–9 and 15–19, the first with respect to the cavalry and the second to speeches delivered on the battle field, are explainable in light of the eschatological war's two stages, and further strengthen the conclusion that cols. 3–9 deal with the War of the Divisions.⁴³

In summary, several characteristics of cols. 3–9 have been identified. These include the references to “all Israel” as to “Jerusalem,” the conscription and purity rules, the enemy being described as “the nations,” the absence of the Kittim, the presence of the cavalry, and the lack of priestly speeches once the fighting is launched. All of

⁴⁰ A possible exception depends on the reading of fragments of a few letters preserved at the end of 1QM 8:18: “... and he shall stand...” (וַיִּשְׁתָּאֵם - Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 114). This could be the usual introduction to the Appointed Priest or the High Priest taking his position to deliver a speech (cf. 1QM 10:2; 15:4; 16:13). On the differences between these two priests and their roles, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 208–11; Nils Martola, “The Priest Anointed for Battle,” *Nordisk Judaistik. Scandinavian Jewish Studies* 4 (1983): 21–40, and my discussion of the High Priest’s role in M, beginning on page 318.

⁴¹ And in the 4Q491 parallels.

⁴² See my discussion of the battle narratives below, beginning on page 312.

⁴³ Yadin thought that the differences were due to the fact that cols. 3–14 make up a general tactical manual, while cols. 15–19 is its specific application to the War against the Kittim (*The Scroll of the War*, 6). However, there are too many characteristics exclusive to the War of the Divisions in cols. 3–9, so that even if it was intended as a rule (סדר) for war, it had the War of the Divisions in mind, not the War against the Kittim.

these cannot fit within the context of the War against the Kittim as described in col. 1, but are entirely consistent with what one knows about the War of Divisions from col. 2. There is no doubt, therefore, that cols. 3–9 were composed specifically for the latter of the two stages in the eschatological war.

3. COLUMNS 10–14

With respect to cols. 10–14, determining if they relate to one or the other of the two stages of the eschatological war is more ambiguous. As a preliminary example, the Kittim are mentioned in col. 11, implying that this column is about the War against the Kittim. Yet in col. 12, Jerusalem is mentioned twice. Since it will not be conquered until the end of the War against the Kittim, this could suggest that col. 12 is dealing with the War of the Divisions. Consequently, it is necessary to survey each section within cols. 10–14 carefully, rather than examining them all together as a single unit dealing with prayers and speeches to be given at war.⁴⁴ Fortunately, instructions for some of these prayers and speeches are found again in cols. 15–19, and the comparison between the two accounts can at times be very informative.⁴⁵ Thus, whenever possible, material from cols.

⁴⁴ The most comprehensive study of these columns and their relationship to the rest of the scroll is found in Davies, *IQM*, 68–112. See also Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 201–26, in which special attention is given to the prayers of thanksgiving (13:7–16; 14:4–15; and 18:6–14).

⁴⁵ Comparison of the prayers in cols. 10–14 and the liturgical sections in cols. 15–19 has been done by a number of scholars who have studied M, albeit mainly from a literary perspective. The main studies include Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 208–28; von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 29–115; Davies, *IQM*, 68–112; Crispen H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 395–475; Zhu-En Wee, “Model for Composition,” 263–83; Yshai, “גגגג,” 121–39. In addition to these, two other views must be noted. First, Carmignac suggested the differences between the two accounts result from a thematic arrangement in cols. 10–14, while a chronological one governs cols. 15–19 (*Règle de la Guerre*, 138). Van der Ploeg for his part concluded that cols. 10–14 are concerned with giving rules, while cols. 15–19 focus more on how the battle is expected to play out (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 16–17). My study of the matter is unique in that it is the only one whose primary purpose is to determine to which stage of the eschatological war the prayers in cols. 10–14 may

TABLE 11: PARALLEL OF IQM 10-14 AND IQM 15-19 (Part 1)	
(Prayers in "quotations", Speeches in <i>italics</i> and "quotations", Prayer titles underlined, Bold represents prayers in both sections.)	
9:E-E]	[Introduction?]
9:E-11:12	"And He has taught us" (יְלִמְדֵנוּ)
11:13-12:5	"You will deliver" (תַּסְבִּיר)
14:E-15:3	Narrative: description of the war
15:4-16:1	Instructions for before the war is engaged
15:4-5a	Introduction: Prayer of Chief Priest before arraying the army
15:5b	<u>Prayer for the appointed time of war</u> (תַּזְמַת מַלְחָמָה מִתְּחִלַּת הַמִּלְחָמָה)
15:5c-6a	Narrative: Chief priest to array the army Minor sense division in 4Q491
15:6a-7a	Introduction: Speech of Appointed Priest before engaging the battle
15:7b-16:1	" <i>Be strong and courageous</i> " (דַּוְקוּ וְאַמְצוּ) --- Major sense division ---
16:3-9	Narrative: Beginning of the battle
12:7-16	" And You, God " (וְאַתָּה אֱלֹהִים)
12:7-13a	Call upon God to act Minor sense division in 4Q492
12:13b-15a	Call upon Zion to rejoice Minor sense division in 4Q492
12:15b-16	Call upon the daughters to rejoice Minor sense division (also in 4Q492)
12:17-E	"Mighty ones of war" (גִּבּוֹרֵי הַמִּלְחָמָה) --- Major sense division? ---
16:11-17:9	--- Major sense division (but minor in 4Q491) --- Narrative: Sons of Light falling
16:11-14	Introduction: Speech of Chief Priest after Sons of Light have been slain
16:15-17:3	" <i>He puts to test in the crucible</i> " (יָבִיחַ בַּמִּצְרָה)
17:4-9	" <i>Strengthen yourselves</i> " (הַחֲזִקוּ) Narrative: Next round of fighting
17:10-E	

PARALLEL OF IQM 10-14 AND IQM 15-19 (Part 2)	
<p>(Prayers in "quotations", Speeches in <i>italics</i> and "quotations", Prayer titles <u>underlined</u>, Bold represents prayers in both sections.)</p> <p>--- Major sense division? ---</p>	<p>--- Major sense division? ---</p>
<p>12:E-13:3 Short blessings and curses 12:E-13:2a Introduction: bless God and curse Belial 13:2b-3 "Blessed be God" (ברוך אל) 13:4-6 "And cursed be Belial" (וארר בלעל) 13:7-17 "God of our fathers" (אל אבותינו) 13:7-10a "God of our fathers" (אל אבותינו) Possible minor sense division in 4Q495 13:10b-17 "And You have made" (ואתה עשית) 13:18-14:1 "For You have appointed us" (כיִא אתה יעדונו)</p>	<p>17:E-18:9 Narrative: Enemy being defeated 17:E-18:5a Introduction: Prayer of Priest and Levites at victory time 18:5b-6a "Blessed be your name" (ברוך שמך) 18:6b-9</p> <p>18:10-E "You have performed wonders" (הפלתה) 18:E-19:8 "And You, God" (ואתה אל) 18:E-19:5a Call upon God to act Minor sense division in 4Q492 19:5b-6 Call upon Zion to rejoice Minor sense division in 4Q492 19:7-8 Call upon the daughters to rejoice Minor sense division (also in 4Q492) 19:9-E Instructions for after the victory 19:9a Narrative: Return to camp 19:9b-11a Narrative: Return to the battle field the morning after 19:11b-13 Introduction: Chief priest taking position with the priests 19:14-E [Prayer?]</p>
<p>14:2-15 Instructions for after the victory 14:2a Introduction: Return to camp 14:2b <u>הולת הַמִּשׁוּב</u> 14:2c-4a Introduction: return to battle field Possible minor sense division in 4Q491</p> <p>14:4b-15 "Blessed be the God of Israel" (ברוך אל ישראל) No sense division in 4Q491 14:16-E "Rise up! Rise up!" (רומה רומה)</p>	<p>14:2-15 Instructions for after the victory 19:9a Narrative: Return to camp 19:9b-11a Narrative: Return to the battle field the morning after 19:11b-13 Introduction: Chief priest taking position with the priests 19:14-E [Prayer?]</p>

15–19 will be brought into the discussion, in an effort to understand better the nature of cols. 10–14 (see Table 11). The goal here is not to study each prayer for its own sake, but to see if anything contained in a particular prayer is useful in discerning for which stage of the war the prayer was intended.

As has already been recognized by most scholars, cols. 10–14 form an independent unit focusing on the liturgies that are to be used during the eschatological war. It lists different prayers and/or speeches that are to be recited at different points throughout a battle. The first section presumably deals with a series of prayers to be said prior to engaging in combat (9:E to 12:5).⁴⁶ These prayers include a variety of elements, such as praising God, appealing to his covenant with Israel, recalling his past works of redemption for Israel, as well as citing prophecies which promise future redemption. The second section (12:7–E) also appears to be prayers intended for before the battle, although it is also possible that they could have been intended to be recited during the battle. Their focus is slightly different, in that they are a call upon God to act. The third section (12:E–14:1) are assumed to be blessings, curses, and other prayers to be recited at the moment of victory.⁴⁷ Finally, the unit ends with a section on prayers for the morning after the victory (14:2–E), consisting mainly of praises and blessings.

3.1. *Prayers for before the battle (1QM 9:E–12:5)*

3.1.1. “*And He has taught us*” (וילמדנו - 1QM 9:E–11:12)

The first set of prayers (9:E–12:5) is divided into two parts or prayers (9:E–11:12; 11:13–12:5).⁴⁸ The first one begins by recalling

belong.

⁴⁶ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 210.

⁴⁷ Comparison with the prayers in 18:6–19:8 further confirms this to be the proper context for these prayers.

⁴⁸ At this point, it is irrelevant whether they are separate prayers or sections of one and the same prayer. I prefer to refer to them as different prayers, as it a better way of keeping oneself aware that the two sections need not necessarily be part of a single prayer.

God's instructions about war given to Moses (9:E–10:8a) before suddenly breaking into a hymn of praise (10:8b–11:12). Because its beginning, along with the paragraph or lines that introduced it, was at the end of col. 9 which is not preserved, it is not certain who was expected to recite the prayer, although from the Scripture quoted early on in the prayer (10:2–4; Deut 20:2–4) one could assume that it is a priest. The beginning of the prayer (9:E–10:8a) makes reference to various actions which must be carried out when at war, either by quoting the biblical texts that command them or by making explicit reference to relevant proof texts.⁴⁹ These include matters of keeping the camp pure (10:1–2a), the priest encouraging the army (10:2b–4), the officers strengthening the moral of the soldiers and possibly sending back the fearful (10:5–6),⁵⁰ and the blowing of trumpets (10:6–8). These are given support by the allusion to, or the quoting of, relevant pentateuchal passages. The proof text for camp purity was probably cited in the last lines of col. 9 which were not preserved.⁵¹ After it comes a citation of Deut 20:2–4 (1QM 10:2–4) about the priest encouraging the army, then a paraphrase of Deut 20:8 (1QM 10:5–6) about the role of the officers, and finally a quotation of Num 10:9 (1QM 10:6–8) about the blowing of trumpets. Since the first and the last issues (camp purity and the blowing of trumpets) are dealt with elsewhere in M,⁵² one would expect that the other two issues cited, the priest's speech and the role of the officers, would be dealt with in the present section (cols. 10–14). However, this is not the case, as there is no further description of them being carried out, neither any specific instructions as to how and when they are to be implemented.⁵³ Even so, it is crucial to keep in mind that

⁴⁹ It has been suggested to call this section a florilegium (von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 60).

⁵⁰ This depends on how one understands the phrase “to return all the melted hearts” (לשוב כול מסי ללב - 1QM 10:5–6). On this matter, see below page 262.

⁵¹ But it can be assumed it was probably Deut 23:10–15 (E:11–16); see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 303.

⁵² Discussion about the trumpets are found in 2:E–3:11 and 7:13–9:9, and issues of camp purity are explained in 6:E–7:7.

⁵³ Since cols. 13–14 deal with prayers for victory (see below), such instructions, if they were included in this unit of M (cols. 9:E–14:E), would have had to have been in the bottom parts of cols. 9, 10, 11, or 12, that have not been preserved. If

these verses quoted out of Deuteronomy are not part of M's instructions per say, but part of a prayer required by M. Yet it is obvious that a biblical command would not be cited if it was not expected to be obeyed. The question this raises, therefore, is how and when were these verses from Deut 20 expected to be fulfilled. Thus, when dealing with this first prayer in cols. 10–14, it is necessary to deal with two separate albeit related issues: first, understanding all that pertains to the recitation of the prayer itself, and second, figuring out when the commandments it references, namely the speech of the priest and the role of the officers, were intended to be carried out. Figuring out the relationship between these two issues is undoubtedly the most difficult challenge in understanding cols. 10–14. In my dealing with this prayer, which I am calling “And He has taught us” (וַיְלַמְדֵנוּ - 10:2), I begin with the latter of the two: the speech of encouragement by the priest and the role of the officers.

3.1.1.1. The speech of encouragement (Deut 20:2–4)

The first point being made by the prayer in citing Deut 20 is that at some point before the battle there is to be a speech of encouragement by a priest (1QM 10:2; Deut 20:2). As far as the content of his address, only Deut 20:3–4 is quoted,⁵⁴ without adding even the slightest bit of information. While it could be that the mere recitation of these verses was considered sufficient to fulfill properly the commandment to give such a speech, neither was this necessarily the case. It would not be out of character with the rest of M if the biblical injunction was expanded upon, and the speech elaborated, added to, and/or even paraphrased. Whichever it may have been, the question still remains: when was the priest to give this speech?

There are three possibilities. The first is that the very recitation of the prayer “And He has taught us” may in fact have been considered

one assumes that that which is mentioned in 10:1–6 has already taken place, then the instructions would have to be at the end of col. 9. If, on the other hand, one assumes that they took place after the speech in col. 10, and one attempts to harmonize it with the sequence of parallel events in col. 15, then the instructions would have been at the end of col. 12 (See Table 12). However, see also note 145.

⁵⁴ The citation of the verse in M contains a few variants. The significance of those in v. 2 are considered below (page 272).

as being the commandment's fulfillment. This would imply that Deut 20:2–4 could be obeyed by simply praying a prayer in which the verses themselves are quoted. In such a case, one would not anticipate finding further instructions in M for the priest's speech as commanded in Deut 20:2. This is in fact the case, at least in cols. 10–14, as in cols. 3–14, although in col. 15 an encouragement speech of the Appointed Priest is spelled out. The second possibility is that the citing of these verses in the prayer was to act as a summary of what had just finished taking place, or, according to the third possibility, of what was about to take place. The present prayer would then act as a kind of concluding or introductory prayer for the events described in the Deuteronomy verses that it quotes.

These three possibilities pertaining to the inclusion of these verses from Deut 20:2–4 on the priest's role in war also come to bear on what is said about the officers immediately thereafter (1QM 10:5–6). These lines contain an additional exegetical challenge, that of determining what the officers' role actually is. In Deut 20:5–8, it is to release those soldiers who are exempt from military duty. In the prayer “And He has taught us,” these verses (vv. 5–8) are not quoted, as were vv. 2–4. At best, they are simply alluded to when the officers' role of encouraging the army is mentioned: twice they are commanded “to strengthen” the soldiers (לְהַחֲזִיק - 1QM 10:5–6). This role is an innovation unique to M, although there is little doubt that it was inspired from Deut 20, even if Deut 20 itself does not warrant it.⁵⁵ The fact that their role is modified from what is in the

⁵⁵ This, in my opinion, is clear evidence that M did not understand the application of these verses in the same way the Talmud (*b. Sotah* 42a) did. There it is interpreted that Deut 20:3–4 is to be recited by the Priest Anointed for Battle and repeated by a second priest, while Deut 20:5–7 is first recited by the same Priest Anointed for Battle but repeated by the officers, with Deut 20:8 being recited by an officer and repeated by officers. Never is it suggested that the officers are to repeat Deut 20:3–4. Yet of everything that is said in Deut 20:2–8 to the soldiers, only verses 3–4 are to encourage and strengthen the troops. If in M, therefore, the officers are to strengthen the fighters, either they are repeating that which was previously said by the Priest Anointed for Battle (Deut 20:3–4), or they have their own independent speech. Neither of these options is considered in the Talmud. The Mishnah (*Sotah* 8) for its part does not seem to be aware that the priest's speech (Deut 20:3–4) is to be repeated by anyone, nor that what the officers are to say (Deut 20:5–7) is first to be said by the priest. For these reasons, I prefer treating

Bible suggests that it reflects an actual procedure or ceremony that was expected to be carried out as part of the preparations for battle. It is doubtful such a deviation from the biblical injunction would have been documented if it did not reflect some kind of actual practice. The question this leaves unanswered is when and how were the officers expected to encourage the soldiers.

3.1.1.2. The meaning of “to return all the melted hearts” (1QM 10:5–6)

Another problem is how to exegete the phrase “to return all the melted hearts” (לשוב כול מסי לבב - 1QM 10:5–6). By understanding the *qal* “to return” (לשוב) as having the same meaning as the *hiph’il* “to return” (להשיב), Yadin interpreted this statement as meaning that, in accordance with Deut 20:8, the officers were to send back all those who were still fearful.⁵⁶ Indeed it makes little sense to quote a biblical text (Deut 20:2–4) whose greater context prescribes exemption from war to then not put it into practice. That the author chose to use the *qal*, rather than the *hiph’il* as would have been expected if this was his intent, could be possibly explained by a preference to keep the same verb form as found in the source text, Deut 20:8.⁵⁷ But this raises an interesting question: of all the reasons for releasing soldiers from war enumerated in Deut 20:5–8, why is only the last one mentioned in M?

On the other hand, the phrase “to return all the melted hearts” is framed in between two instructions for the officers “to strengthen” (לחזק) the army. Consequently, the implied parallelism makes a strong case in favor of the phrase meaning that the officers are to cause those with faint hearts “to repent” or “to be restored.”⁵⁸ In other words, they are to encourage the faint hearted soldiers to take

both speeches as two separate ones, without assuming that the officers are merely to repeat that which the priest was to recite.

⁵⁶ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 305. Jongeling, after summarizing the various other interpretations that had been suggested in which the basic meaning is that the melted hearts are to be restored or to repent, concurs with Yadin (*Rouleau de la Guerre*, 244–46).

⁵⁷ Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 143.

⁵⁸ See Hans Bardtke, “Die Kriegsrolle von Qumran Übersetzt,” *TLZ* 80 (1955): 410, and the discussion in Jongeling, *Rouleau de la Guerre*, 244.

heart once again, rather than to release them from war duty. The advantage of this view is that it explains why M fails to give us the practical details of how the officers were expected to send back the fearful soldiers once on the battle front. It simply did not happen. Furthermore, if there is no reference to the exemption of soldiers, then what is described here about the officers' role has little if anything to do with what is instructed in Deut 20:5–8, and one should not seek to understand their responsibilities in light of this passage. Instead, the officers are to repeat a second time that which the priest had just finished doing: encourage the troops. The only difference is that according to Deut 20, it is only the priest who is commanded to do so, not the officers. That they too are to encourage the troops is then a particularity of the sectarians, albeit inspired from Deut 20. It would also be an indication that no exemption for war as commanded in Deut 20:5–8 was practiced. While this may fit the plain meaning of the text, and can be put into practice without difficulty, it hardly seems reasonable to assume that a sect that followed the Bible so scrupulously would fail to obey some of its imperatives concerning war.⁵⁹ One possibility might be that the sectarians, like the rabbis after them, did indeed make a distinction between a war of duty and a war of choice, and that this prayer was intended for a war of duty only, in which case no exemption from war duty was practiced. Otherwise, it seems preferable to understand the phrase “to return all the melted hearts” as meaning that they are to be sent home by the officers.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 69.

⁶⁰ As mentioned above, one would still need to find an explanation as to why the exemptions listed in Deut 20:5–7 are not all listed. Note *Sifre* 191 (on Deut 20:2) which suggests that the Priest Anointed for Battle is to speak twice. According to *b. Soṭah* 42a and *Tos. Soṭah* 7:18, he was to speak once at the border when going out of the Land of Israel and once on the actual battle field. This resulted in some debate as to what was actually spoken where. According to Rashi, the words of Deut 20:5–8 were spoken at the border of the land, while those of Deut 20:3–4 were recited on the actual battlefield. This would mean that the release of those exempted from war was done prior to the arrival on the battle field. It is tempting to assume that the Qumranites had a similar understanding, as it could potentially explain why only the verses of Deut 20:2–4 are quoted in the prayer “And He has taught us” which was to be recited on the battle field. What it does not explain, however, is the reference to the officers in line 5 (see note 55), unless one assumes that they were to repeat

Even if the meaning is to encourage, it need not necessarily imply that the officers did not also release those who were exempt from fighting, just that they were not expected to do it at the same time as when they were to give their speech of encouragement. Since we have seen that the Qumranites have already introduced an innovation as to the officers' responsibilities in that they too must encourage the troops, could it not also be that the entire ceremony described in the prayer is an innovation, and that the more literal observation of Deut 20:5–8, even though not alluded to in the prayer, could still have been carried out at some other point? In other words, it is conceivable that there may have been an occasion during which the officers released those who qualified for exemption from war duty according to Deut 20:5–8, and that it was separate from the event referred to in the present prayer during which both the priests and the officers were to encourage the troops.⁶¹ But if those exempted from war have already been released by the time the officers are to encourage the soldiers, one wonders why there should be anyone left who would need “to repent” or “to be restored.” One possibility might be that the exemption for reasons of fearfulness is only applicable up until a certain point before the battle, after which, if anyone is gripped with fear, he is no longer given the option to leave the battlefield.⁶² This would then explain why both the priests and the officers were then expected to encourage the troops as described in the prayer. Since nowhere in cols. 10–14 are provisions made for releasing those who are fearful, if it happened at all, we must assume it took place before the recitation of “And He has taught us.”⁶³

everything that the Priest Anointed for Battle had to say, including Deut 20:3–4.

⁶¹ For such a possible scenario and how it finds support in rabbinical literature, see note 60. However, it seems unlikely that the Qumranites would have separated in time that which the Bible instructs to do in sequence. Especially if one understands “to return all the melted hearts” as meaning to send back the fearful, then we would have evidence that M kept the two incidents together and in proper order. In other words, if lines 5–6 of col. 10 were not considered to be a fulfillment of Deut 20:5–8, then neither should the quoting of Deut 20:2–4 in lines 3–5 be considered to be a fulfillment of those verses. This would be akin to Rambam's view of how Deut 20:2–8 was to be applied: all the verses were recited in their proper order twice.

⁶² As in *m. Soṭah* 8:6.

⁶³ If not in cols. 10–14, one would expect to find it after 7:12, and/or after 16:1.

3.1.2. *The context of “And He has taught us”*

It is now possible to summarize all of our options for understanding what the prayer “And He has taught us” wishes to imply by quoting Deut 20, to see which are legitimate, or at least likely possibilities, in an effort to determine if the prayer is more fitting to one or the other stage of the eschatological war. It is most important to keep in mind that by quoting Deut 20, the present prayer “And He has taught us” may be referring to a different ceremony than the immediate context in which the prayer is to be recited. What can be learned about that ceremony may not be directly related to the prayer, but our understanding of the prayer must include the implications of having cited the Deut 20 passage and the ceremony it represents.

3.1.2.1. The context of the ceremony behind 1QM 10:2–6

3.1.2.1.1. The citing of Deut 20:2–4

With respect to Deut 20:2–4 and the priest’s role, it is possible that the citing of these verses may have been as a way of fulfilling the commandment they contain; alternatively, it may be a kind of summary of events that were expected to transpire either prior to or after the recitation of the prayer. Whichever one of these three options it is, it must also allow for the officers to fulfill their role as described immediately thereafter. At a minimum, it can be affirmed that they have been assigned a new non-biblical task, that of encouraging the troops. The question nevertheless remains whether or not the summary of their responsibilities in 1QM 10:5–6 includes the release of those soldiers who are fearful, as a application of what is commanded in Deut 20:8. If yes, then why is only the last of all the reasons for exemption in Deut 20:5–8 mentioned, and if not, then why are the sectarians not exempting soldiers from war as commanded by Deut 20?

The quoting of Deut 20:2–4 may have been done as a way of fulfilling the requirements these verses contain. Yet while this would have allowed for the priest to fulfill his duty, it would not have allowed the officers to fulfill theirs.⁶⁴ There would have had to have

⁶⁴ Unless one assumes that the officers simply repeat that which the priest was expected to say (see note 55). Yet this does not seem to be implied in M.

been another prayer or speech that would have allowed the officers to fulfill their role of encouraging the troops. However, none exists. The only other time officers are mentioned in M, it is to inform the reader of their age restrictions (7:1). A few lines later it is pointed out as an aside that they are Levites (7:14, 16). Other than this and what we read in col. 10, nothing more is said about these Levitical officers. Nowhere are there speeches or prayers spelled out that are to be delivered by Levites only, as required by 1QM 10:5–6. In cols. 10–14, none of the prayers or speeches qualify as being ones that encourage, as they never address the soldiers directly, nor do they contain any admonition to be courageous or to put away fear.⁶⁵ Thus, in the same way that Deut 20:2–4 is apparently not quoted in the prayer “And He has taught us” as a way to fulfill the responsibilities of both the priests and the officers to encourage the troops, neither does it seem to be referring to an occasion that is to take place after the prayer will have been recited since none of the subsequent prayers in cols. 10–14 are for the purpose of encouraging the troops.⁶⁶ We are seemingly left with only one possibility: 1QM 10:2–6 summarizes that which was to have already taken place at some point prior to the army’s arrival on the battle front, even before the prayer “And He has taught us” was to be recited.

It is also important to note that the event alluded to in 1QM 10:2–6 when it quotes Deut 20 cannot be an allusion to or a summary of that which is described in 15:4–16:1, as assumed by Yadin.⁶⁷ In 1QM 10:2–6, it is question of a priest who is to encourage the troops, followed by the officers who do likewise a second time, possibly

⁶⁵ In contrast to the speeches of encouragement by the priests in cols. 15–19 (15:7b–16:1; 16:15–17:3; 17:4–9).

⁶⁶ Unless one allows for the possibility that either those instructions are no longer extant since they were originally at the bottom of some column that has not survived, or that M simply failed to elaborate further on this particular event of the war. Since M is intended for priests only (see the discussion beginning on page 342), this might explain why the instructions for officers are not detailed. For example, one could claim that the instructions in 15:4–16:1 is the outworking of what is summarized in 10:2–6, but because of his priestly focus the author did not see the need of mentioning the officers’ role again, let alone give them additional guidelines as he had just done for the priest (but see below).

⁶⁷ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 211.

also releasing those who are fearful from war duty. In 15:4–16:1, the High Priest is to say a prayer, after which a different priest is to encourage the troops. In order to harmonize the two accounts, Yadin had to suggest⁶⁸ that instead of it being “the priest” (1QM 10:2; Deut 20:2) who was to give the words of encouragement, it really was the High Priest (1QM 15:4).⁶⁹ This view is contradicted by M itself. Both in 7:12 and in 15:6 where instructions to encourage the troops are given, it is explicitly mentioned that a priest must do it, and not the High Priest.⁷⁰ Furthermore, in 15:4, the High Priest is not said to be giving a speech of encouragement to the troops, but to read a prayer.

In light of what we have surveyed so far, the most likely way in which it makes sense for the prayer “And He has taught us” to be citing portions of Deut 20:2–8 is that the verses are quoted as a summary of events that were to have taken place already prior to the recitation of the prayer. As some point, even before the time frame with which M is concerned, both the priest and the officers were to have had a chance to encourage the soldiers for battle. Whether or not the officers were also expected to exempt soldiers from war depends on how one deciphers the meaning of “to return all the melted hearts,” whether it implies exemption from war or not.

3.1.2.1.2. The context of “to return all the melted hearts”

If the phrase “to return all the melted hearts” does imply that the officers were to release those who were fearful, then one must also explain why only this particular exemption is mentioned, and not all the others in Deut 20:5–8? The reason put forward by Yadin is most reasonable. Unlike the others, this exemption must be carried out once the army comes face to face with the enemy.⁷¹ Only then is one able to discern who will loose heart.⁷² All other exemptions can be dealt with long before the army’s arrival on the battle front. It could

⁶⁸ See note 66.

⁶⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 211.

⁷⁰ This does not mean, however, that the prayer “And He has taught us” is not the one recited by the High Priest. That is a different matter altogether as we shall see below.

⁷¹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 65–70, esp. 70.

⁷² Compare to 1 Macc 9:6.

be, therefore, that the ceremony to which 1QM 10:2–6 alludes, and during which the priest and the officers are to encourage the troops, was expected to take place only after most who qualify for exemption had already been released.⁷³

As an aside, that the Qumranites may have practiced exemption from war does not necessarily imply that they made a distinction between wars of duty and wars of choice as in Rabbinic literature, unless it is possible to determine to which stage(s) of the eschatological war exemption was allowed. If for the War against the Kittim, which would have been considered as being a war of duty by the rabbis, then it would seem that no distinction was made and that exemption from war duty was practiced for all wars.⁷⁴ However, if for the War of the Divisions only, defined as a war of choice according to the rabbis, then it would be impossible to tell.

On the other hand, the phrase “to return all the melted hearts” may simply have meant that the officers were to encourage those who were fearful on the battle front. While initially this could be taken to imply that the Qumranites did not exempt those who were fearful, this need not necessarily be the case. As mentioned above, the ceremony which stands behind 1QM 10:2–6 and the quoting of the verses from Deut 20 may not necessarily have been the one during which those exempted from war were released. It could be that the rabbinical, two-stage, order of events was followed, in which Deut 20:5–8 was applied first, and only later was the speech in Deut 20:3–4 given.⁷⁵ This would explain why in 1QM 10:5–6, there is no men-

⁷³ Note that this view is similar to the sequence outlined in Rabbinic literature: first the recitation and application of Deut 20:5–8, then, at a later point, the giving of the speech recorded in Deut 20:3–4 (see note 60). If the scenario being presently described is indeed the one that stands behind M, then one may suggest an exegetical interpretation of Deut 20:8 unique to the Qumranites. They would have concluded that the reason Deut 20:8 states that the officers are to “add” (וַיִּסְפוּ) to what they were saying is not because they were to add to what the priest had said up until then as explained by the rabbis, but because the biblical text was accounting for a time gap between when the first exemptions listed in Deut 20:5–7 would be applied, and when the last exemption of Deut 20:8 would be effected. In other words, the officers’ responsibilities were to be carried out in two stages, the second stage ‘adding’ to the first.

⁷⁴ This was Yadin’s conclusion (*The Scroll of the War*, 70).

⁷⁵ See note 60.

tion of the officers carrying out their duties as per Deut 20:5–8. The ceremony which stands behind 1QM 10:2–6 would simply have been the second stage, the one applying Deut 20:2–4. This would explain nicely why the prayer “And He has taught us” does not allude to the officers’ role of releasing those exempted from war and refrains from quoting Deut 20:5–8 as it does vv. 2–4. While such a scenario is possible, neither can it be confirmed, for it is ultimately impossible to affirm that exemption was to have been effected earlier. It may also be that in describing the role of the officers, 1QM 10:5–6 was in fact indicating that no exemption was practiced. If so, then one would have to conclude that like the rabbis, the Qumranites did make some kind of distinction between a war of duty and a war of choice, and that the prayer “And He has taught us” was used specifically during wars of duty, which in the context of the eschatological war would mean the War against the Kittim.⁷⁶

3.1.2.1.3. Summary and synthesis

Another way to summarize the possible readings of 1QM 10:2–6 is the following. The first possibility (A) is that the Qumranites did have a similar distinction as the rabbis between wars of choice and wars of duty, that no exemption is alluded to in the phrase “to return the melted hearts,” with the result that the ceremony alluded to in this passage is for a war of duty. Of the instructions in Deut 20:2–8, only the speech of encouragement (vv. 2–4) needed to be enacted, because the other elements would have been relevant only for wars of choice. In such a case, the ceremony would have been valid only for the War against the Kittim, and not the War of the Divisions. A second possibility (B) is that the commandments of Deut 20:2–8 took place in two stages, just as surmised by the rabbis. The first stage focused on Deut 20:4–7 or 4–8, and the second on Deut 20:2–4, possibly verse 8 as well. It is to this second stage that 1QM 10:2–6 would be alluding. Regardless of where one situates the applica-

⁷⁶ An alternate possibility is that the sectarians did not view the War of the Divisions as being a war of free choice because of its unique eschatological nature. Yet this creates a conflict with col. 7 where certain individuals are excluded from any kind of participation, even in a support role. This suggests that the War of the Divisions was not a war of duty as defined by the rabbis, or that even in wars of duty, exemptions for purity reasons were nonetheless practiced.

tion of Deut 20:8, in the first or second stage, exemption from war duty could have been practiced. Unfortunately, nothing in this scenario allows us to determine whether or not the Qumranites distinguished between wars of duty and wars of choice. If they did not, then the ceremony could presumably be applied to any war, including the War against the Kittim and the War of the Divisions (B1). If on the other hand they did, then the ceremony would have been for the War of the Divisions only (B2). In all cases (A, B1, B2), with M focusing on the responsibilities of the priests on the battlefield,⁷⁷ we would expect the ceremony alluded to in 1QM 10:2-6 (and which fulfills Deut 20:2-4) to be discussed. Apparently it is not,⁷⁸ so it would seem that the ceremony in question took place at a point in time before that which is covered in M and the recitation of the prayer “And He has taught us.” Alternatively, it may be that the very recitation of this prayer by a priest was believed to be fulfillment enough of the biblical commands required by the verses it cites (Deut 20:2-4), and that no other ceremony was deemed necessary.

3.1.2.2. The context of 1QM 9:E-11:12

Though it proves impossible to narrow down to which stage of the apocalyptic war the ceremony behind 1QM 10:2-6 relates, this was only an initial stage in seeking to determine to which stage the prayer “And He has taught us” relates to. It is here that the above study proves useful. There are two other places in M where we read that the troops are to be addressed before they engage the battle. In 7:12, after the army has been arrayed and the priests are standing in front of it, the one priest is to “strengthen their hands for the war” (לחזק ידיהם במלחמה). In 15:4-6, both the High Priest and the Appointed Priest are to speak out, the High Priest in reciting a prayer before the army is arrayed, and the Appointed Priest in encouraging the troops after they are in position. Fortunately, we have already determined that the first (7:12) relates to the War of the Divisions and the second (15:4-6) to the War against the Kittim. One only needs to determine which of these two contexts the prayer fits best.

⁷⁷ See the discussion below, beginning on page 342.

⁷⁸ See notes 53 and 145.

3.1.2.2.1. The difficulty of it being the War of the Divisions

Even a superficial glance suggests that the prayer fits best with the instructions in 15:4–7, since they require a prayer to be recited, which is not the case in 7:12. Yet, there may nevertheless be a way of understanding how the prayer “And He has taught us” could fulfill the need to strengthen the soldiers for war as commanded in 7:12. Assuming scenario B from above⁷⁹ in which Deut 20:8 would be applied during the first of the two stages for fulfilling the commandments for war as determined by the rabbis, it could be argued that the recitation of this prayer, since it quotes the speech of Deut 20:3–4 in its entirety and since it could be recited before the army when facing the enemy, does fulfill the demands of the second stage. In other words, by alluding to an earlier ceremony in which the verses of Deut 20:5–8 were fulfilled and during which the officers were able to encourage the troops (as per 1QM 10:5–6), and by then having a priest quote Deut 20:3–4, even if only in a prayer, all the requirements of Deut 20:2–8 would thereby be fulfilled. This is, in fact, the only way that any of the prayers in cols. 10–12, those that are to be recited before engaging in the battle, can fulfill what is expected from 1QM 7:12. It was pointed out above that no other prayers in cols. 10–14 could be used for direct encouragement of the troops. Only this first prayer qualifies, albeit indirectly. In other words, if M preserves the speech commanded in 7:12, it can only be this prayer, “And He has taught us.”⁸⁰

There are, however, several difficulties with this view. First of all, in the midst of all the prayers in cols. 10–12 for before the battle, encouragement of the troops is only a minor point mentioned in passing. One would not expect the author to be referring to the reciting

⁷⁹ It cannot be scenario A, for then no exemption would be practiced, this in spite of the fact that the War of the Divisions is not a war of duty, at least not according to the rabbis. Furthermore, we know from col. 2 that not all the soldiers are to go to war during the War of the Divisions, a situation which is contrary to the dynamics of a war of duty.

⁸⁰ Unless one stipulates it is the speech in 1QM 15:7–16:1, and that in 7:12, the author forgot to mention that before the priest’s speech of encouragement, the High Priest was to lead out in prayer. Needless to say, this does not seem likely.

of these prayers as a ‘strengthening the troops’ as implied by 7:12.⁸¹ Instead, one would have anticipated him to say that the priest is to lead out in prayer, or that he is to recite the prayer(s) for before the battle, or something of the like.

Another difficulty is the manner in which the priest is to deliver the speech of encouragement. One of the variants in the citing of Deut 20:2–4 is that in M, the priest is commanded to “stand” (ועמד - 1QM 10:2) when delivering his address, rather than “approach” (וגגש - Deut 20:2) the army. This small variant is particularly interesting because both times when M mentions that the priest is to encourage the troops, he is instructed to do so while “walking back and forth” (והתהלך - 7:12; ויהיה מהלך - 15:6).⁸² Understanding the implication of this seemingly insignificant difference is possible with a closer look at the instructions for before the war in col. 15. There, the High Priest is instructed to “stand” (עמד - 15:4) and recite the prayer for war *before* arraying the army. Next, *after* the army has been arrayed, the Appointed Priest is to deliver his speech of encouragement while “walking back and forth” (see also 7:12). It seems, therefore, that what determines if a speech or prayer is to be given standing or walking depends on whether or not the army has arrayed itself for battle.⁸³ Since the speech of the priest as instructed in 10:2 is to be given while standing, one assumes that it must be delivered prior to the army deploying itself for war. This is not the case in 7:12, both from the context, and the specific use of the verb to walk.⁸⁴

⁸¹ This is not to discount the encouragement one can find in prayer, but in context prayer is probably not what is meant.

⁸² Note that in two instances (16:13 and 19:11) the High Priest is instructed to “draw near.”

⁸³ See the discussion in Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 211–12. This also seems to be the case when the reserves are called up to the battle front (16:11–17:11). After they are called to the front (16:11–12), the High Priest is to approach and stand before them (וגגש כוהן הרואש ועמד לפני המערכה - 16:13) and deliver his speech of encouragement. Immediately thereafter, the priests are to blow the signal for the reserves to array the reserves, at which point they “spread out” (נפשטים - 17:10).

⁸⁴ Note that it is because of this discrepancy that Yadin concluded that it had to be the High Priest in 15:4 who delivered this speech of encouragement, since he is the only one who is commanded to stand (*The Scroll of the War*, 211–12).

3.1.2.2.2. Suitability with the War against the Kittim

While it is possible to apply the prayer “And He has taught us” into the context of 7:12 even in spite of all the difficulties it creates, this stands in contrast to the better fit it has with the instructions in col. 15. First of all as noted above, the recitation of a prayer is in fact required by the High Priest (15:4–5). What is more, after the High Priest’s prayer and his arraying the army, another priest is to encourage the soldiers, just as mentioned in the prayer (10:2–4).⁸⁵ If one assumes his prayer is the one in 9:E–11:12, there are two possibilities. The first is scenario A from above: no exemption was practiced in light of the War against the Kittim being a war of duty, so that of the requirements in Deut 20:2–8, only vv. 2–4 need to be carried out as in 15:6–16:1. If so, it would imply that the Qumranites did make a distinction between wars of duty and wars of choice as the rabbis,⁸⁶ and that like them, they applied Deut 20:2–8 in two separate stages: first Deut 20:5–8 followed by Deut 20:2–4. The second is scenario B, in which the prayer is recited in between the stages, or as part of the second stage, of applying Deut 20:2–8: the first stage is the fulfillment of Deut 20:5–8 during which the officers both release those who are exempted from war duty and encourage the troops, while the second stage is the priest’s speech of encouragement (Deut 20:2–4) as instructed and described in 15:6–16:1.

In conclusion, as complicated as it has been to understand the implications of the first few lines of the prayer “And He has taught us,” especially in their allusion to the laws in Deut 20:2–8 and the extra ceremony these may require, it has enabled us to determine that the prayer fits best in the context of 1QM 15:4–16:1 and the War against the Kittim. This conclusion can be further confirmed by another detail in the prayer. Immediately after referring to Deut 20, the prayer cites Num 10:9 (10:6–8). The verse is explicit about the context in which the command is to be applied: when faced by an

⁸⁵ The only discrepancy is that the priest is walking back and forth rather than standing as commanded in 1QM 10:2–4 and Deut 20:2–4.

⁸⁶ This would then be our earliest attestation of such a distinction. See Bezalel Bar-Kochba (*Judas Maccabaeus*, 494–99) as to why 1 Macc 3 does not qualify as a valid Second Temple Period witness.

oppressor *in* the land. This dynamic is applicable only to the War against the Kittim, and not to the War of the Divisions. This view is to be preferred because it makes the most sense of the officers' role (Deut 20:5-8): they are to fulfill it prior to the army's arrival on the battle front.⁸⁷

3.1.2.2.3. The hymn of praise in 1QM 10:8b–11:12

So far, only the first part of the prayer "And He has taught us" has been examined (9:E–10:8a), and nothing has identified it as being distinctively sectarian.⁸⁸ This changes with the second part, which is a hymn of praise (10:8b–11:12). Its similarities with the first column of *Hodayot* (1QH) have already been recognized.⁸⁹ But more relevant to our purposes is that in 11:6–7, Num 24:17–19 is quoted. As we have seen,⁹⁰ the use of this biblical text at Qumran carried with it eschatological significance for the immediate future. In the present prayer, this is made clear by an accompanying reference to the "troops of Belial" (גדודי בליעל), also allegorically called the "seven nations of vanity" (שבעת גויי הבל - 11:8–9). This eschatological dimension, typically sectarian, is further confirmed by the mention of the Kittim in line 11. Interestingly, it is followed by the citation of Isa 31:8, which from col. 1 we know to be associated with the Kittim's fall.⁹¹ Furthermore, in her study of eschatological poetry, Bilhah Nitzan has suggested that the expression "from of old" (מאז) introduces "words of prophecy" as "a presage of their present realization."⁹² In such a case, Num 24:17–19 and Isa 31:8 would both be prophecies which are believed to be on the verge of fulfillment, and to which the priest quoting them appeals in order to elicit God's help, and with which he reassures and encourages the troops as they launch into battle, specifically against the Kittim. In fact, it must be underscored that in all the liturgy in M, this is the *only* men-

⁸⁷ See also below, page 320.

⁸⁸ This is further emphasized by Yadin's study comparing this prayer with other prayers for war preserved in Second Temple Period literature (*The Scroll of the War*, 212–14).

⁸⁹ Davies, *IQM*, 95–96.

⁹⁰ See the discussion above, beginning on page 139.

⁹¹ See above, pages 97 and 129.

⁹² Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 216–17.

tion of the Kittim. Obviously, this only lends further support to the conclusion reached above, that the prayer “And He has taught us” was specifically intended for the War of the Kittim, and was therefore to be recited by the High Priest as instructed in 15:4–5.

3.1.3. “*You will deliver*” (תסגיר - 1QM 11:13–12:5)

The second prayer (11:13–12:5), which I am calling “You will deliver” (תסגיר - 11:13), is separated from the first by a minor sense division. It is difficult to know what the purpose of this sense division might have been. It may be marking a new prayer altogether, or it may only be indicating that this is the second stanza to, or simply another portion of, the same prayer begun above. Alternatively, it may mark different sources used in composing the prayer. Whatever the case, it is most reasonable to assume that these lines were also to be recited prior to the launching of the first attack. Since it is recorded as a separate unit, I consider it here as an independent prayer.

3.1.3.1. The appeal to Gog (Ezek 38–39) and a war against all nations

The prayer “You will deliver” describes a war against the “ene[m]ies of all the lands” (אויבי כול הארצות - 11:13), recalling the choosing of the “men of war for all the lands of the nations” (אנשי מלחמה לכול) (ארצות הגוים - 2:7), or in other words, the War of the Divisions. As we have seen, this war is fought over a 33 year period, enabling Israel to conquer the rest of the world. At the same time, however, the prayer also appeals to the biblical idea of the eschatological war against Gog (11:15–16; cf. Ezek 38–39).⁹³ Like the War of the Divisions, the war against Gog is against many nations (Ezek 38:5–6, 15, 22; 39:4), yet it has one fundamental difference: the nations will come to the Land of Israel (Ezek 38:8, 16, 18–19, 21; 39:4), rather than Israel going out to them. Such a war, one to be fought in the Land of Israel against a large assembly of nations, rather than just against the Kit-

⁹³ In addition to the mention of Gog, 1QM 11:15–16 alludes to Ezek 38:23 and 38:7, in that order.

tim and their few allies as in col. 1, is a new idea hitherto not found in M.

One can postulate as to why the author or redactor may have thought an allusion to the war against Gog was appropriate. Was it to appeal to its eschatological dimension? Was it because the subject matter is the defeat of the nations, an element integral to the War of the Divisions? Or was it to emphasize the coming of the nations to the Land of Israel for an ultimate battle, just as the one against the Kittim?⁹⁴ Is Gog another name for the Kittim, as the ultimate eschatological enemy? Could it be an epithet for the “king of the north?”⁹⁵ Any of the above are possibilities, but the key to understanding this allusion is to place it in its proper context. If the prayer “You will deliver,” as has been suggested above, is part of what the High Priest is to recite in 15:4–5, then one should look for the rationale behind the reference to Gog, not in what precedes the prayer, but in cols. 15–19 where the prayer belongs.

3.1.3.2. The war against all nations in columns 15–19

Although there are no allusions to Gog in cols 15–19,⁹⁶ several times it is mentioned that the War against the Kittim will be a “war against *all* the nations” (מלחמה בכול הגוים - 15:1 [emphasis mine]; see also 15:2, 13; 16:1; 19:10), even though this stands in contradiction to the list of enemies in 1:1–2. That such references to “all the nations” are somehow connected to the war against Gog is further strengthened by M’s use of the expression “assembly of nations,” one that is to gather against Israel. In 11:16, the war is described as being against “Gog and all his assembly assembled...” (בגוג ובכול קהלו הנקה[ה] ל[ים]), citing from Ezek 38:7. Alluding to this, we read in 15:10–11, that the battle will be against “all the assembly of their multitudes” (כול קהל[ה] מונם). In 19:10, we read that the army of the Kittim is com-

⁹⁴ Yadin points out that although there is no parallelism made between Gog and the Sons of Darkness, nor between Gog and the Kittim, Gog, as king of Magog, is nevertheless a Japhethite (*The Scroll of the War*, 215, n. 1).

⁹⁵ This would be similar to a suggestion put forward by Davies, in which he associated Gog to Antiochus IV (*IQM*, 106).

⁹⁶ The only other reference to Gog in the Dead Sea Scrolls is in 4QJonathan (4Q523 frgs. 1–2:5). Note, however, an additional reference to Magog in 4QpIsa^a (4Q161 3:25).

prised of “all the nations assembled” (וּחִיל כּוֹל הַגּוֹיִם הִנְקֵה־לֵימ). It would seem, therefore, that the portrayal of the War against the Kittim has taken on an added dimension in cols. 15–19 than what was attributed to it in col. 1. It now has a universal, if not final, character. If one were to read just cols. 15–19, one would not have the impression that the War against the Kittim is simply the “beginning of the Sons of Light’s dominion, starting with the Sons of Darkness...” (IQM 1:1), an initial stage that requires another 33 years of battles beyond Israel’s borders to conquer the rest of the world.⁹⁷ Consequently, it is most probable that col. 1 and cols. 15–19 do not share a common author, as was already pointed out by Davies,⁹⁸ but that we have here some kind of merging of sources.⁹⁹ It also seems that our prayer “You will deliver” shares a similar outlook as that which stands behind cols. 15–19, rather than what is reflected in cols. 1–9. Consequently, this prayer fits best with cols. 15–19, just like “And He has taught us.”¹⁰⁰ And while it is impossible to know with certainty, it is likely that it too was expected to be recited by the High Priest.

3.2. Prayers for during the fighting

3.2.1. “And You, God” (וְאַתָּה אֱלֹהִים - IQM 12:7–16)

The prayer “You will deliver” is distinguished from the next one (IQM 12:7–16), which I am calling “And You, God” (וְאַתָּה אֱלֹהִים - 12:7), by a major sense division. Obviously then, the relationship between this prayer and the previous one is less intimate than between “And He has taught us” and “You will deliver” which are only separated by a minor sense division. But beyond this basic conclusion, nothing more can be affirmed about the relationship of this prayer with the preceding ones. Also important to note is that the

⁹⁷ It may be for this very reason that it is found at the end of M, rather than in between cols. 1 and 2 as would have otherwise been expected.

⁹⁸ Davies, *IQM*, 21.

⁹⁹ See note 18 on page 246 as to how the use of the expression “people of God” may also be an indication that cols. 15–19 are from a different tradition than col. 1.

¹⁰⁰ But see below the discussion beginning on page 297.

prayer is not introduced by any rubric, giving either its setting or who is expected to recite it, so that little can be affirmed about the context for which it was intended. Some help may come from comparing the structure of cols. 10–14 to 15–19. I have already suggested that the prayers in 9:E–12:5 correspond to and complement the instructions in 14:E–16:1. Interestingly, a major sense division ends both sections. Immediately after this sense division in col. 16 are instructions for during the fighting, including speeches (16:2–17:E). As we shall see,¹⁰¹ there are parallels between 17:E–19:E and 12:E–14:E. It seems therefore that the prayers in 12:7–E are for the same point in the battle as in 16:2–17:E, namely, during actual combat.¹⁰²

This prayer is unique in that it is the only one which is repeated in cols. 15–19 (18:E–19:8). There, the setting of its recitation is at victory time (17:E–18:6a) just before the army's return to camp (19:9). Any implications this may have for our understanding as to why it has been included nonetheless at this point in cols. 10–14 will be considered later, when comparing the order and selection of prayers between cols. 10–14 and cols. 15–19 as a whole.¹⁰³ Of immediate concern is the difference between this prayer and the ones that precede it, as well as the variants between it and the copy in col. 19.

The main difference from the prayers that precede it is that this one is much more of a call upon God to act, rather than a song of praise (10:8b–E) or a recalling of sacred history and God's promises (11:1–12:5). Its inspirational or motivational character stands out, giving the impression that with God's intervention, victory becomes certain, not just possible (esp. 12:13–16). It is particularly fitting for an army on the verge of launching their attack or in the midst of fighting. Thus, while it can fit as a continuation of the previous two prayers, it need not be. Indeed, when in parallel with cols. 15–19

¹⁰¹ Below, beginning on page 283.

¹⁰² While Yshai agrees that 16:2–17:9 describes that which is to take place during the fighting, she suggests the prayer in 12:7–16 should be recited before the start of the fighting (“התפילות בספרות המלחמה,” 133). But this would imply that the major sense division at 12:6 marks the transition between two prayers to be said before the battle, while the minor sense division at 12:16 marks the division between prayers said prior to fighting and those recited during combat.

¹⁰³ Beginning on page 297.

where there are other prayers to be recited during the fighting (16:15–17:9), one wonders if this one may not also have been intended for such a time.¹⁰⁴

3.2.1.1. Comparing “And You, God” in columns 12 and 19

The variants between it and the version preserved in col. 19 are instructive.¹⁰⁵ Apart from a few orthographic differences, there are two significant additions: the clauses “with the holy ones, mighty [ones, and] host of angels, among our commissioned (men) and the mighty one of wa[r] in our congregation” (עם קדושים גבו[ר]ים ו[צבא] - 12:8–9), and “shine in joyful song, Jerusalem” (והופיעי ברנות ירושלים) - 12:13).¹⁰⁶ Several lexical items in these two phrases are noteworthy.

3.2.1.1.1. Commissioned men

The reference to “our commissioned (men),” if referring to the army and not to the entire people,¹⁰⁷ seems to be fit best in the context of the War of the Divisions, when the army is composed of men chosen

¹⁰⁴ This would be a situation analogous to Moses raising his hands in prayer during the battle against Amalek (Exod 17:8–15).

¹⁰⁵ A detailed comparison of this prayer as it appears in both cols. 12 and 19, as well as in 4Q492 frg. 1:1–8, can be found in Yshai, “התפילות בספרות המלחמה,” 129–47. I highlight here only the differences that have a direct impact on the present study.

¹⁰⁶ There is also the addition of the adjective “guilty” (אשמה) at 12:12. While not significant in understanding to which stage of the eschatological war the prayer relates, it was singled out by Davies in his attempt to retrace the compositional history of M (*IQM*, 103). Note Yshai who highlights the fact that the changes are undoubtedly purposeful and not just circumstantial (“התפילות בספרות המלחמה,” 144).

¹⁰⁷ The poem contains a fourfold parallelism, describing who accompanies with the army (12:8–9):

The king of glory	with us...
The mighty[ones of the] host of heaven	among our commis- sioned (men)
The mighty one of wa[r]	in our congregation
The host of his spirits	with our footmen and horsemen.

It seems therefore that “us,” “our commissioned men,” “our congregation,” and “our footmen and horsemen” are all different descriptions of the army. For the use of פקד in the sectarian texts as meaning commissioned, see CD 10:2; 15:6,8; IQSa 1:9, and Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, “IQSa,” 111, n. 18.

for war,¹⁰⁸ rather than the entire community marching out together as is the case of the War against the Kittim.¹⁰⁹ This is all the more so if there is no exemption practiced during the War against the Kittim: if all are called out to fight, then there is no reason to call any of them “commissioned” so as to differentiate them from another group not at war. Also, the unqualified term “congregation” as meaning the Sons of Light most likely refers to the entire nation of Israel, just as we have seen that it does on the main banner over the entire army (3:13; 4:15) and in the name of the military prince (5:1).¹¹⁰ There the implication is that all of Israel’s tribes have been restored from exile, a situation which is only realized after the victory over the Kittim.¹¹¹

3.2.1.1.2. Jerusalem

Similarly, it is interesting to note the specific mention of Jerusalem in the other added clause (12:13). While on the one hand it is a parallel to Zion which is mentioned in the phrase just before it, this additional reference to Jerusalem is hardly by chance. One possibility is that it may be expressing a more intimate connection with the city that is to exist after the victory over the Kittim during the War of the Divisions. It can hardly be coincidence that these added elements are all characteristic of the War of the Divisions, and that when the prayer is used in the context of the War against the Kittim (as in col. 19), they are absent.¹¹² It is likely, therefore, that this prayer, in the version in which it is preserved in col. 12, has been adapted to fit better the context of the War of the Divisions specifically.

¹⁰⁸ See especially 1QM 2:7–8, but also 2:16.

¹⁰⁹ The same word “their] numbered men” (ויפקוד[הם) is found in 19:12, but here it is directly tied to the “heads of lines” (ראשי המערכות) for whom it is normal to have command over a portion of the entire army.

¹¹⁰ Note how in 1:10, when the author describes the heavenly and earthly sides to the army, he will call the angels a “congregation of divine ones” (עדת אלים) and the military an “assembly of men” (קהלת אנשים), thereby avoiding using the word “congregation” (עדה) to describe the Sons of Light when comprised of only the three tribes.

¹¹¹ See also the discussion on the meaning and use of the word “congregation” in sectarian texts beginning on page 353.

¹¹² These elements are also absent from 4Q492, because like 1QM 19, it too is dealing with the War against the Kittim (see below).

3.2.1.1.3. The war against Gog

At the same time, there are elements in the prayer that are not entirely fitting with the War of the Divisions. Like the preceding prayer, it too contains an allusion to the war against Gog, a dynamic most fitting in the context of cols. 15–19. In 12:9, the army is said to “cover the earth like rain clouds and dew clouds” (כעננים וכעבי טל) (לכסות ארץ), alluding to Ezek 38:16. In M, however, the imagery is reversed. In Ezekiel, those who cover the earth are the army of Gog, all of them riding on horses, while in the prayer “And You, God,” it is his heavenly hosts who are marching out together with the Sons of Light who cover the earth.¹¹³ Another element that seems to reflect the War against the Kittim more than the War of the Divisions is the notion that the war will be won, not by man’s effort, but because of God’s intervention. In the prayer, the people are only called upon to rejoice and allow the spoil to be brought into their cities (12:12–15). Another small detail is the mention of “all the cities of Judah” (כול ערי יהודה - 12:13), reflecting the situation at the opening of the War against the Kittim with the three tribes who have returned from Babylonian exile, rather than the nationalistic outlook that encompasses all twelve tribes as found in the descriptions of the War of the Divisions.

3.2.1.2. A prayer adapted to a new context

The result of the above examination of the prayer “And You, God” (1QM 12:7–16) is that its origins are most likely to be found in a

¹¹³ The mention of Gog’s army riding on horses (Ezek 38:15) is important for understanding the present prayer. In 12:9 we read: “and the army of his holy ones (is) with our infantry and our cavalry” (. וצבא רוחיו עם צעדינו ופרשינו). It is assumed that this clause should be reconstructed in 19:1 as well. In the prayer, this is the assembly who “like clouds (are) to cover the earth (כענן לכסות הארץ) - Ezek 38:16). The mention of the cavalry is therefore an integral component of the contrast the author is making to Ezekiel’s description of Gog’s army, and should not necessarily be seen as an effort to reflect the actual constitution of the Sons of Light’s army. As has already been noted, the cavalry is totally absent in the description of the war in cols. 15–19. Thus, if the horsemen are mentioned in 19:1 as in 12:9, it need not contradict the conclusion we arrived at earlier, namely, that the cavalry is a characteristic of the War of the Divisions and not of the War against the Kittim. Furthermore, in light of the other variants between cols. 12 and 19, the reconstruction, although reasonable, is not certain.

context similar to that of cols. 15–19,¹¹⁴ but that it has been slightly adapted with elements characteristic of the War of the Divisions. This points to a compiler or redactor who thought the prayer important enough to be copied a second time within the same composition, yet not without introducing the aforementioned changes, presumably because he thought these changes would facilitate adapting the prayer to its new context, apparently that of the War of the Divisions.¹¹⁵ That the additions are secondary is suggested by the fact that they relate to the War of the Divisions while the rest of the prayer is more adapted to the War against the Kittim as portrayed in cols. 15–19.¹¹⁶ It is not insignificant that the prayer “And You, God” can be reconstructed in 4Q492 frg. 1 exactly as in IQM 19, but not as in IQM 12 with its added clauses.¹¹⁷ This observation is all the more important, since 4Q492 frg. 1, like IQM 19, transitions from the prayer to instructions for returning to camp after the battle, while IQM 12 does not. This is consistent with the conclusion that the changes in IQM 12 are not circumstantial, but intimately connected to the context in which it is found.

3.2.2. “Mighty ones of war” (גבורי מלחמה - IQM 12:17–E)

After a minor sense division, the prayer “And You, God” is followed by yet another prayer, once again without any kind of introduction as to its context or who is expected to recite it. I have called it “Mighty ones of war” (גבורי המלחמה). Because it is at the bottom of col. 12, only six complete words are extant. Even so, it must be noted that

¹¹⁴ As already posited by Davies (IQM, 103).

¹¹⁵ That the same editor or compiler is responsible for including both versions of the prayer “And You, God” is also suggested by Yshai (“ספרות המלחמה” בקומראן, 219–20, 316).

¹¹⁶ For further evidence that the version of “And You, God” is secondary in col. 12 to the one in col. 19 and 4Q492, see Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “Recensions,” 352–56. This is contrary to John Zhu-En Wee’s conclusion that the added elements in col. 12 are in fact the removed elements in col. 19 (“Model for Composition,” 266–68). His arguments, however, can be used in either direction, all the more so when considering the two different stages in the eschatological war.

¹¹⁷ The only difference between IQM 19 and 4Q492 that can be discerned from the extant texts is that “very” is spelled differently (מואדה in IQM 19:5 and מאוד in 4Q492 frg. 1:5).

one of its words is “Jerusalem.” As we have seen, it can be inferred from col. 1 that the Sons of Light will only take over the city and its temple after the defeat of the Kittim. Thereafter, during the War of the Divisions, they are to set out from and return to Jerusalem (7:3–4, see also 3:10–11). More than likely, though, the mention of Jerusalem is not to be part of some description or prescription of what must take place, but only part of the prayer. If it is justified to see the addition of Jerusalem in the prayer “And You, God” as an attempt to better depict the War of the Divisions, then maybe its mention in this prayer reflects the same. But because the data is so fragmentary, little more than these basic observations can be made.

3.3. *Prayers for victory time and after*

While up until this point (9:E–12:E) the prayers of cols. 10–14 have succeeded one another in succession without any introductions explaining their context, from here on (12:E–14:E) they are accompanied by rubrics which give the intended background. As we shall see, corresponding introductions are found in cols. 18–19 both in their number and the settings they describe (see Table 11). Consequently, what we have here are two parallel accounts for the exact same points in war.¹¹⁸ Comparing the rubrics of these parallel accounts will prove particularly useful for understanding the purpose of the prayers in cols. 10–14.

¹¹⁸ In Yshai’s opinion, col. 19 does not belong to M at all, but is part of a separate composition (“ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 221, 317). In support of her position, she points out that there is no physical connection between cols. 18 and 19. However, since it is possible that what is traditionally called col. 19 could also be col. 20, no such connection would be possible (see above, page 12). Her second argument is that col. 19 does not fit the context of col. 18. Not only does this argument become irrelevant if what is called col. 19 is in fact the twentieth column, it is also refuted by the parallels between the rubrics in cols. 13–14 and those in cols. 18–19. In addition, there are at least five lines missing at the end of col. 18, so that the topic could have easily changed before the end of the column to that which is found in col. 19. Finally, even if Yshai would be correct, she fails to explain why cols. 15–18 discuss the sequence of the battle anew from its beginning after it has been described in detail in cols. 7–14, right up to the day after the victory.

With respect to the prayers themselves, ironically not one of them found in the one account (12:E–14:E) is also in the other (17:E–19:E).¹¹⁹ However, two prayers are very similar, suggesting they are nevertheless to be equivocated: “Blessed be God” (אל ברוך אל - 13:2–3) and “Blessed be your name” (ברוך שמכה - 18:6b–8). Otherwise, all other attempts at equating a prayer from one section with one in the other must remain tentative. The implication of these preliminary observations will be taken up below,¹²⁰ when seeking to understand the liturgical unit (cols. 10–14) as a whole in light of the rituals found in cols. 15–19. Of immediate concern is to identify within the collection of prayers and their frameworks in cols. 13–14 those elements which may help identify to which of the two stages of the war they were intended, especially in comparison to the content of the prayers and their rubrics found in cols. 15–19, columns we have already determined to be dealing with the War against the Kittim.

3.3.1. *The first rubric (1QM 12:E–13:2a)*

Unfortunately, the first such introduction (12:E–13:2a) is partial, its first few lines having been at the bottom of col. 12 which are not preserved. Still, there are instructions to “bless from their position the God of Israel” (וברכו על עומדם את אל ישראל) (13:1). This is undoubtedly parallel to that which is found in 18:5b–6a, where we are told that they are to “bless there the God of Israel” (וברכו שם את אל ישראל) (18:6). It may be that “from their position” in 13:1 is an explanatory elaboration of “there” in 18:6. In order to facilitate further comparison between the two rubrics, I cite them here, beginning with the one in col. 13:

ואחיו ה[כו]הֲנִים והלוויים וכול זקני הסרך עמו וברכו על עומדם את אל
ישראל ואת כול מעשי אמתו וזעמו
שם אֵת בְּ[לי]על ואת כול רוחי גורלו וענו ואמרו...²

¹ and his brothers the [pr]iests and the Levites and all the elders of the rule with him. And they will bless in their position the

¹¹⁹ The prayer “And You, God” (18:E–19:8) does not qualify, as it is found in col. 12, not cols. 13–14.

¹²⁰ Beginning on page 297.

God of Israel, and all his truthful deeds. And they will denounce

- ² Be[li]al there, and all the spirits of his lot. And they will answer and they will say...

The corresponding rubric in col. 18 is much more elaborate:

1 [...] וְכִבֵּהּ [נ]שֵׂא יַד אֵל הַגְּדוּלָה עַל בְּלִיעַל וְעַל כּוֹל [] לְמַמְשֵׁלְתוֹ בַּמִּגְפָּה עוֹלָמִים
 2 [...] וְתִרְוַעַת קְדוּשִׁים בְּרִדְף אֲשׁוּר וּנְפִלוּ בְנֵי יִפְתָּ לְאִין קוּם וְכַתִּיִּם יִכְתּוּ לְאִין
 3 [...] מִשְׁאֵת יַד אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל כּוֹל הַמּוֹן בְּלִיעַל בְּעַת הַהִיא הַיָּרִיעוּ הַכּוֹהֲנִים
 4 [...] הַצְּצוּצָרֹת הַזֹּכְרוֹן וְנֶאֱסַפוּ אֵלֵיהֶם כּוֹל מַעֲרֻכוֹת הַמִּלְחָמָה וְנִחְלְקוּ עַל כּוֹל מְ
 כְּתִיִּם
 5 לְהַחֲרִימָם [] אֹיֵץ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לְבוֹא בְיוֹם הַהוּאָה יַעֲמוּד כּוֹהֵן הַרְוֹאֵשׁ וְהַכּוֹהֲנִים
 וְהַלְוִיִּים אֲשֶׁר
 6 אֲתוּ וְרָא [שִׁי] הֶסְרַךְ וּבְרַכּוּ שֵׁם אֵת אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְעָנוּ וְאָמְרוּ...

- ¹ ... And when the great hand of God is [ra]ised against Belial and against all [] of his dominion in an everlasting slaughter,
² ...] and the alarm-cry of the holy ones as they pursue Assyria, (then) the sons of Japheth will fall to never get up, and the Kittim will be crushed without
³ ...] the upraising of the hand of the God of Israel against the multitude of Belial. At that time, the priests shall blow
⁴ ... trump]ets of remembrance, and all the lines of war will be gathered to them, and they shall divide up against all the m[K]ittim
⁵ ... to annihilate them [...] the sun hastens to set on that day, the Head Priest will stand (together) with the priests and the [Levit]es who are
⁶ with him, and the he[ads] the rule, and they will bless there the God of Israel. And they shall answer and say...

As is immediately visible, it is unfortunate that the parallel lines at the end of col. 12 were not preserved, as the comparison with 18:1–5a would have been most informative. In col. 18, the setting described is that the War against the Kittim, as we have already determined. In col. 13 the one big difference is the addition of the leaders being instructed to curse Belial in addition to blessing God.¹²¹ Yet there is nothing inherent in cursing Belial that would be inappropriate for the War against the Kittim. On the contrary, one

¹²¹ I do not think there is any significance for understanding the context behind the rubric in col. 13 in the switch from the “chie[fs of all the line]s of the rule” (18:6) to the “elders of the rule” (13:1).

would anticipate it to be particularly fitting, so that it is surprising that such an instruction is not also included in the rubric in col. 18. At the same time, neither does anything preclude such a curse from being appropriate for the War of the Divisions.¹²² Unfortunately, no explanation is given as to why the curse is included in the one account (col. 13) and not in the other (col. 18). Such a difference hints to the possibility that while col. 18 is for the War against the Kittim, col. 13 must be about the War of the Divisions, but with the little of the rubric that is preserved in col. 13, this is impossible to confirm, as it could be caused by other factors. However, one can be fairly certain that the same point in the fighting is intended in both columns. Unfortunately, little more than this can be inferred.

In col. 13, this introduction is followed by four prayers, two short and two longer ones. I have called them “Blessed be God” (אל ברוך אל - 13:2b–3), “And cursed be Belial” (וארור בליעל) (13:4–6), “God of our fathers” (אל אבותינו) (13:7–17) and “For you have appointed us” (כי[א] אתה יעדתנו) (13:18–14:1). The first two, as their names indicate, bless God and curse Belial in turn, just as instructed in the rubric. The next two are hymns praising God for his faithfulness.¹²³

3.3.1.1. “Blessed be God” (אל ברוך) and “And cursed be Belial (וארור בליעל) - 1QM 13:2b–6

As mentioned above, an equivalent to “Blessed be God” is found in 18:6b–8, called “Blessed be your name” (ברוך שמכה). While there are some differences, they both begin by blessing God, and are approximately the same length. That in both col. 13 and in col. 18 the liturgical section begins with similar or corresponding prayers further strengthens the assumption that in both accounts we are dealing with the same point in the battle. Unfortunately, with respect to the prayers themselves, they are both sufficiently generic that they could be used equally in both stages of the war, either the War against the Kittim or the War of the Divisions, so that comparing

¹²² See 1QM 4:1–2 where the name of Belial is mentioned on one of the banners, together with a reference to those “of his lot” (גורלו).

¹²³ These last two prayers are divided by a minor sense division, so that it may also be that both prayers are part of the same hymn praising God.

them does not offer any help in discerning the purpose behind the collection of prayers in cols. 10–14.

Interestingly, col. 18 does not preserve any prayer parallel to “And cursed be Belial” (1QM 13:2b–6). Yet it is clear that the battle in col. 18 is also against Belial (18:1, 3). It is difficult to understand, therefore, why such a curse is omitted in col. 18.¹²⁴ Even so, in col. 13 it is clearly the counterpart to “Blessed be God” and should be understood in conjunction with it. Suffice it to say for now that such a curse would have been appropriate for either stage of the eschatological war.

3.3.2. “God of our fathers” (אל אבותינו) and “For You have appointed us” (כיא אתה יעדתנו) - 1QM 13:7–14:1

If both prayers were intended for the same point in the battle, one would assume that there should be ongoing correspondence between cols. 13 and 18 in what comes after the initial blessing (13:2–6; 18:6b–8). However, this is not the case, and the hymns of praise in 13:7–14:1 are significantly different from the prayers in 18:10–19:8. The first hymn of praise, “God of our fathers” (13:7–17) is appropriate in its context: its beginning “Your name we shall bless forever” (שמכה נברכה לעולמים - 13:7) is obviously fitting to the instruction in the rubric to “bless the God of Israel.” Additionally, it imitates the preceding prayer “Blessed be God” by very quickly highlighting the Sons of Light’s favored position vis-à-vis God in addition to blessing him:¹²⁵ “And we (are) with...” or “And we (are) the people of...” (וּאֲנֵנוּ עִם [] לְ [] - 13:7).

¹²⁴ As an aside, it may be significant that Belial is not found at all in cols. 2–9 except in 4:2, but there is a good chance that this is a later dualistic reworking of an editor, as already suggested by Davies (*IQM*, 34). It has been pointed out that one of the differences between S and Sb is that the curses against Belial found in the former are absent in the latter (Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 75). Yet even in Sb it is clear that there are wars to be fought, to be led by the Prince of the Congregation (see especially 1QSb 5:24–29). Could the presence of the curses against Belial be evidence that the prayer in cols. 10–14 were originally intended for the war(s) prior to the eschatological age described in Sa and Sb?

¹²⁵ In contrast, the prayer of blessing in 18:6b–8 praises God throughout. John Zhu-En Wee has noted that in cols. 10–14 the human element is emphasized (“Model for Composition,” 267, 269).

Yet even with these items that link the hymns of praise to the preceding rubric, the hymns' contents have little if any connection to a war context for which they are supposedly intended. What war imagery there is, it could just as well be stylistic or thematic, so that it is even conceivable that these hymns could be used in a different situation altogether.¹²⁶ Obviously, then, they can be equally used in both stages of the eschatological war.¹²⁷

In contrast, the prayer in col. 18, which I am calling "You have performed wonders" (הפלתה - 18:10-E), contains elements that not only relate exclusively to a context of war, but even to a specific point in time during the battle: "And now the day is hastening to pursue their multitudes" (ועתה היום עץ לנו לרדוף המונים) (1QM 18:12). This corresponds exactly with the setting given for the prayer's recitation: "And when the great hand of God is [ra]ised against Belial... and all the lines of war will be gathered and they shall divide up against all *m*[K]ittim to annihilate them [...]the sun hastens to set on that day..." (וְבֵהָ[נ] שא יד אל הגדולה על בליעל... ונאספו... כול מערכות המלחמה) (18:1) - ונחלקו על כול מ[] כ[ת]יים להחרים [] אוץ השמש לבוא...¹²⁸ Unfortunately, much of the bottom of col. 18 did not survive, giving us little to work with in comparing this prayer with the one in col. 13. What can be asserted, however, is that while there is contextual harmony between the rubric and the prayer "You have done wonders" (18:10-E) in col. 18, no such connection is evident in col.

¹²⁶ As suggested by Davies (*IQM*, 109). Note Yadin who points out their similarities to D. Because the content of these prayers did not seem to fit the rubric that preceded them (12:E-13:3), Yadin lumped them together with those before them (12:17-13:6) and assigned the lot to the time *after* the Sons of Darkness have been defeated, suggesting these prayers related instead to the events in 19:9-10 (*The Scroll of the War*, 210, 223-25). However, this ignores the rubric in 12:E-13:2 and its correspondence to the one in 17:E-18:5a.

¹²⁷ Note that Duhaime suggests that there is evidence that lines 9b-12a are a later addition to the prayer "God of our fathers" ("Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran," *CBQ* 49 [1987]: 43-46). Even if so, it is impossible to know when such an addition was made. Furthermore, it has no implications for the present survey.

¹²⁸ It is all the more difficult, then, to understand why there is a large sense division between the two prayers (18:6b-8 and 18:10-E). A possible explanation is that the prayers were drawn from different sources, and the compiler used the unit delimiter to mark this fact.

13 between its rubric and the prayers “God of our fathers” and “For you have appointed us.”

Another difference in col. 18 is that the prayer “You have performed wonders” transitions into “And You, God” (18:E–19:8), a prayer found previously in 12:7–16. As we have seen, in col. 12 it is a call upon God to participate in the fighting, coming immediately after two other prayers that are to be recited before joining the battle with the enemy. In the context of cols. 18–19, the prayer “And You, God” also serves as a petition for God to intervene, and although it is not recited when the fighting first begins, it is likewise used when the Sons of Light launch an attack: in col. 12 it is the initial one; in col. 19, the final one.

There is yet another oddity with this prayer “And You, God” and where it is placed in the sequence of prayers in cols. 15–19. The introductory rubric gives no hint that the priests and Levites are to call upon God to join in the war; they are only instructed to bless God. Thus, while it is possible to see the rationale behind its inclusion at this point in the battle narrative, it is disconnected from the rubric that precedes it, suggesting that the entire prayer may be secondary in this specific location.

Thus, after the rubrics in 12:E–13:2 and 17:E–18:6a instructing the leadership to bless God specifically at the point when they are to engage in the final pursuit of the enemy, and after the initial blessings (13:2–6 and 18:6b–8),¹²⁹ the two columns then preserve very different prayers. The overall mood of the prayers in 18:6–19:8 is that one is on the verge of a great victory, at a momentous point in the war. All that is lacking is the last effort of the Sons of Light to finish off the task (18:12; 19:3–4). In contrast, the prayers in col. 13 do not seem to carry that same kind of urgency, nor the sense of being face to face with a magnanimous event. Particularly obvious is the absence of any call to action; instead, there is only a call to rejoice (13:12–13). One almost gets the feeling that the war is already won, or that the prayers are out of context. Yet in spite of these differences between cols. 13 and 18, little in the content of the

¹²⁹ I have included the blessing of Belial in 13:4–6 as part of the prayer blessing God (13:2–3), since both by its content and length, it is more related to it than to the prayers that follow.

prayers restricts them to one or the other stage of the eschatological war. In 18:12, there is mention of the “day is hastening for us to pursue their multitudes” (היום אץ לנו לרדוף המונם), reminiscent of the “day of their war against the Kittim” which is “hurrying unto the end” (1:12). In contrast, the prayers in col. 13 hardly seem adapted to a war context in the first place.

3.3.2.1. The context of the prayers for victory time

In summary then, of the four prayers in 12:E–14:1, the first two are especially suited to the rubric that introduces them (13:1–2), while the last two seem to be almost superfluous, if not ill-suited in a war context. Yet neither the rubric nor the prayers are so specific that they are applicable to only one or the other of the eschatological war’s two stages. In contrast, the parallel rubric in 17:E–18:6a is for the most part specifically adapted to the War against the Kittim. That it is followed by a prayer blessing God (18:6b–8) without one cursing Belial as in col. 13 is consistent with the rubric. Also, it appears that the prayer in 18:10–E could be a continuation of the one in 18:6b–8, as it too praises God. Like the rubric, it too is specifically suited for the War against the Kittim, with the mention of the day hurrying along. However, the next prayer “And You, God” (18:E–19:8) does not seem to relate back to the rubric preceding it, raising the possibility that it is a later insertion. On the basis of these observations, it is likely that the differences between the two accounts are due to their being related to different stages in the eschatological war: cols. 13–14 for the War of the Divisions and col. 18 for the War against the Kittim. Another possibility would be that the scenario introduced by the rubrics was expected to occur more than once over the course of a battle, allowing for different sets of prayers each time.

3.3.3. *The second rubric (1QM 14:2–4a)*

The final rubric in cols. 10–14 introduces that which is to take place after the victory (14:2–4). Without any doubt, it corresponds to the

one in 19:9–13.¹³⁰ Fortunately, unlike the preceding rubrics, more of these two are preserved, and comparison between them is much more profitable. I include the relevant texts below, beginning with col. 14:

2 ואחר העלותם מעל החללים לבוא המחנה ירננו כולם את תהלת המשוב
ובבוקר יכבסו בגדיהם ורחצו
3 מדם פגרי האשמה וישבו אל מקום עומדם אשר סדרו שם המערכה לפני נפול
חללי האויב וברכו שם
4 כולם את אל ישראל

- 2 and after they have gone up from upon the slain to come to the camp, they shall all sing joyfully the psalm of return. And in the morning they shall wash their clothes and bathe
3 from the blood of the corpses of the guilty. Then they shall return to the place where they had stood, there where they had arranged their line, before the fallen slain of the enemy, and there they shall bless,
4 all of them, the God of Israel...

And the corresponding lines from col. 19:¹³¹

9 ואחר יאספו המחנה בלילה ההוא למנוח עד הבוקר ובבוקר יבואו עד מָקוֹם
המערכה
10 אֲשֶׁר נָפְלוּ שָׁם גְּבוּרֵי כְּתִיּוֹם וְהַמּוֹן אֲשׁוּר וְחֵיל כּוֹל הַגּוֹיִם הַנִּקְהָלִים אִם] [״״
חללים
11 לְאִיִּן מִ[קַּב]ר אֲשֶׁר נָפְלוּ שָׁם בַּחֶרֶב אֶל וּנְגַשׁ שָׁם כּוֹהֵן הַרִ״אשׁ [״ הוֹ״]
12 [...] מְלַחֲמָה וְכוּל רֵאשֵׁי הַמְּעַרְכוֹת וּפְקוּדֵיהֶם...
13 יָהּ בְּעוֹמְדָם עַל חַלְלֵי כְּתִיּוֹם וְהַלְלוּ שָׁם אֶת אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל...

- 9 And after, they shall gather (in) the camp (for) that night to rest until the morning. And in the morning they shall come to the place of the line
10 where they fell there, the mighty (men) of the Kittim, and of the multitude of Assyria, and of the army of all the assembled nations, (to see) if [] the slain
11 with no one to b[ur]y (them), those who fell there by the sword of God. And there the he[ad] priest shall draw near[] hw []
12] war, and all the heads of the lines and [their] numbered (men)...
13 together when standing over the slain of the Kitt[im, and] there they [shall pr]aise the God of Israel...

¹³⁰ As has been highlighted by various scholars such as Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 196, n. 1; van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 12; Davies, *IQM*, 73.

¹³¹ As reconstructed with the help of 4Q492.

The instructions in col. 14 differ from those in col. 19 in several respects: first, upon the Sons of Light's return to their camp after the battle, they are to sing a "Psalm of Return" (תהלת המשוב - 14:2),¹³² rather than simply resting (19:9). Second, they are to perform several purification rites to cleanse themselves of their enemy's blood (14:2–3). Third, there is no mention that the enemy has fallen as a result of God's direct intervention, nor is there a question about whether or not they have been defeated.¹³³ Fourth, the opposing army is called "enemies" (14:3) and not Kittim (19:10). Finally, the High Priest, other priests, and the Levites are not explicitly mentioned.¹³⁴

Since both these columns give instructions for the exact same point in the battle, for the evening of and the morning after the victory, the differences between them preclude them from being for the same victory but require that they be for different ones. Since col. 19 is dealing explicitly with the War against the Kittim which has only one victorious evening, col. 14 cannot be about that same victory but must be, by deduction, about the War of the Divisions. Note, for example, how the Sons of Light's opponents are "enemies," just as in cols. 3–9. This conclusion is further strengthened by the introduction to M (cols. 1–2) where we read that one of the differences between the War against the Kittim and the War of the Divisions is that in the former, it is God's miraculous intervention that allows the Sons of Light to conquer the Kittim, while in the War of the Divisions, the focus is solely on the human effort and proper observance of the rules for war. Compare also the description of the final pursuit of the War against the Kittim (17:E–18:5) to that of the War of the Divisions (9:3–6). In the former, the tide of victory turns to the side of the Sons of Light, not as an outcome of their fighting, but because

¹³² On the basis of 1 Macc 4:24, it may be that Ps 118 is the Psalm of Return (See Davies, *IQM*, 82, n. 20).

¹³³ I do not agree with Davies that in the two accounts the place where they are to stand to bless God on the morning after is different (see *IQM*, 70–71). In both accounts they are to stand at the "place of the line" (מקום המערכה - 1QM 14:3; 19:9).

¹³⁴ It could be that they are implied as the ones who arrayed the army in 14:3 (cf. 5:16). Note as well the minor difference that in col. 13 the instructions are to *bless* (וברכו) God, while in col. 19 they are to *praise* (להלל) him, though I do not think that this carries any significance.

of God raising his “mighty hand” (יד אל הגדולה - 18:1). In the latter, victory is merely the result of the Sons of Light’s military superiority: the battle is to continue “until the enem(ies) are smitten and turn back their necks [i.e. in flight]” (עד הנגף האויב והסבו עורפם) (9:2). There is no hint of God’s active participation.¹³⁵

Assuming col. 14 to be about the War of the Divisions helps clarify more of the differences between the two accounts. In col 14, the Sons of Light depart “from upon the slain” (מעל החללים - 14:2), apparently as a sign that the battle has already been conclusively won. Additionally, there is no reference to the time of day, leaving the reader with the assumption that there is nothing unusual about it. In the War against the Kittim, the return to the camp is specifically said to take place at night (19:9), and, according to 4Q492 (since the text is missing in 1QM 19), they simply leave the battle field, without any reference to having slain the enemy: “And after, they shall gather (in) the camp at night...” (ואחר יאספו המחנה בלילה...) (frg. 1:8). It seems, therefore, that the absence of the Psalm of Return and washing in col. 19 (and in 4Q492) is due to the uncertainty when returning to camp as to whether or not the war is actually over. In the War against the Kittim, the tide turns in the Sons of Light’s favor because of God’s sudden intervention (18:1), and while the entire army joins in the final pursuit (18:4), the fall of darkness apparently hinders them from finishing out their task (18:5, 12). The battle is interrupted before total defeat of the Sons of Darkness is secured. When they return the next morning, presumably to finish off the task, they discover that God has done it for them (19:9–11).¹³⁶ None of these dynamics are applicable to the War of the Divisions as described in col. 2. However, the scenario as presented in col. 14 is fitting to the War of the Divisions: victory is secured during the daytime as the Sons of Light’s superiority overcomes the enemy, so that by the time they return to camp, they can already begin the liturgical and purification rites required for after war. Unlike the previous rubric (12:E–13:2), there is no doubt that the present one

¹³⁵ See above, note 125.

¹³⁶ At least, this is the scenario suggested by Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 222–23).

(14:2–4) is intended specifically for the War of the Divisions and not the War against the Kittim, especially when compared to its corresponding one in col. 19 (lines 9–13). Undoubtedly, then, col. 14 is about the War of the Divisions.

3.3.3.1. Blessed be the God of Israel” (ברוך אל ישראל) and “Rise up! Rise up!” (רומה רומה) - 1QM 14:4b–E

With this in mind, it is now possible to turn to the prayers themselves. Unfortunately, the one in col. 19 is not preserved at all, precluding any possibility of comparing the two accounts. In col. 14, two prayers are extant, the first almost entirely, while of the second only small portions of three lines remain. The first I have called “Blessed be the God of Israel” (ברוך אל ישראל - 14:4b–15), and the second “Rise up! Rise up!” (רומה רומה - 14:16–E).¹³⁷ Of the second prayer (14:16–E), only the clause “S]ons of Darkness” (בְּנֵי חוֹשֶׁךְ - 14:17) is preserved, suggesting that the prayer is specific to the eschatological war. But nothing makes it distinctive for either of its two stages.¹³⁸ In contrast, the first prayer is particularly fitting in the present context, at least initially. In the rubric, the leadership is asked to “bless God,” and this is exactly what the prayer does, as its title indicates.¹³⁹ Furthermore, the prayer’s content clearly reflects its intent to be used in a context of war: “and an assembly of nations he has gathered to exterminate without remnant” (וקהל גויים אסף לכלה) (14:5) and the mention of “to teach war” (ללמד מלחמה) (14:6).

However, when it comes to examining the prayer in light of the two stages of the eschatological war, the matter is more problematic. The first of the two citations above could imply a situation similar to that described in cols. 15–19 based on the war against Gog, and of the War against the Kittim in 1:5–7, and not the War of the Divisions

¹³⁷ Since 4Q491 frgs. 8–10, an almost exact copy of 1QM 14:4–18, does not have a sense division between the two prayers, it may in fact be that they are two parts of a single prayer.

¹³⁸ The only mention of the Sons of Darkness in cols. 15–19 is in 16:11, as part of a battle narrative. The expression, however, is never found in any of the prayers in those columns. This stands in contrast to cols. 10–14, where it appears in another prayer, at 13:16 (see also 13:5).

¹³⁹ See also 14:8, 12.

as implied by the rubric. One detail may be noteworthy: unlike cols. 15–19, it is not *all* nations that are gathered (15:1, 2, 13; 16:1; 19:10). Whether this is significant or not is difficult to ascertain. Could it reflect the adaptation of a prayer taken out of its original context, cols. 15–19 and their appeal to the war against Gog, and used in a different scenario, such as the War of the Divisions? That the nations in question are to be “without remnant” is both reminiscent of the War against the Kittim in 1:6 and one of the banners used for the War of the Divisions (4:2).

The prayer also mentions that the Sons of Light are the “rem[nant(s)]” (שא[ר]ית), a notion apparently connected to the “dominion of Belial” (ממשלת בליעל - 14:9). In M, the Sons of Light are described as being remnants only in cols 13–14 (13:8; 14:8, 9). From col. 1, we know that the dominion of Belial is to come to an end with the War against the Kittim (1:5–6). This is confirmed in 18:11, where we are told that the battle is “to turn the dom[in]ion of the enemy to naught” (להסיר ממ[ן]ש[ל]ת אויב לאין עוד). In that war, we know that some in the Sons of Light’s army will fall. In col. 14, however, God is blessed for having done wonders to his remnant during the dominion of Belial. What is striking about this statement is that it is made after the victory, and that nowhere in the prayer is God blessed for having just brought Belial’s dominion to an end as one would have expected in light of 1:5–6 and 18:11, or if the victory in question was over the Kittim and Belial. This may be a hint that the victory in question is not the one during the War against the Kittim. Furthermore, since this and all the other statements related to Belial’s rule in col. 14 are in the past, it is possible that this part of the prayer is not reflecting a current situation, nor one to come, but that which has already taken place. In the same way that God is being praised for keeping his covenant with Israel’s fathers, so He is being praised for the faithfulness He showed during the dominion of Belial, a dominion now passed away by the time of the present victory. It appears, therefore, that the remnant in question are those who have not only made it through the time of Belial’s rule, but through the first stage of the eschatological war, the War against the

Kittim, as well.¹⁴⁰ They are the ones who were tested in the War against the Kittim (16:11–17:1), but did not fall. This is also consistent with Mic 5:4–7 (E:5–8), a text we have seen to have inspired both cols. 1 and 2, where the remnant are those who have survived the war against Assyria. Consequently, it would appear that the prayer in col. 14 is a blessing to be recited during the War of the Divisions, recalling God’s past faithfulness in that He preserved the Sons of Light through the evil times under Belial’s rule, and that He has brought them through yet another victory.

However, this conclusion is mitigated by another one of the prayer’s characteristics. Throughout it emphasizes the people’s weakness and its ill-suitedness for fighting war. This is certainly not what one would have expected concerning the “men of war” (אנשי מלחמה - 2:7) and the “men of valor” (אנשי חיל - 2:8) who have been specifically chosen for the War of the Divisions. Rather, such a description reflects more the kind of army that would have been in need of encouragement before the War against the Kittim (see 15:6a–16:1). Several of its lexical elements are also used exclusively in the context of the War against the Kittim, such as the “people of his redemption” (עם פדוותרו - 14:5; cf. 1:12; 11:9; 14:10; 17:6; even 15:1 and 18:11) and the “melted heart” (לב נמס - 14:6; cf. 11:9). Indeed, the characterization of the army is similar to the one in the prayers “And He has taught us” (9:E–11:12) and “You will deliver” (11:13–12:5). These prayers, as we have seen, were specifically composed for the War against the Kittim.¹⁴¹ Consequently, while there is little doubt that the rubric in col. 14 was composed specifically for the War of the Divisions, especially when it is contrasted to the rubric in col. 19 that is for the War against the Kittim, the prayers in col. 14 betray an original setting different than their present context.

¹⁴⁰ This is consistent with E. P. Sanders view: “The sect did not entitle itself ‘remnant’ during its historical existence. The term is used in the biblical sense of those who survive the judgment (thus ‘survivors’ is parallel to ‘remnant’ in 1QH 6.8 and 1QM 13.8)” (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977], 250–51).

¹⁴¹ See the discussion above, beginning on page 274.

3.4. *The origins of columns 10–14*

3.4.1. *The basic differences between columns 10–14 and columns 15–19*

Having considered each prayer in cols. 10–14 independently and in comparison to their parallel prayers in cols. 15–19, it is now possible to consider both units (cols. 10–14 and cols. 15–19) as a whole. Already, we have noted that while there are some extensive similarities between them, there are also some critical differences (see Table 11). Without entering into too much detail, I begin with a general synthesis of those which are most significant. In cols. 15–19, five times there are introductory rubrics¹⁴² given in order to clarify the circumstance and the logistics of the prayers or speeches about to be delivered.¹⁴³ In cols. 10–14, only two are extant.¹⁴⁴ While it is possible that one is missing at the bottom of col. 9, this still does not account for the difference.¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, even with the two rubrics in cols. 13–14, both of which have parallels in cols. 18–19, it is clear that the order of the prayers in cols 10–14 is chronological, just as in cols. 15–19.¹⁴⁶ Even so there are big differences content-wise: in cols. 10–14 there are three sets of prayers (9:E–12:E; 13:2–14:1; 14:16–E) and one hymn (psalm) which is not

¹⁴² In cols. 10–14, rubrics are anything that comes between two prayers. In cols. 15–19, there is also much description of the fighting, so that Davies rightfully divided the text into “framework, liturgy, and battle-narratives” (*IQM*, 68). While I too respect such a literary division of the text, there are times when the battle narrative is integral to setting the context for the prayers that follow, in which case I include it in the rubric for comparison with what is in cols. 10–14.

¹⁴³ 14:E–15:5a introduces the prayer of the High Priest (15:5); 15:5b–7a introduces the speech of the Appointed Priest (15:7b–16:1); 16:11–14 introduces the speech of the High Priest (16:15–17:9); 18:1–6a introduces the prayer of the priests and Levites at victory time (18:6b–8) and 19:9–13 introduces the prayer for the morning after the victory (assumed to be in 19:14–E).

¹⁴⁴ 13:1–2a introduces prayers of blessing and cursing (13:2b–14:1) and 14:2–4a introduces the prayers for after the victory (14:4b–E).

¹⁴⁵ Since the beginnings of all the prayers in cols. 10–14 are preserved, we can be certain that there were no additional rubrics than the two that are extant. The only exception could be a possible introduction at the end of col. 9 which would have introduced either the entire liturgical section or the first prayer specifically.

¹⁴⁶ Compare 13:1 to 18:6 and 14:2–4 to 19:9–11a. In addition, see the discussion about the placement of the prayer “And You, God” beginning on page 277.

spelled out (14:2b), while in cols. 15–19, there are two speeches (15:7b–16:1; 16:15–17:9), one set of prayers (18:6b–19:8), and one prayer which is not spelled out (15:5). In cols. 10–14, therefore, there are only prayers,¹⁴⁷ while in cols. 15–19 there are two speeches (15:7–16:1; 16:15–17:9). Surprisingly, the only prayer that is found in both cols. 10–14 and cols. 15–19 (12:7–16; 18:E–19:8), is apparently not even recited at the same point in the war!

Other differences between the two units concern those who are to address the army. In cols. 10–14, we hear of a priest and officers addressing the people one after the other (10:2, 5), and of the leadership, both priestly and lay, blessing God and cursing Belial (13:1–3). At the end of the war, no particular group is singled out, leading to the assumption that everyone participates in the final blessing. In cols. 15–19, the High Priest is to read a prayer, followed by a priest who is to give a speech of encouragement (15:4–7). Later on during the war, the High Priest is to give his own speech of encouragement (16:13). As the battle comes to an end, it is the leadership, including the High Priest and lay leaders, but not the soldiers, who are to offer up the necessary prayers (18:5–6; 19:11–12). A striking difference is the total absence of the High Priest in cols. 10–14 while in cols. 15–19 he plays a most prominent role.¹⁴⁸

Even in light of these basic differences, it would appear that the conclusion reached about the instructions and prayers for the morning after the battle in 14:2–E, namely that they are for the War of the Divisions while their counterparts in 19:9–E are for the War against the Kittim, should be extended to the entire liturgical unit of cols. 10–14. This is not to say, however, that all the prayers in cols. 10–14 were composed for the War of the Divisions in mind. What is true for the entire unit does not necessarily apply to each of its components, as we have already seen. In fact, at least one of the prayers, “And He has taught us,” even as it presently stands, fits the War against the Kittim best. Even so, this conclusion about the entire unit is nevertheless warranted, based on several additional observations.

¹⁴⁷ It is important to note that the speech of encouragement in 10:2–5 is really only the citation of Scripture within a prayer.

¹⁴⁸ See the discussion on the High Priest’s role during the eschatological war beginning on page 318.

3.4.2. *A compilation of prayers for the War of the Divisions*

3.4.2.1. The evidence from the prayer “And You, God”

Above I have suggested that the emendations made to the prayer “And You, God” (12:7–16; 18:E–19:8) in order to include it into cols. 10–14, a prayer which otherwise fits best in the context of cols. 15–19, preserve elements that reflect the War of the Divisions. Fortunately, the prayer is preserved in both units, allowing us to notice such a fact. It may be possible that similar changes were made to other prayers that were drawn from other compositions to be included in cols. 10–14. While one could guess where this may have happened, without the original sources any such suggestion would only be mere speculation. Still, what we can learn from “And You, God,” is that even if a prayer originated within a certain context, it could be adapted to fit a different one altogether. Another example of this are the prayers “God of our fathers” (13:7–17) and “You have appointed us” (13:18–14:1). The intended setting for which both these prayers were originally composed may not even have been one of war. Thus, simply because certain elements within cols. 10–14 do not readily reflect the War of the Divisions does not mean that the entire unit was not intended for it. That the additions to “And You, God” are particularly geared for the War of the Divisions suggests this is the context of the framework into which the prayer was inserted.

3.4.2.2. The evidence from the parallel accounts in columns 13–14 and columns 18–19

There is yet an even more compelling reason to suppose that cols. 10–14 were compiled for the purpose of providing a kind of “rule of prayer” for the War of the Divisions. At the very least, it would only make sense to have such, especially after all the other rules found in cols. 3–9 which are also for the War of the Divisions. No such collection of rules is found for the War against the Kittim. But the reason becomes much more obvious when cols. 10–14 are compared with cols. 15–19, as was done above. Obviously, some of the dissimilarities are due to the different genres and purposes of the two units. As mentioned earlier, cols. 10–14 focus on liturgy for war, which is why they only rarely reference anything about the war

itself. In contrast, cols. 15–19 are more concerned with the development of the fighting, with the author or redactor fitting the prayers and speeches into his broader narrative framework. Even so, the comparison of those sections in both units that correspond to the same point in the fighting (cols. 13–14 and 18–19) leaves no doubt that both accounts *cannot* be describing the same battle.¹⁴⁹ At the very least, the conclusion about the final rubrics in each unit (14:2–4a and 19:9–11a) can be extended to all of cols. 13–14 and 18–19: if the one (cols. 18–19) is about the War against the Kittim, the second (cols. 13–14) can only be about the War of the Divisions.

3.4.2.3. Columns 10–12 and the absence of set-backs

More difficult to grasp is the purpose of cols. 10–12. Without a single extant introductory rubric, the task appears hopeless. If introductory rubrics were included in cols. 13 and 14, and presumably also at the end of col. 9, why not also include them in cols. 10–12? Since there are none, should these columns even be associated with cols. 13–14? Why is one of the prayers in cols. 10–12, “And You, God,” used again in cols. 15–19? Why only one? Why was it not repeated in cols. 15–17 rather than in col. 19? If it was used during the fighting as col. 19 implies, then why was it not rather included

¹⁴⁹ This negates Becker’s view that all of col. 13 is an insertion into cols. 10–14 (*Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament*, SUNT 3 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964], 105). His motivation to suggest such was to align the order of prayers between cols. 10–14 and 15–19, so that the prayer “And You, God” (12:7–16 and 18:E–19:8) would be at the same place in the sequence of events. But if this was so, it would mean that the redactor composed the rubric in 12:E–13:2a as a parallel to the one in 17:E–18:6a and the prayer “Blessed be God” (13:2b–3) as a parallel to the prayer “Blessed be your name” (18:6b–8), then inserted them and the prayers that follow (13:4–14:1) into cols. 10–14, knowing full well that such an insertion was putting the prayer “And You, God” *before* the rubric in 12:E–13:2, while in cols. 15–19 it comes *after* the rubric in 17:E–18:6a. Even assuming this to be the case, it would imply further that the final redactor of M did indeed want the prayer “And You, God” to be recited at a different point in the battle in cols. 10–14 than in cols. 15–19. Thus Becker’s scenario seems unlikely to me, as the prayers in 13:7–14:1 could have just as easily been inserted before 12:E–13:3, thereby preserving the prayer “And You, God” at the same point in the battle sequence in both units. For this reason, I prefer seeing a some kind of purposeful motivation behind the different order of the prayers in the two units, rather than it being the result of some simple insertion of material.

with the prayers in col. 13? Why spell out any of the prayers in cols. 15–19 if they are already included in cols. 10–12 or 10–14?¹⁵⁰ I suggest that the answers to all these questions are tied up in one of the most significant differences between cols. 10–14 and 15–19 that I have yet to highlight: absent from cols. 10–12 is anything that relates to the Sons of Light suffering any kind of set-back (15:3–17:E), just as in cols. 3–9.¹⁵¹

This is confirmed by a couple of observations. In the same way that none of the prayers in cols. 10–12 were suitable for the officers' speech of encouragement before launching the war, so they are not suitable for encouraging the soldiers who are seeing their fellow soldiers fall by the enemy's sword (cf. 16:11). In cols. 15–19, there are two speeches of encouragement (15:7b–16:1 and 16:15–17:9), allowing us to know what such a speech entails, and revealing the soldiers' state of mind in war. Yet apart from the citation of Deut 20:3–4 in col. 10, there is nothing in all of the prayers in cols. 10–14 that even remotely resembles these two speeches. In fact, the possibility that the soldiers could have fear is not even raised. Nowhere in cols. 10–14 do the concepts of danger and fear even play a role in the contents of the prayers.

A second point is that if one removes the passages in cols. 15–19 which deal with the reversal suffered by the Sons of Light (16:11–17:E) during the War of the Kittim from the account in cols. 15–19, as well as the prayer “And You, God” (since it is found in both cols. 10–14 and 15–19), then there is almost perfect parallelism between the two accounts. Both end up having the same number of occasions for liturgy: before the war (9:E–12:5 and 14:E–16:1), at victory time (12:E–14:1 and 17:E–18:E), and after the victory (14:2–E and 19:9–E).

More importantly, the presence and absence of casualties is one of the foundational difference between cols. 1 and 2 and their description of the two phases of the eschatological war. In those columns,

¹⁵⁰ See Chaim Rabin (“המבנה הספרותי של מגילת מלחמת בני אור ובני חושך,” in מחקרים במגילות הגנוזות: ספר זכרון לאליעזר ליפא סוקניק, ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin [Jerusalem: Hekal haSefer, 1961], 31–33) who summarized some of the problems listed above.

¹⁵¹ See above, page 202.

the War against the Kittim is said to be a time of trial for the Sons of Light, including three rounds during which they will suffer near defeat (cf. 1:8, 13). In contrast, the War of the Divisions is described in such a way that victory appears to be automatic, without ever taking into consideration even the possibility that the Sons of Light could face defeat. This is a major difference, and the fact that it is absent in cols. 10–14 as in 3–9, while being present in cols. 1 and 15–19, is certainly key, and cannot be ignored. This is yet another reason to assume that cols. 10–14 was compiled as a unit with the War of the Divisions in mind.

3.4.2.4. Implications

Assuming such helps explain some of the other differences between cols. 10–14 and 15–19 noted above. No longer does one expect to find the same exact prayers for the same point in the battle sequence in both accounts. The instructions can be different, albeit similar. Alternate prayers can be recited, their numbers can change, speeches can be omitted, and so forth. I have already pointed out how assigning the second rubric (14:2–4a) to the War of the Divisions helps clarify its differences from the corresponding one about the War against the Kittim (19:9–13). Understanding that both units are about different stages in the eschatological war is particularly helpful when considering that the moment of recitation of the prayer “And You, God” changes: in cols. 10–14 it is either before the army launches its initial attack or during the attack itself; in cols. 15–19 it is during the final pursuit. Interestingly, when considering that in cols. 10–14 there are no reversals expected in the war, the initial attack happens to also be the final one. This still does not eliminate all the differences between the two accounts, as in col. 12 the prayer “And You, God” is to be recited before the soldiers set out for the battle field, while in col. 19 it is said when they are already in the heat of the battle.¹⁵² But this minor difference notwithstanding, the relocation of this prayer may be further confirmation that in cols. 10–14 the Sons of Light are not to suffer any set-backs, and that the very

¹⁵² Assuming that a priest is to recite the prayers in 9:E–12:E, then not only is the prayer “And You, God” recited at a different time in the war, but also by different people, since in col. 19 it is by all the leadership.

prayer used during the final attack of the War against the Kittim, the only attack which will end up being victorious, is used right from the beginning of the conflict in cols. 10–14, since in the War of the Divisions, each attack launched ends up in victory. In both contexts, the location of the prayer is understandable. Furthermore, if the prayers “God of our fathers” (13:7–17) and “For You have appointed us” (13:18–14:1) are indeed secondary and intrusive, then the prayer “And You, God” would indeed be the last prayer recited in the war, save for the two brief blessings and curses to be said during the time of victory (13:2–6).¹⁵³

Assuming that cols. 10–14 are about the War of the Divisions also helps explain the very different prayers listed between the two units for the moment of victory (13:7–14:1 and 18:10–E). Above I pointed out that while the prayers in col. 18 convey the urgency of the situation and the ominous significance of the moment, the prayers in col. 13 express almost a kind of nonchalance. Obviously, this could stem from these prayers being secondary and out of context as suggested. But even so, it fails to explain why a compiler or redactor would have included them in the first place. However, considering that they are to be used during the War of the Divisions, then there is no significant turning point in the war as in the War against the Kittim of col. 18; instead, the battle simply continues on its normal course toward victory, as it had from the very first when launched. It is little wonder, then, that the prayers are more hymns of thanksgiving than war related requests.

Another result of understanding cols. 10–14 as relating to the War of the Divisions is that cols. 10–12 are then a series of prayers to be recited prior to launching the first battle, presumably by the same individual, since no rubric introduces a change in speaker as in 15:4–7a. Apparently, the same speaker presumably introduced at the end of col. 9 and responsible to recite the prayer “And He has taught us” (9:E–11:12) continues on with the other three prayers that follow (11:13–12:E). Here we have yet another difference with the instruc-

¹⁵³ This is different than Yadin’s suggestion that the prayer was to be recited twice (*The Scroll of the War*, 215–16). If it was to be repeated again at victory time, why was it then not mentioned in col. 13, instead of two other prayers that have apparently been inserted (13:7–14:1)?

tions for the War against the Kittim, in which there are two speakers, both the High Priest and the Appointed Priest. The presence of only one speaker during the War of the Divisions is consistent with the absence of the High Priest in cols. 10–14 as in 3–9. In fact, that all the prayers in cols. 10–12 are recited by the same individual fits perfectly with the instructions found in 7:12 where the one priest is to address the soldiers after the army has been deployed but before they set out to fight. I have suggested above how the prayer “And You, God” can fit into the context of the instructions in 7:12, even if not in a problem-free way.

3.5. The relationship between columns 10–14 and columns 15–19

Finally, it is now possible to draw some conclusions about the liturgical unit of M, cols. 10–14. Obviously, it has a complicated compositional history. Even so, as a final completed unit, its framework is undoubtedly that of the War of the Divisions. But while its framework fits the War of the Divisions, its content most often betrays the context of the War against the Kittim as found in cols. 15–19. Could it be that the prayers in cols. 10–14 were somehow intended to be used in both stages? The answer to this is negative, as I suggest that there are two reasons that preclude cols. 10–14 from also being used during the War against the Kittim as during the War of the Divisions. First, it lacks some of that war’s key elements such as the set-backs to be suffered by the Sons of Light. Second, it suggests alternate scenarios for very specific points in the war, like the instructions for the morning after the victory (col. 14), scenarios which cannot be harmonized or assimilated with that which is found in cols. 15–19 about the War against the Kittim. Simply put, the contradictions in the rubrics between cols. 10–14 and 15–19 that cannot be harmonized preclude cols. 10–14 from being used at the same time that cols. 15–19 are to be put into practice. Since there is no doubt that cols. 15–19 are for the War against the Kittim, cols. 10–14 can only be for the War of the Divisions as its structure makes clear, even when its content is not as fitting. Suffice for now to say that when cols. 10–14 were composed or compiled, much of the

material it drew upon came from sources which reflected the same War against the Kittim as in cols. 15–19. Incidentally, but nonetheless important, the tradition about the War against the Kittim in these columns is different than the one in col. 1, although some redaction has taken place to make it fit better. The main difference is that in col. 1, the War against the Kittim is against the King of the North and a few of his allies, based on Dan 11 and Mic 5, while in cols. 15–19, it is based more on the war against Gog from Ezek 38–39.¹⁵⁴

4. ADDITIONAL MATTERS PERTAINING TO COLUMNS 3–19

4.1. *Trumpet use in the War Scroll*

The topic of the trumpet in M, their numbers, and their use throughout the course of a battle, does not seem to be very harmonious.¹⁵⁵ For those scholars who refused to accept this dynamic as purely circumstantial, this has led to various theories. For example, Yadin sought to harmonize all the different references to the trumpets into a single coherent structure.¹⁵⁶ Davies, for his part, saw the many difficulties as an opportunity to discern various sources behind M as well as several stages in its composition.¹⁵⁷ In light of the implications the matter has for understanding the scroll, possibly even its development, some remarks are in order.

Trumpets are discussed in several places in M: there is a list in 2:E–3:11 and another in 7:13. In addition, trumpets are mentioned in the description of the tactics or the course of the battle, first in 7:15–9:9 and again in 16:3–18:4.¹⁵⁸ Before examining how all these pas-

¹⁵⁴ *Contra* van der Ploeg who saw the primitive form of the scroll as comprised of cols. 1, 10–12, and 15–19, and inspired from both Dan 11 and Ezek 38–39 (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 19–20; see also Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 162).

¹⁵⁵ For a concise summary of the apparent inconsistencies in the way M describes and uses the trumpets during the course of the war, see van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 14–18.

¹⁵⁶ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 87–113.

¹⁵⁷ Davies, *IQM*, 29–32.

¹⁵⁸ In the Cave 4 manuscripts, trumpets are mentioned in 4Q491 frgs. 11 ii and 13, 4Q493, and 4Q496 frg. 8.

sages can be understood together, it is necessary to highlight that there are two different kinds of trumpets, those which are ceremonial and those which are used on the actual battle field.¹⁵⁹ While trumpets of the first kind are listed, and their inscriptions specified (3:2–5), they are never mentioned again in the M corpus.¹⁶⁰ The reason for this is that although they are for times of war, they do not relate to the actual fighting. All of the other trumpets from col. 3 are mentioned again, except for the “trumpet of the way of return” (הצוצרות דרך המשוב) which is to be used when returning “from the war against the enemies to the congregation in Jerusalem” (ממלחמתם אל העדה ירושלים - 3:10–11). As with the ceremonial trumpets, the lack of further reference to this trumpet might be due to its not being used during combat. Alternatively, it may have been at the bottom of col. 14 as part of instructions given for the day after the battle.¹⁶¹ Slightly different is the case of the “trumpet of ambush” (הצוצרות המארב - 3:2, 8). It too is not mentioned again, but this may simply be circumstantial, since the bottom part of col. 9 is missing, exactly where the ambush is discussed (9:17).

4.1.1. *The sequence of trumpet use in battle*

Even so, the coherence in trumpet use during combat is still not readily visible. Most blatant is the fact that the six that are listed in 3:1–2 do not always have the same name as in 3:6–11, nor even as in 7:13. To make the matters worse, the instructions for trumpet use which follow immediately after the list in 7:13 fails to include all the trumpets just listed and even adds some additional ones. Yet in my opinion, there may be more coherence to all the passages than is initially apparent, as can be discernible by comparing all the different

¹⁵⁹ Yshai calls them trumpets for daily use (“ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 123).

¹⁶⁰ 4Q493 has an additional trumpet, that of the Sabbaths (הצוצרות [השבתות] - line 13).

¹⁶¹ I do not think that it was part of col. 19 because of the use of the word “congregation” (עדה), which apparently was not in use as a designation for the sectarians until after the War against the Kittim. See the discussion on this word below, beginning on page 353.

battle narratives and how the trumpets are used therein.¹⁶² I believe it is possible to discern the following basic sequence of trumpet use: “summoning” (מקרא), “formation” (סדר), “second alarm” (תרועה), “slain” (הללים) together with the horns, “slain” by themselves after the horns have ceased, and “return” (משוב).¹⁶³ This basic pattern is repeated for each “line” (מערכה - 7:17, cf. 4Q491 frg. 10 ii:12) that is sent to the front of the battle,¹⁶⁴ as is obvious at the beginning of col. 8 where the “trumpet of return” (הצוצרות המשוב - 8:2) calls back the one line and is followed by the “trumpet of summoning” (הצוצרות המקרא - 8:3) to call out the next line.¹⁶⁵ This sequence in the use of the various battle trumpets defines what I call a ‘battle cycle’ which is to be repeated as needed throughout the war.¹⁶⁶

4.1.1.1. Modifications to the sequence

At the same time, this basic cycle can be slightly modified in certain circumstances. Thus, when the Sons of Light suffer a severe reversal and need to pull a unit back from the front, they will first call out the new line with the “trumpet of summoning” (הצוצרות המקרא - 16:12) before calling back those on the front with the call “to return” (לשוב - 16:13), presumably on the “trumpets of return.” On the other hand, should those on the frontline be gaining the upper hand, then more troops would be called out with the “trumpets of summoning” (הצוצרות המקרא - 9:3) and the general routing will be signaled with the “trumpets of pursuit” (הצוצרות המרדף - 9:6).¹⁶⁷

¹⁶² 1QM 1:7–9:9; 16:2–18:5; 4Q491 frg. 10 ii; frg. 11 ii; frg. 13; and to a lesser degree, 4Q493.

¹⁶³ For a most detailed account of the different phases in the battle narratives, see Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 119–31; and the shorter summary in “הדגם,” 127–32. While Yshai did not focus on the sequence of trumpet use, her description of the battle phases confirms it.

¹⁶⁴ The composition of the “line” is not always the same. In 8:4 it is composed of three units (דגלים) of skirmishers; in 9:4 it is composed of six skirmishing units joining the one already engaged in the battle; and in 16:12 it is an entire line of reserves that is sent out.

¹⁶⁵ See also 4Q493 line 12 which says that the procedure is to be repeated for all the lines.

¹⁶⁶ See Table 14.

¹⁶⁷ The only place where this sequence is not respected is in 8:14–17, but I agree with Davies that these lines are only summarizing the basic procedure as a conclu-

4.1.1.2. Equivalent trumpet names

This basic structure can be reconciled with all the battle descriptions, assuming that the trumpet names can vary, just as they do in col. 3. There, the “trumpet of gathering” (הצוצרות המאסף - 3:2) which is to be used when returning from the battle (בשוב המלחמה) is subsequently called the “trumpet of return” (הצוצרות המשוב - 3:10). The “trumpet of summoning” (הצוצרות המקרא) (3:1) whose inscription is “memorial of vengeance in God’s appointed time” (זכרון נקם במועד אל - 3:7–8) can also be called the “trumpet of memorial” (הצוצרות הזכרון - 16:3).¹⁶⁸ Also, the “trumpet of formations for war” (הצוצרות סדרי) (המלחמה - 3:1, 6) can simply be called the “trumpet of war” (הצוצרות המלחמה - 4Q493 line 3). Similarly, the “trumpet of the slain” (הצוצרות החללים) (3:8), also called the “trumpet of the signal of the slain” (הצוצרות תרועת החללים) (3:1), can simply be called the “trumpet of the signal” (הצוצרות התרועה) (4Q493 line 11).

This cycle does contradict the list in 7:13 where the trumpets “of summoning” and “of remembrance” are considered as two different kinds, not one. However, I suggest that this is an error by the author or a subsequent copyist. The list in 7:13 has five different kinds of trumpets. In the battle description which follows immediately after (7:14–9:E), there are also five different kinds of trumpets, yet the trumpets listed in both do not correspond. As we have seen in col. 3, there was a certain fluidity in the various names used, indicating that a trumpet did not necessarily have a fixed name, but a specific role. The same fluidity is apparently also found in the trumpet names in cols. 7 through 9. In fact, assuming that the trumpet “of gathering” (7:13) is the same as the trumpet “of return” (8:2, 13), all the other trumpets from the list, except for the one “of remembrance,” can be found in the description of the battle. Conversely, the “formation for war” (סדר מלחמה - 8:5) listed in the battle description is missing from the list in 7:13. Since both trumpets are in the second position, “of remembrance” in the list and “of war” in the battle description, it

sion to the entire sequence (*IQM*, 44).

¹⁶⁸ This had also been suggested by van der Ploeg (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 338).

makes sense to assume that the mistake lies here, especially when this allows one to harmonize the list with all battle descriptions.

4.1.2. *Trumpet sequence in the Cave 4 War Material*

4.1.2.1. 4Q491 and 4Q493

As mentioned above, this sequence of trumpets fits all battle descriptions found in M. With respect to 4Q491, the data is so fragmentary that it is impossible to follow a sequence through completely, but from what can be determined, the order is consistent with that which is found in M. 4Q493, on the other hand, seems to have an abridged version, although it too respects the basic order of trumpet use. It begins the cycle with the “trumpet of memorial” (line 2) after which the “gates” are opened for the “skirmishers” (אנשי הבנים - lines 2–3) to go out. This fits exactly with what we know of the “trumpet of summoning” described in 1QM 3 lines 3 and 8. Immediately thereafter they blow the “trumpet of war.” The rest of the line is missing, but not before mentioning the “lines” (מערכות - line 3), thereby being consistent with the “trumpet for the formations of war” (see 1QM 16:4–5). After some instructions to the priests to stay clear of the slain and the skirmishers, they are to blow a “sharp sound” (קול חד - 4Q493 line 6). This same expression, although expanded to a “sharp staccato sound”¹⁶⁹ (קול חד טרווד - 1QM 8:9, 12; 16:7; 4Q491 frg. 11 ii:6, 21; frg. 13:6), is always and only used in connection with the “trumpet of the slain.” Thereafter, the text moves straight to the “trumpet of return” (line 8). It would seem therefore that at this point the author did not choose to elaborate on the various repeated uses of the “trumpet of the slain,” such as the “second alarm” (תרועה) (שניית - 1QM 8:7; 16:6; 17:11; 4Q491 frg. 11 ii:20), when it is sounded together with the horns of the Levites (1QM 8:8–10; 16:7–8; 17:12–13; 4Q491 frg. 11 ii:21–22; 4Q491 frg. 13:6–7) or alone after the horns have ceased (1QM 8:11–12; 9:1–2; 16:9; 17:14–15; 4Q491 frg. 11 ii:23). After the “trumpet of return” the cycle is to begin anew with the second line (מערכה השנית - 4Q493 line 9). The end of the line is missing, but reconstructing “[t[rumpets]]” is rea-

¹⁶⁹ For טרווד meaning “staccato,” see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 296.

sonable. Baillet has suggested that the trumpets in question are of “summoning” (בה[צוצרות המקרא]),¹⁷⁰ but in light of the next word, “and]when [they are fill]ed” (במל[אם] - line 10), it seem to me more reasonable to suggest that the trumpet in question is of “war formations” (סדרי המלחמה),¹⁷¹ thereby giving us the missing subject of what is being “filled.” If correct, this would mean that the “trumpet of summoning” was skipped or assumed as the cycle of trumpet blowing started over for the second line. The author then briefly mentions that it is to be followed by the trumpets “of alarm” and “of gathering” (4Q493 lines 11–12), trumpets which are also known as “of the slain” and “of return” respectively. The description of battle trumpets is concluded with the statement that such is the procedure for all the lines (line 12), confirming that we are indeed dealing with a cycle that repeats itself.

4.1.2.2. The implications of 4Q493’s trumpet usage

4.1.2.2.1. Possible evolution in trumpet names

The foregoing examination suggests it is unlikely that 4Q493 is a copy of M. Its pattern of trumpet use on the battle field testifies to a cycle that is much less elaborate than anything preserved in all other battle descriptions. In fact, it is the most primitive extant account about how the priesthood is to lead the army with trumpet signals.¹⁷²

¹⁷⁰ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 50. Yshai (“ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 240–41) agrees with Baillet, although she also acknowledges the possibility of reconstructing it as the “trumpet of memorial” (הצוצרות הזכרון), an alternate name for the “trumpet of summoning” (see above, page 308).

¹⁷¹ See 1QM 8:6; 16:5; 17:10–11; 4Q491 frg. 11 ii:19–20; frg. 13:4. In all these cases, the instruction is for the line moving out to reach its final position before the next trumpet is to be blown. While there is not enough space at the end of the line to reconstruct the full name of the trumpet (בה[צוצרות סדרי המלחמה]), there could have been enough room for the shortened name of this trumpet as it is found in 4Q493 line 3: הצוצרות המלחמה (see above, page 308).

¹⁷² Although the editor suggested reconstructing the word “Levites” (הלויים) at the end of line 9 (Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 50), this reading is so fragmentary that it seems unwise to assume it. Reading Levites is all the more doubtful since it would then imply that it would be they and not the priests who would be blowing the trumpets for the second line, something which is unparalleled in the rest of M Material. It seems, therefore, that 4Q493 does not contain any instructions for the Levites and their horn blowing. This would therefore be an example of how the Levites’ role is more elevated in M than in one of its possible sources (see the dis-

It may not be coincidental that it is also the oldest manuscript of all *War Scroll* material. Even so, it already has at least four, if not five, different trumpets named.¹⁷³ Thus, the Cave 4 material does not provide any further evidence supporting Davies' suggestion that in the Second Temple Period there were originally only two kinds of war trumpets that over time evolved into the system described in M.¹⁷⁴ For example, Davies suggested that the compiler of M was the one responsible for harmonizing the name of the "trumpet of gathering" with its second name, the "trumpet of return."¹⁷⁵ However, 4Q493 already uses both names (lines 8 and 12) for trumpets fulfilling the same role. Therefore, what Davies considered to be harmonization may simply be explanatory, clarifying the fact that a trumpet with a specific role can nonetheless have different names. Nothing more than that, although theoretically possible, is supported by the Cave 4 evidence.

Nevertheless, it may be that a certain progression in trumpet names can be discerned. As we have seen, the trumpets for beginning the battle is that "of summoning" (המקרא) or that "of remembrance" (הזכרון). In 4Q493, it is mentioned only once (line 2), and called the "trumpets of remembrance" (הצוצרות הזכרון). In IQM 15–19, it is mentioned three times (16:4, 12; 18:4). Twice it is called the "trumpet of remembrance" and once the "trumpet of summoning" (הצוצרות המקרא).¹⁷⁶ In cols. 7 through 9, the trumpet is also found

cussion below, beginning on page 340).

¹⁷³ The inclusion of a fifth depends if one accepts the beginning of line 12, "the gath[ering]" (המאסף), first as an acceptable reading, and second as being the name of one of the trumpets.

¹⁷⁴ Davies, *IQM*, 75.

¹⁷⁵ Davies, *IQM*, 29.

¹⁷⁶ The mention of the "trumpet of remembrance" in IQM 18:4 is not in lieu of the "trumpet of pursuit" in 9:6 as claimed by Davies (*IQM*, 74), but of the "trumpet of summoning" in 9:3. This is clear because the blowing of that trumpet in 18:4 is to bring the soldiers to the front of their lines to hear the speech of the priests, but not yet to send them in pursuit of the enemy. Compare with 4Q491 frg. 13 where after a speech or prayer (lines 1–3), the trumpets are blown for the army to move in position opposite the enemy (lines 3–5). Thus the trumpet in 18:4 called the people forward just as in 9:3, whereas the one in 9:6 is to send them to the battlefield, just like the one in 4Q491 frg. 13:3–5. This misunderstanding led Davies to suggest a rather convoluted theory as to the development of trumpet names in which he posited that IQM 16:11–13a is secondary (*IQM*, 75). The difference from what is

three times (7:15; 8:3; 9:3), always as the “trumpet of summoning.” Interestingly, this is its name in col. 3 (lines 1 and 7) and in the list in 7:13. It may be, therefore, that originally the name was “of remembrance” and that over time it evolved to be that “of summoning,” so that by the time the lists were compiled (cols. 3 and 7), it was being called by this latter name.

4.2. *The battle narratives*

Intimately connected to the sequence of trumpet use are the battle narratives. Above, I have showed that the one in cols. 7–9 relates to the War of the Divisions, while the account in cols. 15–18 is about the War against the Kittim, and that this explains many of the differences between the two versions. In cols. 7–9, there is only one encounter against an unnamed enemy, an encounter that never suffers any reversals, so that no reserve soldiers nor motivational speeches are needed, but which is finished off by a final charge of the entire army including the cavalry. In cols. 15–19, the war is specifically against the Kittim, and based on col. 1 it is expected to last seven rounds (line 13), meaning that there will be setbacks and losses on the battle field, that the reserves will have to be called up and speeches delivered to encourage the army not to lose heart, and that the final pursuit, apparently without any cavalry, will only take place once it is clear God is already miraculously intervening.¹⁷⁷

In spite of such differences, both accounts preserve the same ‘battle cycle’, as I have already shown by examining the sequence of trumpet use. In both accounts, there is evidence that the battle cycle is repeated several times during a specific campaign.¹⁷⁸ However, because the bottom of the scroll is not preserved, it is more difficult to determine how many times the cycle is to be repeated, especially when one seeks to relate it to the seven lots or rounds of the War against the Kittim.

found in cols. 7–9 is not because the former is secondary, but because it relates to a different stage of the eschatological war.

¹⁷⁷ And not that the battle is already won, as suggested by Davies (*IQM*, 73).

¹⁷⁸ This has also been confirmed by Yshai; see above, note 163.

4.2.1. *Battle sequence for the War of the Divisions*

In cols. 7–9, enough is preserved of the text to enable a fairly confident understanding of how a battle during the War of the Divisions was expected to unfold, especially when complementing the battle narrative with information from the description of the different kinds of soldiers and their weaponry (5:3–6:6). The most complete account is found in col. 8 which preserves a complete cycle. It begins with the return of a unit of skirmishers who have just finished attacking the army with their slings. This detail helps in reconstructing the description of the first two units of skirmishers which is now missing at the bottom of col. 5. These skirmishers, as we can learn from 6:1, are to cast seven times before returning to their position, and are to be equipped with slings. Their return in 8:1 completes the first cycle. The second cycle sends out the next three units of skirmishers, those equipped with lances (8:2–17; cf. 6:1b–4a). They too are expected to cast seven times before they fall back into the ranks (8:12–13).¹⁷⁹ It is clear that there is a certain procedure that is to be repeated for each unit (8:14), apparently indicated by the blowing of the trumpets of the slain (8:16–17). Once all three units have cast their weapons, they are called back (8:17). Although the column breaks off at that point, it is safe to assume that the next two units of skirmishers (cf. 6:4–6) were then sent out, and the cycle repeated itself for the third time, with its final stages apparently preserved in 9:1–2. With this last offensive the enemy will have been weakened sufficiently to warrant sending out the entire army for the final pursuit and eventual annihilation (9:3–7). Thus there is no need to call the skirmishers back with the “trumpet of return”; instead, the final attack is signaled on the “trumpet of pursuit.”

Noting that the description of the entire cycle took about 12 lines,¹⁸⁰ and assuming that the cycle begun in 7:15 ends at 8:3,¹⁸¹ this would imply that there are about six lines missing at the end of col.

¹⁷⁹ This implies that the three inscriptions for lances in col. 6 are not because each skirmisher carries three lances, but that each unit has its own inscription which they have on all seven of their lances.

¹⁸⁰ From “trumpet of return” (8:2) to “trumpet of return” (8:13).

¹⁸¹ From “trumpet of summoning” to “trumpet of summoning.”

7. Similarly, assuming that the cycle begun in 8:11 ends at 9:1,¹⁸² there would also be about six lines missing at the end of col. 8. This is consistent with the estimation of the majority of scholars, and precludes the minority view that more lines are lost at the bottom of M.¹⁸³

4.2.2. *Battle sequence for the War against the Kittim*

4.2.2.1. The problem

Discerning how many cycles are used in the battle narratives in cols. 15–19, and how they relate to the seven rounds of the War against the Kittim, is more complicated. If one assumes that speeches mark the beginning of a new cycle, col. 16 preserves an entire battle cycle, taking up about 13 lines.¹⁸⁴ Not surprisingly, it is of similar length to the description of a battle cycle in cols. 7–9: as we have seen, the sequence of trumpet use demonstrates that the battle cycle is the same in both narratives. However, a big difference is that the War against the Kittim is to last for seven rounds. Even so, the narrative in cols. 15–18 is not any longer than the one in cols. 7–9.¹⁸⁵ In fact, while in the latter there are remnants of three battle cycles,¹⁸⁶ in cols. 16–18, only two can be ascertained.¹⁸⁷ This is all the more problematic since a third lot is mentioned in 17:16 (בגורל השלני[ן]י), so

¹⁸² The cycle begins and ends with the silencing of the Levites after they have blown their horns.

¹⁸³ See above, page 12.

¹⁸⁴ From line 3 to line 15. However, this includes the description of an additional trumpet in the cycle, since the “trumpet of summoning” is blown before the “trumpet of return.”

¹⁸⁵ Compare 7:15–9:7 to 16:3–18:5, noting that the later includes 12 lines of a speech (16:15–17; 17:1–9).

¹⁸⁶ The end of one cycle and the beginning of another can be found in 8:1–3. The end of the second is in 8:14–E, and the end of a third at the beginning of col. 9, since it begins at an earlier point in the battle cycle than where the previous one left off at the end of col. 8.

¹⁸⁷ The first begins and ends in col. 16 (lines 3–13). The “trumpet of summoning” marking the beginning of the second cycle is in 16:12. The second trumpet in the sequence is only found in 17:10, so that it is impossible to know whether the speech at the beginning of col. 17 is the same as the one at the end of col. 16 or not. Similarly, the last trumpet in col. 17 is that of the “slain,” while the first one found in col. 18 is the “trumpet of summoning” for the last pursuit.

that, even if not all seven rounds are described, at least three battle cycles are referenced before the final pursuit in 18:3–4.¹⁸⁸

4.2.2.2. A possible solution

An initial issue is the relationship of the rounds to the battle cycles. So far, the assumption has been that there is a one to one correspondence, but is this necessarily the case? The *War Scroll* (1:13) states that during three of the rounds, the Sons of Light will be stronger and able to inflict casualties upon their enemies. During the other three rounds, the army of Belial will cause them to “return” (לְמָשׁוּב), meaning to retreat.¹⁸⁹ In other words, during those three lots, there will be no offensive maneuvering, only retreat and fending off the enemy as best one can. That being the case, neither will there be battle cycles during those three lots. Thus, if the battle cycles are used only once per attack, then there are to be only three of them.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ Nowhere in cols. 16–18 are we told that a lot (גִּירָל) means a single battle cycle. At the same time, there is no indication that more than a single battle cycle is expected for each lot, as opposed to the War of the Divisions where at least some parts of the cycle are repeated (cf. 8:14). What can be determined is that the battle narrative in cols. 15–19 begins with the start of the combat (cf. 15:5–6 where the High Priest arrays the army) and ends with the final pursuit by the entire army (cf. 18:1–5). Therefore, the number of battle cycles recorded are somehow sufficient to understand the entire progression of the war.

¹⁸⁹ Yadin’s translation makes it most clear: “and *in* three the army of Belial shall recover *so as to bring about* the withdrawal of the lot [of Light]” (*The Scroll of the War*, 260).

¹⁹⁰ Since in the last round there is only a single final pursuit. The possibility remains that more than a single battle cycle was used for one or more of the rounds. This seems very unlikely in M, where both battle narratives, one for the War of the Divisions (cols. 7–9) and one for the War against the Kittim (cols. 16–18) span almost exactly two columns. In the former, it is nearly certain that only three cycles are described, so that one would naturally expect the same number of cycles, and not more, in the latter’s account. However, it may prove helpful in understanding 4Q491. All of the fragments which deal with the battle narrative of the War against the Kittim (frgs 10 ii; 11 ii; and 13) give evidence of at least four battle cycles when arranged in their present sequence. On the one hand, this fourth cycle is consistent with a war of seven rounds, since in 4Q491 frg. 13, unlike in M, the final pursuit also respects the order of the battle cycle. However, frg. 11 ii:19, in the middle of the third cycle, says that it is the “second war with the Kitt[im]” (מִלְחָמָה שְׁנִיָּת עִם) (הַכְּתִיָּאִים), seemingly a reference to the second round. By allowing for more than a single cycle per round, it would still be possible for the end of frg. 11 ii to be describing the second round and not the third. However, see note 56 on page 385.

Assuming this to be the case, it may now be possible to reconstruct the battle narrative in cols. 16–18. After the speech by the appointed priest (15:7–16:1), the first round is engaged following the normal procedures of a battle cycle (16:3–9). The next line is left blank to mark the transition to the second round, the one during which the Sons of Darkness will have the upper hand. To counter their offensive, the priests must call out more troops (16:12), even before they can call back those out on the front. It is only after the priestly speech of encouragement (16:15–17:9) that the third round actually begins (17:10–15), although it is only the second round during which the Sons of Light have the upper hand. Only by describing the sequence of attack, counter attack, and rebuttal, has the author described the entire process that will repeat itself until the war is won. With seven rounds, this sequence repeats itself exactly three times, although with some overlap: the rebuttal is also the attack. The first two times, the process is exactly identical: attack, counter-attack (of the enemy), rebuttal / attack, counter attack, rebuttal / attack. With the third repetition, there will be a change: there will still be an attack, counter-attack, but instead of a rebuttal, it is God who will intervene with his mighty strong arm and turn the tide. At that time (בעת ההיא - 18:3), rather than a rebuttal, it is to be the final pursuit for victory, the seventh and final round.¹⁹¹ It is because of this change that the author must give additional instructions, at the beginning of the third attack or battle cycle, here called a “round” (ובגורל השל[ני]ש[ני] - 17:16), of the Sons of Light. This third attack is, according to 1QM 1:13, the fifth of the seven rounds. Thus, the third battle cycle that will finish out the war is attack, counter-attack, followed by God’s intervention and the final pursuit.¹⁹² There is no

¹⁹¹ It is for this reason that Yadin chose to reconstruct the beginning of 18:1 as “[and in the seventh lot]” (ובגורל השבע[ני] - *The Scroll of the War*, 342–43). However, it may be that in cols. 15–19 the term “round/lot” (גורל) has a different meaning that in col. 1 (see below). Furthermore, his reading of the *yod* is not generally accepted (see, for example, Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 135), making it impossible to reconstruct the term “round/lot” in the first place.

¹⁹² Support for this scenario may come from the rest of line 16 and the beginning of line 17 which comes immediately after the mention of the “third round” in col. 17. Though fragmentary, a certain reconstruction can be suggested based on parallel texts from other battle cycles (see Table 14): “to [cause] the slain [to fa]ll [accor-

need to repeat the entire sequence, as only the last part changes. Only a few lines explaining the differences are given (17:16–E),¹⁹³ apparently focusing on the near defeat of the Sons of Light at that point, before describing God’s miraculous intervention (18:1–3).

The foregoing study of the battle narratives suggests that in the War against the Kittim there will be only three battle cycles, not of the launching of various sub-units of the skirmishers as in cols. 7–9, but of major offensive initiatives against the enemy. The three battle cycles now represent the three rounds during which the Sons of Light will be on the offensive against their enemies. The three rounds during which the Sons of Darkness will have the upper hand are only briefly described as a time when the faithful are allowed to fall according to the “mysteries of God” (ברזי אל - 16:11; 17:17). Reading the battle narrative in this way, it is possible to make sense of the account in col. 17, especially in light of its reference to the “third round” (line 16). This is not to be understood as the third of the seven round of 1QM 1:13, but as the third round of attack by the Sons of Light. Although the attack will prove to be successful initially, it will soon become disastrous for the Sons of Light, and they will suffer yet another reversal, one from which, were it not for God’s intervention (1QM 1:14–15; 18:1–5), would have certainly ended in their final defeat.

ding to the mysteries of] God” (לְהַפִּיֵל חַלְלִים [בְּרִזֵי אֵל]). Earlier in col. 16, we learn that those who fall according to the mysteries of God are the slain of the Sons of Light (lines 11 and 16). This implies that those being slain in the third round are the Sons of Light and not the Sons of Darkness as would be expected from the description of the seven rounds in col. 1 where the first round—and subsequent odd numbered rounds—are those during which the Sons of Light are victorious. If, however, the term *goral* (גורל) in cols. 15–19 means “battle cycle” rather than “round” as suggested above, then in each battle cycle, including the third one, the Sons of Light get repelled, and it is only after the third cycle that God intervenes to give them a miraculous victory as is in fact described immediately thereafter.

¹⁹³ On the assumption that cols. 7 and 8 were originally 24–25 lines long, the description of the changes in the third round that lead up to the intervention of God’s hand (as described in 18:1–5) would be eight to nine lines long.

4.3. *The role of the High Priest*

4.3.1. *The High Priest and the Appointed Priest in columns 15–19*

Related to both matters of trumpets and speeches for war is the role of the High Priest. Most scholars have assumed that he is present throughout the scroll, if not explicitly, then at least implicitly. As I have already pointed out, it is important to note that he is not mentioned in the extant text of cols. 3–14, although it remains technically possible that he is the referent of “his people” (עמו) in 13:1.¹⁹⁴ Even so, as Davies has rightfully highlighted, his role is different in col. 2 than in cols. 15–19, the former being ritual, the latter more military.¹⁹⁵ In light of the two stages of the eschatological war, and of the capture of Jerusalem by the Sons of Light at the end of stage one, it is not surprising that the High Priest should resume his responsibilities in the temple. As we have seen, in cols. 15–19 we have a clear description of his duties on the battle field during the War against the Kittim: he leads the soldiers in prayer before the battle (15:4–5), he arrays the soldiers in battle lines (15:5–6), he encourages the army when they suffer losses (16:13–14),¹⁹⁶ he partakes in the prayer of blessing when the Sons of Light are victorious (18:5–8),¹⁹⁷ and is present for the gathering of the troops on the battle field on the morning after the victory (19:11). In addition to him is another priestly figure, the “appointed priest” (הכוהן ההרויץ - 15:6) which one must be careful not to confuse with the High Priest. All we read about the Appointed Priest in cols. 15–19 is that he is responsible to walk (והתהלך) before the army once it has been arrayed and encourage (והזק) the soldiers (15:7).¹⁹⁸

4.3.2. *Columns 3–14: the High Priest or the Appointed Priest?*

This description of specific roles for these two priests stands in sharp contrast to that which is found in cols. 3–14, particularly 7:9–14:E.

¹⁹⁴ See above, page 224.

¹⁹⁵ Davies, *IQM*, 26, n. 6.

¹⁹⁶ The speech to be given is recorded in 16:14–17:9.

¹⁹⁷ The blessing itself is recorded in 18:6–8.

¹⁹⁸ The speech he is to give is recorded in 15:7–16:1.

The first reference to a special task for a priest is in 7:12: after seven priests take their position before the army, one of the them (הכֹּהֵן הַאֲחֵד) is to walk (יִהְיֶה מְהַלֵּךְ) before the army and encourage (לְחַזֵּק) the soldiers. There is little doubt that he is the appointed priest (הַכֹּהֵן הַחֲרוּץ) of 15:6.¹⁹⁹

A second reference is in 10:2. Here however, the mention of the priest is not from M proper, but from a biblical passage which is quoted by M as part of an extended speech or prayer. This speech or prayer begins in the non-extant portion of the bottom of col. 9 so that it is impossible to know who was expected to recite it and under what specific context. Nevertheless, the biblical citation is from Deut 20:3–4 which mentions the role of a priest to encourage the soldiers before they set out to war. It is not just any priest, but *the* priest (הַכֹּהֵן). It seems unlikely that the High Priest was intended here, or he would have been mentioned specifically. Rabbinical understanding of this verse certainly did not interpret it as referring to the High Priest.²⁰⁰ One is left to assume that we are dealing once again with the Appointed Priest (הַכֹּהֵן הַחֲרוּץ).²⁰¹ One difference with his role here is that he is to take his stand (וַעֲמַד) rather than walk back and forth before the army as in the previous two texts. Interestingly, when the High Priest is to fulfill his duties in cols. 15–19, he too is to take his stand (עֲמַד) rather than going back and forth (הִתְהַלֵּךְ) before the army. Finally, as mentioned previously, we know that an individual priest was mentioned in the non-extant bottom portion of col. 12. Whichever one of these two priests he may have been, we know that he took part, together with other priests, Levites and elders, in blessing God and cursing Belial (13:2–6).

For Yadin, that the priest in 10:2 is expected to take his stand and deliver a speech or prayer, just as in 15:4–5, implies that the priest in question is not the Appointed Priest, as implied by Deut 20:2 and Rabbinic literature, but the High Priest.²⁰² For his part, Nils Martola concluded that there was a contradiction between the role of the High Priest as described in 15:6ff and that of the Appointed Priest as

¹⁹⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 292; Martola, “Anointed for Battle,” 28.

²⁰⁰ *m. Sota* 8:1.

²⁰¹ Martola, “Anointed for Battle,” 22.

²⁰² Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 210–11.

described in 10:2ff: both are said to carry out the same task, one which Deut 20:2–4 assigns to the Appointed Priest. Martola suggested that the solution for this overlap is that both priests were expected to fulfill the same role, but on different occasions, the High Priest taking on the task of the Chosen Priest once the Sons of Light would suffer a setback. Still, Martola is careful to point out that the High Priest's speech of encouragement in 16:15–17:9 is less inspired by Deut 20 than that of the Chosen Priest in 15:7–16:1.²⁰³

4.3.2.1. The evidence from comparing columns 10–14 to columns 15–19

In our comparison of the liturgical sections in cols. 10–14 with those in cols. 15–19, we noted several major differences. These do not pertain only to the content of the prayers and speeches, but also to who is expected to deliver them. With respect to the latter, the problem is at times further exacerbated when in cols. 10–14 we are not told who is intended to deliver a particular speech or prayer. Yet correctly defining the role of the High Priest during the War of the Divisions (cols. 3–14) is dependent upon a proper understanding of one of these differences. It is summarized below so as to highlight what implication it may have for our understanding of the High Priest's role in the eschatological war.

The difference pertains to what is actually said by the Appointed Priest when he encourages the army, as commanded in Deut 20:2–4 (cf. 10:2 and 7:12). The only place where one can be certain that such a speech is spelled out, if it is more than just the citing of those verses, is in 15:7–16:1. This is particularly instructive, because it gives us an example of what the sect deemed appropriate for fulfilling the Deut 20:2–4 commandment. It demonstrates how literally the Deut 20:2–4 command was to be carried out. Although the speech elaborates on the biblical injunction, all of the imperatives from Deut 20 are nevertheless quoted: “do not be afraid, do not *th*[], do not be alarmed, do not tremble before them” (אל תיראו ואל תח[], מה ועל תחפזו ואל תערצו מפניהם - 15:8; cf 10:3–5 and Deut 20:3). Furthermore, the Appointed Priest evokes a very real fear of defeat, even

²⁰³ Martola, “Anointed for Battle,” 30–31.

alluding to the fact that the soldiers will want to flee the battlefield (lines 8–9). As we have noted, none of the prayers in cols. 10–12 preserve anything similar, even in paraphrase form. None of them address the possibility that the soldiers could be fearful and in need of encouragement, except in the opening lines of col. 10 which quote Deut 20:3–4. The only hint that there could be a need for encouragement is when the prayer “And He has taught us” mechanically quotes Deut 20:2–4. If this prayer is the one the High Priest is to read as per 1QM 15:5,²⁰⁴ then we are left with no prayer or speech in cols. 10–14 that is suitable for the Appointed Priest to recite as instructed in 7:12. Instead, one would have to assume that it is the same as the one in 15:7–16:1. It hardly seems likely that an author or compiler would have expected his readers to skip back and forth in an otherwise orderly account of what was expected to transpire.²⁰⁵ Furthermore, the speech by the Appointed Priest in 15:7–16:1 hardly seems appropriate for the War of the Divisions in which the Sons of Light’s victory is a given. Rather, knowing that in col. 15 the commandment of Deut 20:2–4 is fulfilled literally by the Appointed Priest as requested, it is only natural to assume that the same is expected to take place in col. 10 and the War of the Divisions, especially when this is implied by the instructions in 7:12.²⁰⁶ Most likely then, the recitation of the prayer “And He has taught us” (9:E–11:12) is in fact the fulfillment of the commandment in Deut 20:2–4 for the War of the Divisions. As such, it would appear that the role of the officers were indeed fulfilled at an earlier stage, akin to the procedure determined by the rabbis.²⁰⁷ And if the prayer in 9:E–11:12 is for the Appointed Priest to recite, then it is highly likely that the following ones are as well (11:13–12:5; 12:7–16; 12:17–E), since we are not

²⁰⁴ See among others Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 210–13, 331), van der Ploeg (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 14), and Rabin (“המבנה הספרותי,” 34–36).

²⁰⁵ The prayer of the High Priest mentioned in 15:4–5 would be recorded in 9:E–12:E, while the speech of encouragement for the Appointed Priest as instructed in 7:12 would be recorded in 15:7b–16:1.

²⁰⁶ As we have seen, the prayer “And He has taught us” (9:E–11:12) was originally for the High Priest to recite as commanded in 15:5, but that it was taken out of that context and assigned instead to the Appointed Priest in cols. 10–14.

²⁰⁷ See the discussion on Deut 20:2–8 above, beginning on page 260.

told that the speaker is to change. This would mean that nowhere in cols. 10–12 is there a prayer for the High Priest.

4.3.2.2. Other evidence for the absence of the High Priest on the battle field in columns 3–14

The absence of a prayer for the High Priest in the liturgical section of cols. 10–14 may be confirmed by other data. In col. 7, the account of the procedure for battle begins with the army already arrayed. This is in contrast to col. 15 where the account begins with the High Priest's role prior to the deployment of the soldiers. Why then does the one account begin at a point prior to the soldiers being arrayed for battle, and the other only after? If, as has been suggested, M, especially cols. 7–9, are a priestly rule,²⁰⁸ it seems particularly odd that the High Priest's role would have been forgotten or omitted at this point. One must therefore allow for the possibility that this omission in col. 7 is in fact not an omission, but rather an indication that the High Priest is not present on the battle field. In fact, the arraying of the army before the enemy is most likely described in 5:16ff. While the text suffers from lacunae, the arraying of the army is done by a group rather than by an individual (יִסְדְּרוּ - 5:16). While it is impossible to know whether this is the seven priests who have a special leadership role as described in 7:9ff, it cannot be the High Priest.

The absence of the High Priest in the War of the Divisions may be further confirmed by another detail. In cols. 14 and 19, we have parallel accounts giving instructions for the morning after the victory, and the prayer to be said. In 19:11, the author is careful to point out the leadership role of the High Priest in the reciting of the prayer. In col. 14, however, there is no mention of him being present, let alone leading the army in the prayer. Here again, the best explanation is that he is absent from the scene.

Finally, we have seen that in the War of the Divisions, there is no allowance made for a possible set-back while at war. Consequently, no speeches encouraging the army once the battle is engaged are found. Thus, even if the High Priest was on the battle field, this would not be one of his roles.

²⁰⁸ See note 66 on page 345.

4.3.3. *Summary and synthesis*

In summary, two of the responsibilities assigned to the High Priest during the War against the Kittim, that of leading the army in prayer before the battle and that of encouraging the reserves after a set back, are not mentioned in cols. 3–14 and therefore do not seem to be part of the War of the Divisions. Should the High Priest even be present on the battle field during the second stage of the eschatological war, he would not be needed for those specific tasks. The other of his tasks, that of arraying the army for battle, is mentioned in cols. 3–14, but specifically in the plural, also implying that in the War of the Divisions, this is not one of his responsibilities. Finally, while the High Priest is to play a prominent role during and after the victory against the Kittim, in the War of the Divisions, the text (cols. 13–14) does not even suggest that he is present.

Therefore, in light of col. 2 and the High Priest's role in the ongoing worship at the temple, it seems most reasonable to conclude that he was not expected to fulfill any military role during the second stage of the eschatological war. Consequently, the referent of "his people" (עמו) in 13:1, one of the brothers of the priests, is most likely the Appointed Priest, the one chosen "by all his brothers" (על פי כול) (על פי כול - 15:6–7).

5. TWO STAGES BUT THREE TRADITIONS

Only with a proper understanding of the relationship between cols. 1 and 2 is it possible to correctly read the rest of M. In particular, it is of utmost importance to understand that the eschatological war is expected to have two stages, each with its own distinctive characteristics. Once this is done, it is possible to identify the two stages in the rest of the scroll: cols. 3–9 continue the discussion begun in col. 2 on the second stage of the eschatological war, the War of the Divisions. While on the surface cols. 15–19 step back in time to describe further details about the War against the Kittim, it does so with material coming from a separate tradition, one inspired by the war

against Gog in Ezek 38–39.²⁰⁹ This same tradition is also the inspiration for much of what is in cols. 10–14, yet as we have seen, its framework and some of its content have been reworked to fit the War of the Divisions. Thus, while cols. 1 and 2 only offer a preliminary preview of the two stages of the eschatological war, the rest of the scroll elaborates them and complements our understanding of their distinctiveness.

At the beginning of this chapter, the characteristics of the two stages of the eschatological war were identified based on the historical introduction to the war given in the first two columns. With the help of the rest of M, it is now possible to further define what each stage is expected to look like. While it is not necessary to reiterate all the differences highlighted in our study above, several of the main points bear repeating here. Most obvious is that the different natures of the two stages of the war have been emphasized: the most difficult and risk-filled battle will be against the Kittim, while the War of the Divisions is little more than a formality that the Sons of Light have to fulfill. Related to this is that for the War of the Divisions, there is no need for any reserves. Also, the High Priest will no longer be present on the battle field after the Sons of Light's victory over the Kittim since he will take up his role at the temple.

More significant than all of these is the implication that cols. 3–9 may not have been intended for the War against the Kittim at all. This helps resolve one of the more perplexing aspects about M. The depiction of the army as portrayed in cols. 3–9 seems so idealistic and removed from reality, especially when understood as representing the dreams of a small Jewish sectarian group residing in the Judean Wilderness, that it has led some scholars to suggest that M was never intended to be about an actual physical war, but simply some kind of liturgy.²¹⁰ However, if the army described in these

²⁰⁹ In the same way that it inspired the vision of the eschatological war in the non-sectarian composition *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* (4Q387 frg. 4 - see page 167).

²¹⁰ Bleddyn J. Roberts, "The Jerusalem Scrolls," *ZQW* 69 (1950): 238; Theodor Herzl Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956), 276; Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, XII, and more recently Harrington, "'Holy War' Texts," 175–83; see also the discussion in Duhaime, *War Texts*, 53–61.

columns was never intended to be the one responsible for taking on the Kittim, but was only intended for the War of the Divisions, M may not be as far-fetched as sometimes assumed. With six years of preparations at its disposal, coupled with the return of all the exiled tribes of Israel, the army and its equipment as depicted in cols. 3–9 are no longer just unrealistic idealism.²¹¹ Even their elaborate inscriptions and decorations on the weapons, while remaining extravagant, can be followed literally, since this vision of the War of the Divisions was not intended merely for a small sectarian group in the Judean Wilderness, but for the entire nation of Israel that will have been restored from its physical and spiritual exile.

A hint of this was already pointed out with respect to the cavalry: absent from the War against the Kittim, it is an integral element during the War of the Divisions. But this fact may also have been implied with respect to the weaponry. In col. 6, the equipment of the “skirmishers” (אנשי הבינים) is described, and in cols. 8–9, we see it being put to use: both the sling and the javelins are to be cast by the skirmishers, each seven times (8:1; 8:10–11). In contrast, the specifics of the weaponry used by the skirmishers in cols. 16–18 is never mentioned.²¹² Rather, the account remains generic and applicable to any unit of skirmishers, regardless of their weapons.²¹³ This is all the more striking if, as some have suggested, cols. 15–19 are a later development than cols. 3–9.²¹⁴ Unlike the War of the Divisions which is totally under the control of the Sons of Light, the War against the Kittim was expected to come to them, on its own schedule. Neither is the composition of the army of the Sons of Light determinable. This made it impossible for the author of M to provide extensive details as to how the war was expected to progress, except for general tactical observations which could be applied to virtually any conflict. Obviously the same scheme as for the War of the Divisions was used, especially in relationship to trumpet use and battle cycle, exemplifying some interdependence between the two

²¹¹ As suggested by van der Ploeg (*Le rouleau de la guerre*, 73).

²¹² Compare especially 8:10–11 with 16:8.

²¹³ Although it is always assumed that they are not engaged in hand to hand combat (see 1QM 16:6; 17:12; 4Q491 frg. 11 ii:5, 21; frg. 13:5).

²¹⁴ See page 384, note 52.

accounts.²¹⁵ But for the War against the Kittim, it is nothing more than a generic adaptation of a particular battle tactic applied to a war which is believed to last seven rounds.

In conclusion, our study has enabled us to discern M's overall structure. After a short introduction detailing the historical background that was expected to lead up to the eschatological war (col. 1), the readers' attention is focused on the minutiae of the War of the Divisions: its time-line and the process for conscription (col. 2), the army's composition and its weaponry (cols. 3–7), tactical issues (cols. 7–9), and finally, its liturgical elements (cols. 10–14). This is followed by a kind of appendix (col. 15–19), sequentially going back in time for the purpose of providing details of the War against the Kittim, especially there where they diverge from the instructions for the War of the Divisions. At the same time, we noticed two separate traditions concerning the War against the Kittim, the first in col. 1, inspired by Dan 11,²¹⁶ and the second, primarily in cols. 15–19, but also in cols. 10–14, inspired by the war against Gog in Ezek 38–39.

²¹⁵ For more on the relationship between cols. 10–19 to the rest of M, see page 384.

²¹⁶ Also Isa 31:8 and Mic 5:4–5.

CHAPTER SIX

THE WAR SCROLL AND THE RULE OF THE CONGREGATION

The relationship between M and Sa has long been recognized.¹ Much of it has already been expounded by Jacob Licht in his classic work on the three ‘rules’: S, Sa, and Sb.² To a lesser degree, it has been explored by Lawrence Schiffman as well.³ Both are foundational texts for the Qumran sectarians, and similarly to D and S,⁴ they deal with community organization. In light of the present reading of M, a review of the similarities between the two are in order, as they can now be appreciated in a slightly different light. In fact, understanding how they are complimentary helps confirm the two stages of the eschatological war and how the sectarians anticipated a kind of intermediary period between the present evil age and the final, fully-redeemed, age to come in which evil will have been

¹ The *Rule of the Congregation* was initially published by Dominique Barthélemy, “28a. Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa),” in *Qumran Cave I*, Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik, DJD I (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 108–18. See also the more recent edition of Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, “1QSa,” 108–17. Other studies on Sa will be mentioned as needed.

² Licht, מגילת הסרכים.

³ Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*.

⁴ While there are a number of works looking at the similarities between D and S, at times including Sa, few incorporate M into the discussion, and if they do, it is only cursory. A sampling of the more recent ones include Charlotte Hempel, “Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, vol. II, Peter Flint, W. and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 67–92; Sarianna Metso, “The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*, ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, STDJ 34 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 85–93; Philip R. Davies, “The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*, ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, STDJ 34 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 27–43; Kapfer, “Attitudes Toward the Temple,” 152–77. Consequently, Licht’s and Schiffman’s investigations remain the most comprehensive on the relationship between M and Sa.

annihilated.⁵ It is during this in-between time that the sectarian community expected to apply Sa, Sb, and the ‘Rule of War’, our *War Scroll*.⁶

1. BASIC SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE *WAR SCROLL* AND THE *RULE OF THE CONGREGATION*

In his study of Sa, Carmignac noted at least 12 points of contact between it and M, several of which are exclusive to the two documents. In addition, he also pointed to certain ideas which, although not identical in wording, nevertheless have parallel or similar meanings.⁷ The intimate relationship between these two texts can be seen best in matters pertaining to how the sect divided responsibilities according to age, as in its procedure for conscripting soldiers for war. With respect to the former, the two texts are particularly complementary: while Sa seeks to lay out all the stages of a person’s life, from birth until retirement, M focuses only on those

⁵ As will become clear with the rest of this chapter, there is little doubt that the authors and redactors of Sa believed it was intended for the future eschatological and messianic period (see John J. Collins, “Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields, VTSup 94 [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 107–10; contra Hartmut Stegemann, “Some Remarks to *1QSa*, to *1QSB*, and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 65–68 [1996]: 479–505; *Qumran*, 113–15), even if some of its content reflected current practices of the sectarians (Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 145; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 35–36, 68–71; Charlotte Hempel, “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of *1QSa*,” *DSD* 3 [1996]: 253–69).

⁶ The *Rule of the Benedictions*, being an anthology of prayers, is only marginally helpful in understanding how the sectarians anticipated being organized during the messianic age. See Barthélemy and Milik, “*1QSa*,” 118–30; Carmignac, “Le Recueil des Bénédiction,” 29–42; Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 277–89; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 72–76; James H. Charlesworth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Blessings (*1QSB*),” in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994), 119–31.

⁷ Jean Carmignac, “La Règle de la Congrégation,” in *Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*, vol. 2, Jean Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée, *Autour de la Bible* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963), 9–27.

stages relevant to being in the army. Although one becomes a full citizen at the age of twenty, military service is only expected from 25 on (1QSa 1:12). Even so, at that age one is not allowed to join the fighters, but is restricted to support tasks, such as watching over the weapons and the provisions (1QM 7:3). Fighting soldiers themselves must be at least 30 years old (1QSa 1:14–15), and as they mature, their roles are expected to change (1QSa 1:19). While these are not detailed in Sa, they are in M: the “skirmishers” (אנשי הבנים) and its cavalry are 30 to 45 years old (1QM 6:14),⁸ the “men of the rule” (אנשי הסדר) and its cavalry are from 40 to 50 years old (1QM 6:14; 7:1), and the officers over the camp (סורכי המהנות) are 50 to 60 years old (1QM 7:1).⁹

The harmony between the two texts on matters of war is made even more explicit in the procedure for conscription. In M it is only briefly described: conscription for war “against the lands of the Gentiles” (לכול ארצות הגוים - 2:7) is to be carried out by the “men of renown” (אנשי השם - 2:6) who are “summoned for the meeting” (קרואי המועד - 2:7), together with the “heads of the fathers’ (families) of the congregation” (ראשי אבות העדה - 2:7). They are to choose men from all the tribes of Israel (2:7); who are called “men of war” (אנשי מלחמה - 2:7) or “men of valor” (אנשי חיל - 2:8). Later we are told of certain restriction as to whom may be chosen: no young boy, woman, lame, blind, crippled, blemished, and unclean (7:3–5). The rationale for these and other restrictions placed upon the soldiers is because of the angels’ presence among them (7:6).

In Sa, conscription for the “war to subdue the Gentiles” (מלחמה גוים - להכניע גוים - 1:21) is to be carried out during a convocation of the “council of the *Yahad*” (עצת היהוד - 1:25–2:11). Although this convocation has other responsibilities, conscription, also called a “convocation of war” (תעודת מלחמה - 1:26), is one of its major ones. Participants at this convocation are described in 1:27–2:3: as a

⁸ The age for the skirmishers is not preserved in M, but it can be inferred from its cavalry and the rest of the divisions (see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 75, 157–58).

⁹ On these divisions according to age and the rationale behind them, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 75–79; Licht, *מגילת הסריס*, 253–60; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 13–26. Divisions according to age are also found in D (10:5–10; 14:5–7) but not in relationship to matters pertaining to war.

whole, they are known as the “men of renown” (אנשי השם - 2:2), who are “summoned for the appointed (meeting)” (קיראי מועד - 2:2),¹⁰ exactly as in M. Furthermore, the “heads of the fathers’ (families) of the congregation” (ראשי אבות העדה) also have an important leadership role (1:24–25). Finally, the list of those who are expected to be in attendance are (1:27–2:1):¹¹

כול... 27
 ה[כמי]העדה והנבונים והידעים תמימי הדרך ואנושי החיל עם 28
 שרי השב[טים] וכול שופטיהם ושוטריהם ושרי האלפים ושרי[ן למאות] 29
 ולחמשים ולעשרות והלויים בתו[ך מחל]קת עבודתו... 2:1

27 ...all
 28 the wi[se] of the congregation and the understanding and the knowledgeable, the perfect in the way and the men of valor, with
 29 the princes of the tri]bes and all their judges and their provosts with the princes of the thousands and the princes of the[hundreds]
 2:1 and of the fifties and of the tens, and the Levites i[n the cour]ses of their service...

One of the groups constituting the council are the “men of valor” (אנושי החיל - 1:28), who, according to M, are to be conscripted. However, one should allow for the possibility that this designation may not be limited to a military context, so that it is not necessarily certain that in Sa it is synonymous with those in M.¹² Nevertheless, in both texts the nation’s leadership is divided up in thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (cf. 1QM 3:14–4:5, 4:15–5:2).¹³ Of particular note as well is the special role of the Levites, just as in M.¹⁴ Finally, the participants in this council face certain restrictions similar to the soldiers in M: there shall be no unclean, afflicted, crippled, lame,

¹⁰ On the variant spelling, see Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 33, n. 24.

¹¹ All transcriptions for Sa are from Parry and Tov, *Religious Law*.

¹² See Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 263; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 33.

¹³ Although there are some differences between this hierarchy on the home front from what it is on the battle front. Most noticeable is the presence of the “heads of the camps for three tribes” (ראשי המחנות אשר לשלושת השבטים) (1QM 3:17) and the “prince of the myriads” (הנשיא הרבוא) (1QM 3:16).

¹⁴ See the discussion above, beginning on page 234, as well as below, starting on page 340.

blind, deaf, dumb, blemished, or tottering (1QSa 2:4–8).¹⁵ Interestingly, the same apologetic for these rules is given: the presence of angels in their midst (2:8–9).

1.1. *Licht's understanding of the relationship*

Noting these similarities and others, Licht looked beyond them and sought to understand the nature of relationship between the two texts. His conclusion was that in opposition to all other sectarian texts at Qumran,¹⁶ the main focus of these two was on how the community was expected to be organized and operate *during* the messianic age to come. Although the sect believed it was already living in the end of the days,¹⁷ they were still anticipating a major turning point in history when they would cease being a small minority of the entire nation in the land, and be joined by the rest of Israel who will have finally recognized them as God's chosen and faithful ones. How this was expected to happen, we are not told. Apparently, they did not see it as a result of their own doing, and so they did not concern themselves with that aspect. What did interest them, however, was how the community was to reorganize and operate in light of this new reality. These expectations are outlined in the two documents, with Sa focusing on those not at war, and M highlighting those going to the battle front. This does not mean, however, that Sa was intended for times of peace, with M being about times of war. On the contrary, a major focus of Sa is the preparations necessary for going to war, the only difference is that it is concerned only with that which needs to take place by those on the home front, and ignores what takes place on the battle front. The *War Scroll*, on the other hand, is the opposite, ignoring for the most part that which is to take

¹⁵ For a commentary on these restrictions, their relationship to other Qumran texts and rabbinical literature, see Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 261–65; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 37–52.

¹⁶ The only exception is Sb which should be counted together with M and Sa. It is not included in the discussion here, for it does not relate directly to the eschatological war. See note 6.

¹⁷ On the use of the term “end of days” (אחרית הימים) at Qumran, see Steudel, “אחרית הימים,” 225–46.

place on the home front, and focusing on issues relating to the battle front. One interesting difference is that while M looks forward to a time when evil would be completely destroyed (1QM 1:8), no such hope is expressed in Sa.¹⁸

1.2. Schiffman's understanding of the relationship

In his study of Sa, Schiffman understood its relationship to M a little differently. For him, M describes a 40-year war which would bring about the utopian age, culminating in a messianic banquet described in S and which would signal the ushering in of this new, utopian age. At this time, proper worship would finally take place in the eschatological temple, as it would follow the laws envisioned by the sectarian leaders. This utopian age, according to Schiffman, is expressed in the sect's hopes for the final destruction of the wicked and proper observance of Jewish Law.¹⁹ He recognizes, however, that because one of the functions described in Sa is to declare the start of the eschatological war, that the eschaton depicted in Sa must therefore have begun before the events described in M.²⁰ Some confusion remains, therefore, since he understands Sa to apply to the utopian age enabled by the eschatological war, yet he admits that it is already in practice from the beginning of that war, before the utopian state is reached. He reconciles this overlap by suggesting that much of what is found in Sa is a reflection of present practice, in that the sect was already attempting to live as if the messiah had already come, so that the distinction between present and future in the text is blurred.²¹

¹⁸ Licht, "משעת עולם," 64–69; מגילת הסרטים, 242–43, 248–49.

¹⁹ Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 7.

²⁰ Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 31.

²¹ Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 35–36, 68–71.

2. THE IMPORTANCE OF LICHT'S INSIGHTS

While Schiffman's study emphasizes the continuity between S, D and Sa, Licht was careful to note all the differences between the latter and the first two. This enabled him to better characterize the changes the sect expected to undergo as it entered into the messianic age (Schiffman's eschaton). These he summarized as follows: a) the outlook will shift from being one of an isolated sect to that of the entire nation of Israel; b) some aspects of the sect's present leadership will nevertheless be continued into the messianic age, specifically the leadership role of the council of the *Yahad*; and c) there would be an attempt to return as much as possible to a political and religious organization as described in the Bible, specifically during the 40 years of wilderness wandering.²² Having understood these changes, Licht was then able to make some conclusions about the chronology of those events which are either explicitly mentioned in Sa and M, or implied by them. These observations are particularly insightful for our understanding of M.

2.1. A nationalistic outlook

One of the big differences that Licht saw in Sa is the absence of any sectarian or dualistic outlook. Instead, the composition is entirely nationalistic.²³ The polemic against the rest of the nation who opposed them is completely absent, apparently because it no longer exists. The faithful are no longer individuals who have voluntarily

²² Licht, מגילת הסרטים, 245. It may be because of this that the eschatological war is to last 40 years, just like the years of wandering in the Great Wilderness (Num 14:33–34; 32:13, and *passim*). Accordingly, the time of Belial's rule would be equated with the years of bondage in Egypt, the eschatological age as the years of wandering in the wilderness, and final redemption as the entry into the promised land.

²³ By nationalistic, Licht means that it encompasses all of Israel's tribes, not just a remnant from among a few of them. How these two conflicting ideas are played out in D, S, Sa, M, and to a lesser degree in Sb, is the subject of Licht's seminal article "מטעת עולם," 49–75. His ideas are foundational for a proper understanding of the relationship between them, and with other sectarian documents. Another full treatment of these ideas can be found in Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 242–57.

joined the sect, but are Israelites born into the nation, of all ages, both male and female. The perspective ceases to be one of an isolated sectarian minority group living celibate lives in the wilderness (as appears to be the case in S),²⁴ to being that of the majority, of the entire nation.²⁵ At the leadership level, this implies that it is no longer constituted of volunteers, but of people who are appointed: thus, for example, the lay leaders of Israel will be added to the “council of the *Yahad*” (עצת היחד).²⁶ In this context, it is important to note that even D which does not display the same strictness as S in its regulations for community members, most noticeably by allowing members to marry,²⁷ nevertheless displays this isolationist, sectarian attitude vis-à-vis the rest of the nation of Israel. Similarly, its nationalistic hopes are put off until some point in the future.²⁸ Licht concluded that since none of these characteristics are present in Sa, the sect saw itself in its present state as a small remnant of the faithful during an evil period, but without abandoning its nationalistic aspirations: it did not consider itself as the “Israel” of the eschaton. Rather Sa was for that time when somehow their nationalistic aspirations of seeing the rest of Israel conform to their religious outlook would be fulfilled.²⁹

Having perceived the above, Licht was able to draw two important conclusions about the transition necessary between the outlook of D and S, and the anticipated state of affairs during the messianic age as it finds expression in Sa. First, since the sect had separated itself on account of the evil leadership ruling over the nation, these will need to have been dealt with prior to the implementation of any-

²⁴ On the extent of the *Yahad* community, see John J. Collins, “The *Yahad* and ‘the Qumran Community’,” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu, JSJSup 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81–96.

²⁵ Licht, “משעת עולם,” 64, 67–68; מגילת הסרכים, 245.

²⁶ Licht, “משעת עולם,” 74; מגילת הסרכים, 266. On the meaning of “council of the *Yahad*” in the sectarian texts in general, see below note 89.

²⁷ On this and other matters where S is stricter than D, see Davies, “The Judaism(s),” 27–43; Metso, “The Damascus Document and the Community Rule,” 85–93; Collins, “The *Yahad*,” 81–96; Kapfer, “Attitudes Toward the Temple,” 152–77.

²⁸ Licht, “משעת עולם,” 61–62, 68–69.

²⁹ Licht, “משעת עולם,” 71–73; מגילת הסרכים, 242–43.

thing in Sa.³⁰ Licht noted that this hope, that these evil rulers would be judged, was expressed in other sectarian compositions (1QpHab 5:4; 1QS 9:23; 10:19–20; 1QH 6:4; 4QpPs^a [4Q171] frgs. 1,3–4 iii:7–8),³¹ and suggested that the sect saw them as the primary cause for Israel's apostasy: once they would be removed, nothing would hinder the rest of Israel from (re)joining the sect.³²

2.2. National reunification

The *War Scroll*, like Sa, shares this nationalistic, rather than sectarian, outlook.³³ Because of this, Licht turned to it in order to learn more about these expectations. In light of M, he surmised that maybe the events described above would take place during the first stage of the war. Specifically, he pointed to the first six years of the war not described in col. 2, which, together with Yadin and Flusser,³⁴ he understood as being years of fighting. During that time, Licht suggested, is when the sect would be at war with these leaders.³⁵ This being the case, the implementation of Sa could take place immediately thereafter, beginning with the acceptance of the rest of the nation into the sect and the renewal of proper temple worship.³⁶ Only afterwards, would the war against the nations take place, the sect now having been bolstered with the population base it needs for a 33-year long war against the nations.³⁷

³⁰ Licht, "מטעת עולם," 66; מגילת הסרכים, 243.

³¹ Licht, "מטעת עולם," 70.

³² Licht, "מטעת עולם," 72–73.

³³ Licht, "מטעת עולם," 64–65; García Martínez, "Apocalypticism," 189.

³⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 264–65; Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 153.

³⁵ Licht, "מטעת עולם," 66, 71, n. 66.

³⁶ Licht, "מטעת עולם," 69.

³⁷ Licht, "מטעת עולם," 70.

2.3. *Not Israel's final redemption*

The second conclusion Licht came to was that both Sa and M are primarily concerned with what must take place with the onset of the messianic age, and the war in particular, ignoring most other issues:

Both these compositions express the tendency to solve the problems of the future from a practical point of view... And both these compositions focus on their vision of the war, during which the people of Israel will be saved from the yoke of the evil Gentiles, and do not deal with any other of the events of the end times.³⁸

Just as importantly, neither does Sa discuss anything related to the conclusion of the end of time, the world in which there will be no more evil, what is often called the 'world to come'. It is only about the days of the messiah. Similarly, while M highlights this final hope (1:8–9), it is only in passing, with its primary focus on what will need to be done until then.³⁹ Sanders summarized it in this way: "Thus we have seen in both 1QSa and 1QM a terminological difference from 1QH and 1QS... The distinction is clearly that 1QSa and 1QM are addressed to the time of the eschatological war."⁴⁰

3. THE COMPLEMENTARITY OF THE *WAR SCROLL* WITH ITS TWO STAGES IN THE ESCHATOLOGICAL WAR

3.1. *The restoration of the 12 tribes of Israel*

These two insights are particularly relevant in light of the way I have suggested understanding the first two columns of M, and the implications it has for understanding the chronology of the war. Most obvious is that Licht's reconstruction of events fits perfectly with my reading of the first two columns. It only needs to be modified slightly in that the first stage of the war is to last a short time rather than the entire six years as he suggested. The differences between cols. 1 and 2 that I have highlighted above can now be put into a

³⁸ Licht, "משעת עולם," 64 (translation mine).

³⁹ Licht, "משעת עולם," 64–65.

⁴⁰ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 249.

broader context, that of the sect's nationalistic hopes.⁴¹ As noted, Sa fits perfectly with col. 2 of M. What was not sufficiently emphasized by Licht, although he sensed it, is that Sa cannot be harmonized with col. 1. Most striking is the reference to the "violators of the covenant" (מרשיעי ברית) (1:2), men of Israel who oppose the sect. This alone precludes col. 1 from having a national outlook as in cols. 2–14 and in Sa. The fact that only the three Southern Tribes, Levi, Judah, and Benjamin, are mentioned further reinforces this lack of a national perspective. Since they comprise the Sons of Light, then at this point in the chronology of events described in M, the sectarians still did not consider themselves as forming 'all Israel', a fact that only further highlights the absence of a national perspective in col. 1 in contrast to what is found in cols. 2 and following. Additionally, it underlines their perspective that the Northern Tribes were still in exile.⁴²

Noticing this point is what prompted Sanders to suggest that while M and Sa did not share the same outlook as S and H, there were also differences between them: "in 1QSa the 'rest of Israel' is converted to the sect in the last days, while in M it appears that at least some Israelites ally with the Gentile armies to be destroyed in the final war."⁴³ What Sanders failed to take into account were the two stages of the eschatological war, and that what is described in col. 1 cannot be taken into consideration when dealing with cols. 3–9.

3.2. *The convocations for war*

Licht also correctly perceived that the "convocation for war" (תעודת מלחמה) in 1QSa 1:26 related to the "convocations for war" (תעודות המלחמה) of 1QM 2:8, implying the second stage of the eschatological war. Schiffman, on the other hand, suggests that the statement in Sa is that "after some sign that the end of the days had dawned... this

⁴¹ By national, I mean inclusive of all of the 12 tribes of Israel (see above, note 23).

⁴² See Licht's discussion on how the sect probably related to the rest of Israel before the messianic age ("מטעם עולם," 60–63).

⁴³ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 250.

assembly... would make the decision to set into effect the series of events described in the *War Scroll*.⁴⁴ It is certain that the “convocation for war” in 1QSa 1:26, although in the singular, refers to multiple incidents, just as the other two reasons for assembling the congregation together: “judgment” (משפט) and the “council of the *Yahad*” (עצת היהד) are also in the singular but are meant to be understood as occurrences which would take place repeatedly.⁴⁵ If there was any doubt, it is made clear in M, where it is in the plural: “convocations of war” (תעודות המלחמה - 1QM 2:8). Accordingly, Schiffman did not intend the initial launching only, but the ongoing leadership needed throughout the war. But what Schiffman appears to have ignored is that in Sa, it is a unified *national* assembly which is responsible for the convocation to war, while the first events depicted in 1QM 1 reveal a nation still divided against itself. In addition, the war in question in Sa is against the Gentiles (1:21), just as it is in the second column of M (7, 10–14); in the first column, however, the term Gentile is never used and the war is only against the Kittim and a few of Israel’s immediate neighbors. It is also clear that in M, this convocation is for the purpose of conscription, more than for determining when to go out to war. These are already determined and listed in 1QM 2:10–14. Since the Hebrew term for “convocation” (תעודה), and especially its use at Qumran, includes the idea that it has been appointed or determined,⁴⁶ it may be for this very reason that the term “convocation” was used in both M and Sa, and what allowed the author of M to outline already the exact campaigns and their respective lengths for the War of the Divisions. As we have seen, the decision to launch the initial war was not in the hands of the sectarians, at least not exclusively. As Flusser was the first to highlight, it is dependent upon the outworking of a precise

⁴⁴ Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 31 (italics in the original).

⁴⁵ Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 261–63; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 30–31.

⁴⁶ See the discussion of the term in Jacob Licht, מדבר יהודה, מגילת ההדיות ממגילות מדבר יהודה (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1957), 255; Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, HSS 29 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 115; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 30; Cana Werman, “התורה והתעודה הכתובה על הלוחות,” *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 473–92; “תעודה: לבירור טיבו של המונח,” ed. Gershon Brin and Bilhah Nitzan (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2001), 231–43; “The תורה and the תעודה Engraved on the Tablets,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 83.

historical scenario during which the king of the Kittim will be launching out from Egypt to exterminate Israel (1QM 1:4; cf. Dan 11:44–45).⁴⁷ According to 1QM 1, the Sons of Light expected the war to come to them. Thus, it is impossible to harmonize Sa with col. 1 of M, and Licht's original understanding that the "convocation of war" relates only to the second phase of the war must be upheld.

4. THE WAR AGAINST THE KITTIM: THE HARBINGER OF THE MESSIANIC AGE

Consequently, I suggest that the relevancy of both M and Sa can now be understood as limited to the forty years of the eschatological war left to be fought *after* the initial victory over the Kittim. Subsequent to those forty years, it can be assumed that the dynamics were expected to change again, since it would be the end of the "appointed time of darkness" (תום כול מועדי חושך) - 1QM 1:8). But up until that point there was need for a gradual conquering of darkness: "and [the sons of right]eousness will shine unto the uttermost ends of the world, increasingly so..." (וְ[בני צ]דָק יאירו לכול קצוות תבל הלוך ואור) - 1QM 1:8). While Jerusalem may have been liberated and Israel freed of its oppressors, the laws of purity still find relevancy in the ongoing war against the rest of the world, where evil and rebellion against God still exist. But once the war is over and the entire world has been conquered, once God's "exalted greatness will shine to all extremities [] for peace and blessing, honor and happiness" (יאיר רום) (1QM 1:8–9) - גודלו לכול קצי [] לשלום וברכה כבוד ושמחה, it is doubtful that all these regulations would still be considered relevant. The texts give us no indication of what kind of world they anticipated after the eschatological war, nor what kind of continuity could be expected to extend beyond the messianic age. Nevertheless, with the end of the war, M would obviously become obsolete, as well as much of Sa, in so far that it too focuses primarily on the war. Similarly, the regulations concerning the lame and the impure in both M and Sa will only be relevant up until the onset of the idealistic

⁴⁷ Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements," 146–48.

age. They are not a sign that these texts are not eschatological, simply that they relate to the messianic age that leads up to the world's final redemption from evil.

5. OF PRIESTS AND LEVITES

5.1. *The role of the Levites*

5.1.1. *The role of the Levites in the Rule of the Congregation*

There is, in my opinion, yet another way that Sa helps better understand M, and it relates to the role of the priests and Levites. Before launching into the matter proper, it is necessary to summarize briefly the Levites' status during the Second Temple Period. While in the Bible the prevailing view is that priests and Levites are two different offices with the Levites being subservient to the priests,⁴⁸ it has been noted that in a number of compositions, the Levites' role has been elevated to that on par with the priests.⁴⁹ Robert Stallman summarizes the evidence from Qumran in this way: "[T]he Dead Sea Scrolls has shown them in striking prominence, most notably in material concerning the future, be it cultic service, combat, or community life and organization."⁵⁰ On the other hand, Cana Werman has pointed out that in the Second Temple Period the office of the Levites was a non-existent entity, because the only ones who remained from the tribe of Levi were priests.⁵¹ She suggests it is for this reason that in the contemporary literature, Levi, as a son of Jacob, is already elevated as being a priest, while at Qumran "a fictive existence for the Levites, a literary creation designed to

⁴⁸ See a brief survey of the matter in Julia M. O'Brien, *Priest and Levite in Malachi*, SBLDS 121 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 1–26.

⁴⁹ For a survey of the origins as well as the development of the exegetical tradition that supported this view, see James Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 (1993): 1–63. See also Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," 465–79, who points out that in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Levites are at times given a position of authority superior to that of the priests.

⁵⁰ Stallman, "Levi and Levites," 188.

⁵¹ Werman, "Levi and Levites," 212–16, 221–22.

camouflage their scarcity” is created.⁵² Be that as it may, the Qumran texts nevertheless give us a window into the sectarians’ thinking on the matter, a witness of how they believed the situation ought to be.

It has been noted that in Sa, the role of the Levites was expanded beyond its cultic function, and that they served in civil matters as well.⁵³ The key passage is 1:22–27:

...ובני לוי יעמודו איש במעמדו 22
 אל פי בני אהרון להביא ולהוציא אתכול העדה איש בסרכו על יד ראשי 23
 [א]בות העדה לשרים ולשופטים ולשוטרים למספר כול צבאותם על פי בני 24
 צדוק הכהנים
 [וכול ר]אשי אבות העדה ואם תעודה תהיה לכול הקהל למשפט או 25
 לעצת יחד או לתעודת מלחמה וקדשום שלושה ימים להיות כול הבא 26
 עת[יד לעצ]ה...⁵⁴ 27

22 ... and the sons of Levi shall stand, each in his own position
 23 according to the sons of Aaron, to bring in and take out the
 entire congregation, each man in his rule, at the hands of the
 heads of the
 24 fa]thers’ (families) of the congregations: as princes, judges,
 and provosts, according to the number of all their hosts,
 according to the sons of Zadok the priests
 25 and all the h]eads of the fathers’ (families) of the congregation.
 And if there shall be a convocation for the entire assembly, for
 judgment, or
 26 for the council of the *Yahad*, or for a convocation for war, they
 shall sanctify them three days in order that all coming may be
 27 prep[ared for the coun]sel...

These lines make it clear that the Levites are to be under the authority of the priests and the heads of the families of the congregations, and that their responsibility is making sure that the proper order of the entire congregation is respected.

The text may be implicitly mentioning another one of their roles. In line 26, we read that “they shall sanctify them.” The object of this

⁵² Werman, “Levi and Levites,” 212.

⁵³ Potentially as a reflection of 1 Chr 23:4 and 2 Chr 34:12; see Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 247, 260; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 28.

⁵⁴ Following Carmignac’s (“La Règle de la Congrégation,” 22) and Licht’s (מגילת הסרכים, 263) reading, rather than הנה[יד ל]הנה.

verb is obviously the congregation being gathered for the convocation, thus one must seek the subject referent elsewhere. Since the previous sentence was describing the role of the Levites, it appears that they are the subject here as well.⁵⁵ Such a role seems rather out of character for Levites, and it has motivated a different, albeit less literal, understanding of the text, namely that the sanctification⁵⁶ in question is self-imposed, just as it was in Exod 19:10–15 upon which the passage is apparently inspired.⁵⁷ Because of its biblical precedent, this latter interpretation is in many ways preferable. Nevertheless, it may be that the author wished to point out some responsibility the Levites might have had in the process of purification the community was expected to undergo. Could it be that we are to understand this problematic phrase in the context of the Levites' role mentioned just a couple lines earlier, that of making sure that proper order is respected? Here the matter would not be order, but purity issues, meaning that the Levites are to make sure that those being called to the convocation are indeed sanctifying themselves for the required three days prior to their entrance into the temple.⁵⁸ Whether or not this interpretation is justified, it is important to highlight the fact that the Levites' primary role is to make sure that proper order is being followed within the congregation of Israel.

5.1.2. *The role of the Levites in the War Scroll*

This expanded role of the Levites, extending beyond its cultic aspect, is similarly found in M. While they are present during temple worship (2:2–3), they also carry out non-cultic responsibilities during the war. In 7:14, we are told that there are Levitical provosts (שוטרים מן הלויים - see also 7:16), just as in the passage from Sa quoted above. Furthermore, they are present precisely when the army is to go out to

⁵⁵ Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 261, 263.

⁵⁶ Or purification (see Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 30).

⁵⁷ Barthélemy, "1QSa," 115–16; Carmignac, "La Règle de la Congrégation," 22; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 30, n. 9.

⁵⁸ On the necessity of this three-day purification period and its relationship to Ezra-Nehemiah and the *Temple Scroll*, see Aharon Demsky, "Who Came First, Ezra or Nehemiah? The Synchronistic Approach," *HUCA* 65 (1994): 16, n. 55.

war: “and fifty skirmishers shall go out from the first gate and[]Levites, the provosts, and with every line they will go out according to the entire r[ule]” (לויים) [ו]ן השער האחד וְיָצְאוּ מִן הַשַּׁעַר הָאֶחָד וְיָצְאוּ כָּל הַלֵּוִיִּם וְיָצְאוּ כָּל הַלְּוִיִּם וְיָצְאוּ כָּל הַלְּוִיִּם וְיָצְאוּ כָּל הַלְּוִיִּם (1QM 7:16–17). Their other roles which are described in M are all subservient to the priests, just as instructed in Sa: together with the priests they are to recite the blessings and the curses before the battle (13:1; 15:4; 18:5), and while the priests give direction to the army by blowing the trumpets, the Levites do the same at certain points in the war by blowing on their horns (8:9; 16:7; 17:13). It may be significant that here too their tasks are connected to the various aspects of the army’s going to and from the battle.

5.2. *The ceremonial focus of the War Scroll*

The description of the Levites’ role in Sa, reflected practically in the responsibilities they carry out in M, may help us better understand the latter composition’s purpose: it is not a military tactical manual per se, but rather some kind of war manual concerned primarily with order and ritual.⁵⁹ A survey of M’s content with an eye for these issues will make it quite obvious that it was composed with the officials of the cult in mind rather than for the military itself and/or to educate about tactical issues.⁶⁰

After the general introduction in col. 1, the first topic addressed in M is that of proper temple worship. While we have seen how the sect’s return to Jerusalem and to the temple in particular is of particular importance to the sectarians, and that it plays an important role in the conscription process, other than guarantying divine favor it has no tactical value. Similarly, the enumeration of the years of war against the sons of Noah seems to reflect little of the realities one

⁵⁹ As already suggested by Ginsberg in 1948 (“The Hebrew University Scrolls from the Sectarian Cache,” *BASOR* 112 [1948]: 22).

⁶⁰ This idea was already expressed by Duhaime when he compared M to Greco-Roman tactical treatises (“The *War Scroll* from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises,” *RevQ* 13 [1988]: 133–51). See also Carmignac who pointed out that the entire scroll was not written with the perspective of the combatants in mind (*Règle de la Guerre*, XII).

would expect in war. Thus, already at the very beginning of M, we see how matters of sequence and timing, elements of utmost importance in religious ceremony, are given priority over the practical logistics of war.

The next section (2:16–7:7) is a general description of the army as a whole, including the trumpets, the banners, and the various fighting units with their weaponry. While it contains some matters which appear to be tactical, such as who marches out and when, these are only given to facilitate the description of the army and how it is to be ordered. Most telling is that this section begins with a segment on trumpets (2:16–3:11), which are used only by the priests. One must be mindful that at this point the reader has no knowledge whatsoever of anything else of the army: its size, divisions, leaders, weapons, tactics, etc. Here we have the most obvious indication that priority is given to priestly matters, over and above all other military aspects. This point is all the more striking when M is compared to other Greco-Roman treatises: apart from some kind of introduction, they typically begin with a description of the divisions of the army.⁶¹

After the trumpets, the next segment describes the banners of the army (3:13–4:E). The focus here is on their inscriptions. On the great banner which is over the entire people, it must include the names of Israel and of the twelve tribes. While there is nothing unexpected about such a requirement, it is surprising that it must also include the name of Aaron separately (3:14), as if it was a separate tribe or fighting unit.⁶² Obviously, then, special care is given to highlight the Levitical element in the nation, even though it has no

⁶¹ Duhaime, “Tactical Treatises,” 139, 144, 147.

⁶² This special treatment of Aaron separate from the rest of the twelve tribes is found again in another inscription. Unfortunately, the scroll has been eaten away so that only the first letter of what is to be inscribed has been preserved: “And on the *m*[] of the prince of the whole congregation...” (...נשיא כול העדה...) (1QM 5:1). The inscription, however, is clear: “they shall write his name,[and] the name of Israel and Levi and Aaron and the names of the twelve tribes of Israel according to their generations and the names of the twelve princes of the tribes” (יכתובו שמו] ושמם ישראל ולוי ואהרון ושמות שנים עשר שבטי ישראל כתולדותם ושמות שנים עשר שרי שבטיהם) (1QM 5:1–2). Here “Aaron and Levi” replaces of the single mention of “Aaron” on the banner over the entire congregation. Note as well how there are twelve prince of tribes, obviously excluding the division of “Aaron and Levi,” and hinting to the fact that it does not have any combat role in the war.

active role in combat. Additionally, after having described the banners over the divisions of the three tribes, individual tribes, myriads, thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, there is then a separate section describing the banners for the sons of Aaron. They are similarly divided into units of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (3:E–4:5),⁶³ as if they too constituted a fighting force. Yadin has made a strong argument that the text did not originally contain a threefold division of Aaron's sons, but a fourfold division, thereby differentiating between priests (sons of Aaron) and Levites (Kohath, Gershon, and Merari).⁶⁴ Yet the fact that they are mentioned at all when they have no fighting role in the army is in itself significant. Even the inclusion of banner inscriptions in a military treatise is unique. While Duhaime was able to find some parallels with other treatises in the way that the banners offer a description of the divisions of the army,⁶⁵ there remains nonetheless an important difference: in other treatises, the divisions of the army are given as the primary goal, whereas in M, it is merely an aside necessary for a coherent description of the banners.

The next section (7:9–9:E) is concerned primarily with army tactics. Yet even here, the instructions are given from the perspective of the priests and Levites only, reflecting little of the war from a soldier's perspective.⁶⁶ Most blatant is that the entire section begins with a description of the clothes to be worn by the priests, including the mention that the same garments cannot be worn during temple service (7:10–12). Once again, this detail is purely ceremonial, and bears no consequence whatsoever on the tactical development of the

⁶³ For a most likely reconstruction of the Aaronic banners, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 57.

⁶⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 55–56. See also Jongeling's discussion of other views, and why Yadin's is preferable (*Rouleau de la Guerre*, 125–26). Note also Carmignac's argument that this can hardly be a division of priests only, since so few of them are present in battle (cf. 1QM 7:9–12 - *Règle de la Guerre*, 60). Note as well 1QSa 1:23, where the Levites are divided according to their hosts, hinting that their divisions may parallel that of the rest of the army.

⁶⁵ Duhaime, "Tactical Treatises," 140.

⁶⁶ As already pointed out by Duhaime ("Tactical Treatises," 141, 143, 149–50). Highlighting the fact that tactical treatises were found in circles of philosophers, he suggests that there is no reason why a priestly group may not have similarly wished to teach those under its instruction about their role in military matters.

war. In fact, the entire section makes most sense if one reads it as an instruction manual for priests and Levites to know when they are to blow their trumpets and horns, and fulfill other duties they may have in the course of a battle. Where the army's movements are mentioned, or other events that transpire on the battle field, it is apparently only to give the background necessary for a proper timing in the use of the trumpets.⁶⁷ Another obvious illustration that the scroll's focus is on priestly matters is the instructions given for after the victory. Other than the usual procedure for blowing the trumpets, there is one additional admonition: the priests are not to come into the midst of the slain for fear of their defilement (9:7–9). As for the rest of the army, not a single detail is given. While this section is most similar to what is found in other Greco-Roman tactical treatises, its uniqueness is nonetheless obvious, even aside from its priestly or Levitical focus. Never is there any rationale given for what is being presented, neither does there seem to be any concern with strategy. As with the rest of the scroll, what is described are matters unaffected by the needs of tactical considerations, of what may motivate strategic decisions, or of how to improvise in light of the changing scenarios which may transpire on the battle field.⁶⁸

The section on tactics is followed by one on prayers and speeches to be given at war (10:1–14:E). All of them are to be said by priests, at times together with Levites (10:3–5; 15:7–E; 16:15–E). Yet the topic of such a section, like that of the trumpets, finds no parallel in other Greco-Roman treatises.⁶⁹ Possibly more than any other sec-

⁶⁷ This may possibly be compared to Arrian's treatise in which he used real battle examples to illustrate the points he was trying to convey (Duhaime, "Tactical Treatises," 148).

⁶⁸ See Duhaime's discussion of these precise matters in "Tactical Treatises," 140–42, 145–46, 148–51. When comparing 4Q493 to 1QM 7:7–9:E, Yshai concluded that while 4Q493 described the war from the perspective of the priests, M did so from that of the fighters and the entire congregation ("ספרות המלחמה," בקומראן, 253, 319). The foregoing survey has demonstrated that this is in fact not the case, but that M has retained much if not all of the special emphasis on the priests found in 4Q493 (note Abegg who called 4Q493 is a "handbook for priests." See "War Scroll," 75–76).

⁶⁹ Duhaime has suggested that maybe this section can be considered to be an addition, paralleled to the additions found in Arrian's treatise, though admittedly the topic of prayers and speeches are not found in other treatises. Reviewing these is

tion, this one highlights the religious aspects of the war which was to be carried out by the priests, and which were obviously considered to be of prime importance to the author of M. As for the rest of M, cols. 15–19, it is an amalgamation of the various topics previously discussed, although not without introducing some contradictions. Even so, this final section of M only reinforces the observations made thus far.⁷⁰

This brief survey has highlighted how M in its entirety is concerned with those aspects which are somehow connected to the interests of the religious authorities:⁷¹ the entire war is presented as a kind of religious ceremony with its appointed times for war against a predetermined list of enemies; when describing the army itself, the trumpets of the priests take prime position; the priests and the Levites are listed on the army's banners, even though they do not have any role in the fighting itself; when discussing tactics, the concern is one of proper dress and avoidance of impurity; and a large section is devoted to speeches and prayers to be uttered by the priests and the Levites. It seems, therefore, that M is primarily interested in that which pertains to cult and ceremony at war, particularly from the perspective of the religious authorities.⁷²

This is further confirmed by the fact that apart from priests and Levites, nowhere in all of M is there a concern to discuss any other leadership role. We are informed about the presence of a prince over the entire congregation (נשיא כול העדה - 1QM 5:1), of leaders of different units such as the camp of the three tribes, the tribe, the myriad, the thousands, fifties, and tens (1QM 3:14, 16), of the heads of the

not profitable for the present discussion and is therefore omitted here.

⁷⁰ Duhaime noted that these columns may have some affinities with Arrian's description of the battle array against the Alans, though he also highlighted one major difference: Arrian's description is from the perspective of a civilian commander preoccupied with strategy, while in M the focus is on the religious figures and the speeches they must give ("Tactical Treatises," 149).

⁷¹ This is different than those who suggested that only portions of M were intended for priests (see Carmignac, *Règle de la Guerre*, 108; Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 71; Duhaime, "Tactical Treatises," 141). In my opinion, the entire text is intended for priests, similar to Duhaime's suggestion that M emanated from a priestly milieu (*War Texts*, 59).

⁷² Not unlike the instructions for Joshua's battle against Jericho (Josh 6).

households of the congregation (1QM 2:7; 3:4), of the heads of the lines (ראשי המערכות - 1QM 19:12), yet never are any of their responsibilities even alluded to. The focus is exclusively on the religious authorities.

Thus, together with Sa, there is an emphasis on ceremonial matters. In Sa, this is most obvious in its description of the Levites' role. Yet they are to be under the authority of the priests and the heads of the families of the congregations for all civilian matters (1:22–25). Although they do not have any judicial responsibilities, they are responsible to ensure that the community's principles are properly applied. As far as we can tell, their position and role in M is in harmony with this perspective (7:14, 16). In addition, M gives us a glimpse of their cultic role as well, in the temple (2:2–3) and as assistants to the priests on the battle field (7:13–15;⁷³ 8:9; 13:1; 15:4; 16:7; 17:13; 18:5). In these situations they seem to be responsible to the priests only.

5.3. *A priestly perspective*

There is, however, a significant difference between the two texts. While in Sa there are specific instructions given to the Levites, this is not the case in M. Rather, the focus is on the priests only. Several points make this particularly clear. First, even though M mentions that some Levites will have to give a speech of encouragement to the army (10:5), nothing more is said, neither when such a speech is to take place nor what its content must be. Conversely, the details of priestly speeches are spelled out (15:7–E; 16:15–E). Second, the author makes sure to describe the trumpets used during the war, complete with a series of inscriptions to be used at various stages of the war (2:E–3:11). Yet although we are informed that Levites are to assist the priests in blowing their horns (8:9–11; 16:7–8; 17:13), they

⁷³ Notice how in this passage the author seems to be differentiating between those Levites who are assisting the priests (7:13b–14a, 15) and those who are civilian officers (7:14b).

are never enumerated and no description of them is ever given.⁷⁴ Similarly, priestly vestments are carefully described (7:10–12), yet there is no mention of what the Levites are expected to wear. Finally, whenever the scroll does describe a Levitical duty, it is always as an aside to a discussion about priestly responsibilities. The clearest example of this is in col. 7. In lines 12–18, we are told that when the priests are to walk out in front of the army before the battle to encourage the soldiers, they will be accompanied by seven Levites. Additionally, three Levitical provosts are to stand in front of these priests and Levites. Yet apart from these two details, nothing more is said about what they are expected to do. Instead, the text continues on with its discussion of the role of the priests as if the Levites were not even present. If the role of the Levites are mentioned, it is always incidentally, and the description is always incomplete. All these examples, therefore, highlight how M focuses on the responsibilities of the priests.

At the same time, if M was composed for priests, it apparently includes topics which are superfluous to their tasks, casting doubt on whether this was really its purpose. For example, even though the banners of the army emphasize the preeminence of the priests (1QM 2:13–4:E), these are not integral to their role. If M is a manual for priests, why then the lengthy descriptions of the weapons of the different units in the army (1QM 5:3–6:6; 9:10–E)? Why discuss the cavalry at all (1QM 6:8–E)? Or the age and purity requirements of the soldiers (1QM 7:1–7)? While initially it appears that these elements of M preclude a priestly focus, this need not necessarily be the case. As we have seen, the Levites' role in Sa is to insure that proper order in the community is respected. We have also seen that they are to carry out their responsibilities under the authority of the priests and the heads of the families of the congregation. Consequently, the Levites were not responsible for determining what proper order was

⁷⁴ It could be suggested that they were mentioned at the bottom of col. 2. However, this would mean that the instruments of the Levites would have been given priority over the instruments of the priests. It may also be suggested that since they are ram's horns, they are not included because they are not man-made, but there is still no reason why they could not have had inscriptions similarly to the priests' trumpets.

to be, but simply to make sure it was being respected. Apparently, defining proper order fell upon the priests together with the heads of the families of the congregation. Since both priests and the heads of the families of the congregation are present on the battle front, could it be that even when at war, this was one of their primary responsibilities? If so, then one would expect that all matters of ceremonial importance would be discussed in a war manual for priests. In my opinion, not only could this account for the inclusion of the matters mentioned above which otherwise seem totally unrelated to priestly functions, it may also help explain some other peculiarities in M.

Let us take the banners as an initial example (3:13–4:E). The *War Scroll* is careful to highlight the importance of their being the right size and having the correct inscription. These are ceremonial, and not tactical, issues. In fact, M fails to address such matters as who is expected to bear them and how they are to be used on the battlefield. Surprisingly, they are not even mentioned again. Yet this is exactly what one would expect in a manual focusing on priestly responsibilities: since the priests are not responsible for using the banners on the battle field, the specifics of their usage are omitted. Yet, because it is important that they be ceremonially correct, an aspect which does fall under priestly jurisdiction, these details are included. This is not to say that the tactical aspect of the banners is ignored. The very fact that they are included in the discussion confirms that they were understood as having tactical value. Rather, it seems as though the implication is that for the banners to be as efficient as possible tactically, they must also be ceremonially acceptable. The two need not be mutually exclusive. But assuming that M is concerned primarily about priestly matters, be it their direct involvement in the battle, or making sure that proper ceremonial procedure is being respected, then any topic being discussed will ignore that which is tactical only. For the banners, this means that details are given as to what they must look like, but no instructions pertaining to their use during battle are given.

It seems to me that this rationale offers a reasonable explanation for the unique way in which M deals with other topics. For example, while it goes at length to describe the various weapons used by the

different military units (5:3–6:E; 9:10–E),⁷⁵ the descriptions clearly favor the ceremonial aspect over the tactical, as they include the kinds of decorations and the inscriptions that will adorn the different weapons (see especially 5:7–10, 15; 6:2–3; 9:15–16), matters which are inconsequential to their effectiveness when in the hands of a soldier. One even wonders if the weapon measurements have a more ceremonial than tactical significance. What is certain is that no tactical rationale is ever given in M. But should it see a merging of ceremonial aspects with the tactical, this could explain the unusual emphasis on non-military aspects of the weapons. Such a rationale could also apply to the cavalry (6:8–17). Initially, the entire description appears to be tactical, dealing with such issues as the number of horsemen, how many formations, their position in relationship to the rest of the army, the kinds of horses to be used, their equipment, etc. Yet after this description, the cavalry is hardly ever mentioned again. Yet if these apparently tactical elements were considered to contain ceremonial importance as well, this would explain why the cavalry, like the banners, is described but then hardly referred to again. If the additional part played by the cavalry was considered to be devoid of ceremonial importance, or if it was not connected to some aspect over which the priests were responsible, there would have been no need to mention it again.

Obviously, this suggestion that ceremony is the determining factor behind M's choice of material, and how it subsequently discussed it, cannot be proven. If I have suggested it, it is because it is consistent with what we can infer to have fallen under priestly jurisdiction. The fact that in other parts of M the focus is clearly on the role

⁷⁵ For studies dedicated specifically to the weaponry in M, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 114–40, 243–46; Israel Shatzman, *The Armies of the Hasmoneans and Herod: From Hellenistic to Roman Frameworks*, TSAJ 25 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991), 212–14; Israel Shatzman, “על הצבא במגילת מלחמת בני אור בבני חושך,” in היהודים והרומי בעולם ההלניסטי והרומי, ed. Isaiah M. Gafni, Aharon Oppenheimer, and Daniel R. Schwartz (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1996), 105–31; Russell Gmirkin, “The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 89–129. A summary of these treatises can be found in Duhaime, *War Texts*, 83–95. It should be noted that the consensus today is that the weapons reflect a second century BCE context, although possibly with some first century BCE updating.

of the priests makes it reasonable to assume that the scroll's other peculiarities are similarly understandable in light of their relationship to the priests. Consequently, I suggest that M should be defined as a "War Manual for Priests." This kind of manual would not be without precedent. Varro reports that Roman priests in charge of war ritual did in fact use such kind of books in the performance of their duties (*De Lingua Latina* IV:14), although none are extant.⁷⁶ Could it be that M is an adaptation of one such book? If so, it was applied to a very specific and narrow context, that of providing guidance to priests for what was believed to be the ultimate eschatological war.

Duhaime, who considered such a possibility, ended up rejecting it as problematic because the Qumranites were "apparently devoid of any military power and remote from the battle field."⁷⁷ Consequently, he suggests that one of M's purposes was to "oppose what they considered an inappropriate way for the civilian authorities of their day to conduct war."⁷⁸ However, M may not be a polemic against non-priestly leadership. Rather, the sporadic and selective role of the priests in M is in fact a sign that it expected others, non-priests, to concurrently carry out the remaining leadership roles. These are not scroll's concern, which is why they are completely ignored. Second, 1QM 1–2 gives the background for the War of the Divisions: it was not expected to be applicable immediately, during the time when the Qumranites had separated themselves from the society around them. Rather it anticipated a future time when the dynamics would be suitable and the guidelines applicable. Here again is yet another illustration of how important it is to understand the two stages in the eschatological war in order to properly situate the rules and guidelines it prescribes.

5.4. *Sefer haMilhamah: a different composition*

In light of my understanding that all of M is a manual for priests, I do not agree that *Sefer haMilhamah* (4Q285 and 11Q14) is the miss-

⁷⁶ Duhaime, "Tactical Treatises," 150.

⁷⁷ Duhaime, *War Texts*, 60.

⁷⁸ Duhaime, *War Texts*, 60.

ing end of M as has been suggested⁷⁹ and often reiterated.⁸⁰ Rather, this composition focuses primarily on the “prince of the congregation” (נשיא העדה - 4Q285 frg. 4:4, 6, 10; frg 7:4). Indeed, many of the instructions are for this individual: he is to “treat the Kittim with contempt” or “despoil the Kittim” (כחיים יבום) - 4Q285 frg. 3:4);⁸¹ he is to “pursue them] to the [Great] Sea” (ורדף אחריהם נש[יא העדה עד הים] - frg. 4:6); he “shall make a stand against them” (וְיַעֲמֹד עֲלֵיהֶם) - frg. 4:8); the leader of the Kittim is to be brought before him (וְיָבִיאוּהוּ) - frg. 4:10), after which he “shall put him to death” (והמיתו נשיא העדה) - frg. 7:4).⁸² The fact that there are instructions for him to pursue the enemy in flight while in M the priests are commanded not to (1QM 9:7–8) highlights this difference between the two compositions. Indeed, apart from the priestly benediction in 4Q285 frg. 8 / 11Q14 frg. 1 ii, little of the document is specific for priests. It is for this reason that I have not taken it into consideration when seeking to understand M and its copies and recensions.⁸³

6. SECTARIAN USAGE OF THE TERM “CONGREGATION” (עדה)

From the very beginning of the publication of Sa, it was noted that its use of the word “congregation” (עדה) was exceptional.⁸⁴ In the Bible, from which its use is assumed to be inspired, the term is concentrated in the Priestly document and texts related or dependent upon it, where its meaning focuses on that of being a reference to the

⁷⁹ Milik, “Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša’,” 143.

⁸⁰ See for example Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 292; Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 187.

⁸¹ On the meaning of this line and its translation, see Alexander and Vermes, “4QSefer Ha-Milhamah,” 234–35.

⁸² On the meaning of this sentence see Alexander and Vermes, “4QSefer Ha-Milhamah,” 240.

⁸³ Additionally, see note 49 on page 383. Philip Alexander also concluded that *Sefer haMilhamah* is a different composition than M. While he failed to distinguish the importance of the two stages of the eschatological war in M, he nevertheless sensed the difference in content between the two compositions (“Evil Empire,” 29–30).

⁸⁴ Barthélemy, “1QSa,” 108.

“general assembly of the Israelite tribes.”⁸⁵ At Qumran, however, it is thought that the use of the term underwent a certain evolution:

While in the older scrolls the *‘ēdâ* still represents the self-designation of the Qumran community itself as a “holy congregation” (CD 20:2; 1QS 5:20; 4Q181 1:2), it is soon replaced almost completely by → יהי *yahad*, though the strongly eschatological *Rule of the Congregation* again exhibits a retarding tendency (1QSa 1:9; 2:8,21). Here *‘ēdâ* refers to the overall community into which the *yahad* is incorporated (*b^e*) as a subdivision.⁸⁶

While this depiction of the use of the term is accurate, it needs, in my opinion, further elaboration. The “retarding tendency” is more than just that: it is also eschatological, as will become clear as one compares its use at Qumran in contrast to another term with which the sectarians defined themselves, the *Yahad*.

6.1. *Its use in the Rule of the Congregation*

First, it is necessary to underscore the fact that the word “congregation” (עדה) in Sa is introduced in the phrase “the entire congregation of Israel (כול עדת ישראל) - 1:1; 2:12; see also עדת ישראל - 1:20). Already this is significant in light of the absence of this particular expression in all other Qumran texts.⁸⁷ Yet because of this phrase,

⁸⁵ D. Levy and J. Milgrom, “עֲדָה ‘ēdâ,” in *TDOT*, vol. 10, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, trans. David E. Green (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 468–80.

⁸⁶ Heinz-Josef Fabry, “עֲדָה ‘ēdâ - V. Qumran,” in *TDOT*, vol. 10, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, trans. David E. Green (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 480.

⁸⁷ On the assumption that the cryptic texts 4Q249 are copies of Sa, the editor of these texts has suggested reconstructing it in 4Q249ⁱ frg. 1:2 (see Steven J. Pfann, “Cryptic Texts,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, Stephen J. Pfann, et al., DJD XXXVI [Oxford: Clarendon, 2000], 534–43). However, in light of the extreme fragmentary state of these texts (rarely is an entire word preserved per line, and in particular the word עדת in its entirety is never found), it is difficult to verify such an assumption. Out of prudence, therefore, I have chosen to consider the extant text only and not draw any conclusions based on the editor’s reconstructions. It has also been suggested to reconstruct the phrase “congregation of the sons of Israel” (עדת בני ישראל) in *Reworked Pentateuch A* (4Q365 frg. 26a–b:5). Even so, the phrase is inspired from the Pentateuch rather than out of a

where “congregation” is used in the determinative state, without any qualifiers, and where the context does not make it clear that it should be otherwise, one is left to conclude that in Sa, the “congregation” in question is all Israel. There are, however, two other times when “congregation” is defined otherwise. The first is the “congregation of the men of renown” (עדת אַנְוְשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם - 2:8). From 2:2, we learn that these “men of renown” are those who have been chosen from all Israel to participate in the “council of the *Yahad*” (עצת היחד - 1:26, 27; 2:2, 11). Later in the text, this council is also called the “congregation of the *Yahad*” (עדת היחד - 2:21), this being the second alternate use of “congregation” in Sa. Both times, therefore, the word “congregation” refers to the “council of the *Yahad*.” Thus it seems likely that the unqualified uses of “the congregation” (העדה - 2:5, 7, cf. also 2:10) in the context of this council refer to this subgroup,⁸⁸ a kind of smaller congregation representational of the entire congregation of Israel.⁸⁹ The other references to the “congregation,” however, are all in relationship to Israel as a whole: the “hosts of the congregation” (צבאות העדה - 1:6), the “holy congregation” (עדת קודש - 1:9; עדת הקודש - 1:13), the “princes of the fathers’ (families) of the congregation” (שרי אבות העדה - 1:16), the “se[rvi]ce of the congregation” (בעבודת העדה - 1:19), “to bear the burden of the congregation” (לשאת משא עדה - 1:20), and the “heads of the fathers’ (houses) of the congregation” (ראשי אבות העדה - 1:24–25).

6.2. *Its use in the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls*

In the rest of the Qumran corpus, the word “congregation” (עדה) is found 141 times. There are 13 occurrences in which one of its root letters has been reconstructed, and an additional 8 times where two of its letters have been reconstructed.⁹⁰ Before examining its use in these texts in more detail, it is necessary to quickly survey the other term the sectarians used for self-identification, the *Yahad* (יחד).

motivation to name the sectarians’ community.

⁸⁸ Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 261; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 38, 43, 49.

⁸⁹ Licht, מגילת הסרכים, 244.

⁹⁰ Abegg, *Concordance*, 2.544–45.

6.2.1. *The use of the term “yahad” (יהא)*

With respect to the *Yahad*,⁹¹ there is one obvious and significant difference: in addition to being a designation of the sectarians’ “community,” it can also mean “together,” and where the context is ambivalent, the choice is left up to the editor. Nevertheless, *Yahad* is thought to be found some 141 times as meaning the sectarians’ “community,” and an additional 97 times as meaning “together.”⁹² When it means the “community,” there are 16 occurrences when one of its root letters has been reconstructed and another eight when two of its letters have been reconstructed. When it means “together,” 12 times has one letter been reconstructed, and three times two letters are reconstructed.

An initial observation is that there is a slight tendency not to reconstruct the word *yahad* when not thought to be used in its ‘technical’ sense of meaning the “community.” A second observation is that it would appear that the sectarians called themselves the *Yahad* (יהא) slightly more often than they called themselves the “congregation” (יהד). In fact, this trend is even more pronounced than what the numbers above suggest.

6.2.2. *One “Yahad” but several “congregations”*

There is an important element which must be taken into consideration when dealing with the term “congregation.” Whereas the *Yahad*, when used as a technical term, only refers to the sectarian community, this is not always the case with the word “congregation.” It is also used to refer to heavenly beings (1QHa 11:22), to the sectarians’ opponents (1QS 5:1), or to a group associated to a

⁹¹ There has been a recent renewed interest in better understanding to whom exactly this term refers; see Sarianna Metso, “Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement,” *RevQ* 79 (2002): 429–44, esp. 431–32; Eyal Regev, “The *Yahad* and the *Damascus Covenant*: Structure, Organization and Relationship,” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 233–62; Collins, “The *Yahad*,” 81–96; Sarianna Metso, “Whom Does the Term *Yahad* Identify?” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu, JSJSup 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 213–35.

⁹² Abegg, *Concordance*, 1.307–9. One instance is marked as “indeterminate” (p. 309).

specific person, such as the priest (1QSb 3:3), the “spouter of lies” (CD 8:13, 1QpHab 10:10), Absalom (1QpHab 5:12), or even God himself (1QH^a frg. 10:8). What is important to note is that while throughout these various examples the primary meaning of an “assembly” remains, the word is not always used as a technical term to designate the sectarians’ congregation. This is probably seen clearest when considering that out of the 128 occurrences of the word, 83 times, or almost two thirds of the time, it is found in construct form. Consequently, one ought not to assume automatically that a reference to the priest’s congregation or to God’s congregation should be interpreted as a synonym of the technical term “congregation” which designates exclusively the ‘congregation of the sectarians in its entirety’ as it does in Sa.⁹³ The question this raises is in which texts in addition to and similarly to Sa can we be sure that the sect is actually referring to itself as “*the* congregation?”

6.2.2.1. "The congregation"

A survey of the occurrences of “congregation” (הַעֲדָתָא) in its absolute state in the Qumran texts is revealing. It is found only in the following: D (4Q266 frg. 8 i:9, iii:4, frg. 10 i:3–4, 4Q267: frg. 5 iii:6, frg. 9 iv:10, 4Q270 frg. 6 iv:15–16, 18; frg. 7 i:14), Sa (1QSa 1:6, 12–13, 16–17, 19–20, 23–25, 28; 2:5, 7, 16), Sb (1QSb 5:20), *Serekh haMilhamah* (1QM 2:1, 3, 7, 9; 3:2, 4, 11, 13; 4:9, 15; 5:1; 4Q491 frgs. 1–3:5; frg. 16:2; 4Q496 frg. 10:2), *Sefer haMilhamah* (4Q285 frg. 4:2, 6; frg. 7:4; frg. 10:2), *Words of Moses* (1Q22 frg. 1 i:2), *Pesher Isaiah^a* (4Q161 frgs. 5–6:3), *Mysteries* (4Q299 frg. 76:3), *Reworked Pentateuch* (4Q365 frg. 7 i:4; frg. 31a–c:15), *Apocryphon of Moses* (4Q375 frg. 1 ii:6, 9; 4Q376 frg. 1 iii:1), *Apocryphon Pentateuch B* (4Q377 frg. 2 ii:9), 5Q17 (unclassified) frg. 1:2, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400 frg. 1 i:4); the *Temple Scroll* (11Q19 42:14; 11Q20 5:19), and PAM 43665 frg. 25:2.⁹⁴ Removing those texts which are too fragmentary to be helpful to the discussion (4Q299, 5Q17, PAM 43665), as well as those where the use of the

⁹³ Realizing that Sa is dealing with the messianic age during which all Israel will have joined the sectarians.

⁹⁴ I have omitted *Pesher Habakkuk* (1QpHab 10:10), since as mentioned above, the congregation in question is that of the Spouter of Lies.

term is inspired from the Pentateuch rather than by the motive of self-identification (1Q22, 4Q365, 4Q375–6, 4Q377, 4Q400, and 11QT), one is left with only D, Sa, Sb, *Pesher Isaiah*^a, and the M Material. What stands out from this list is that they are all foundational texts of the Qumran sect, and that except for D, all the others are eschatological about the future,⁹⁵ and not referring to the sect in the present. Additionally, it must be noted that all of these compositions are from the end of the second century BCE or the beginning of the first century BCE.⁹⁶

6.2.2.2. The “congregation of...” (...עדת)

Nevertheless, one must not ignore that other texts use the word “congregation,” even if in construct, to refer to the congregation of the sectarians. The list of such names which they may have potentially used for themselves include:⁹⁷ the “congregation of God” (עדת אל) - 1QM 4:9; 4QH^a [4Q427] frg. 7 i:14;⁹⁸ frg. 8 i:10; 4QEschatological Hymn [4Q457b] 1:5; עדת המלך - 4QShirShabb^c [4Q403] frg. 1 ii:24,⁹⁹ the “congregation of your holy ones” (עדת קדושיכה) - 1QH^a frg. 5:3); the “congregation of his chosen one” (עדת בחירו) - 4QpIsa^d [4Q164] frg. 1:3; 4QpPs^a [4Q171] frags. 1–2 ii:5; frags. 1+3–4 iii:5); the “congregation of the poor” (עדת האביונים) - 4QpPs^a frags. 1–10 ii:9; iii:10); and the “congregation of those who serve...” (...עדת משרתי...)

⁹⁵ The line prior to the mention of the “prince of the congregation” (נשיא העדה) in 4QpPs^a mentions the “wilderness of the peoples” (מדבר העמים) - 4Q161 frags. 5–6:2), an expression used at Qumran only in the context of the eschatological war (see the discussion beginning on page 159). Furthermore, the “prince of the congregation” is often mentioned only in texts which contain eschatological interpretation of biblical passages (see Horgan, *Pesharim*, 79).

⁹⁶ For a survey of these documents and their assumed composition date, see Stegemann, *Qumran*, 104–26, as well as note 191 on page 142. For an earlier date of *Pesher Isaiah*^a (4Q161) than what Stegemann suggests, see Amoussine, “4Q161,” 381–92; Amusin, “Reflection of Historical Events,” 123–52, and the more recent discussion in Hanan Eshel, המדינה החשמונאית, 82–91.

⁹⁷ I say “potentially” because it remains uncertain whether or not all of these names necessarily refer to the entire community of the sectarians as opposed to just a segment of them (see below).

⁹⁸ See also 1QH^a 26:10 and 4QH^c (4Q431) frg. 1:9, where the same passage has been reconstructed.

⁹⁹ Note that in this context, God is called “King.” One may also possibly add ...עדה לכל אל... (4QShirShabb^b [4Q400] frg. 1 i:4) to this list.

4QShirShabb^f [4Q405] frg. 23 i:3). Two categories of names including the word “congregation” are discernible. The first includes those which describe to whom the congregation is associated, such as “of God” or “of his holy one.” The second is comprised of those which describe who belongs to the congregation, such as the “poor” or “those who serve...” An additional construct phrase which belongs to this latter category is the “congregation of the *Yahad*” (עדת היחד - 1QSa 2:21; 4QpPs^a [4Q171] frgs. 1–10 iv:19; עדת יחד - 4QH^a [4Q427] frg. 7 ii:9).

6.2.3. *Were the sectarians “the congregation” or simply “a congregation?”*

In Sa, we have seen that this is a small representational group of the larger congregation of Israel. Yet as Licht has pointed out, Sa anticipated such a time when the nation of Israel would join itself to the sectarians.¹⁰⁰ Until that point, we know that the sect in its entirety called itself the *Yahad*,¹⁰¹ but apart from D no other non-eschatological text uses “the congregation” to define the sectarians’ community.¹⁰² In fact, if before the eschatological or messianic age

¹⁰⁰ See above, page 331.

¹⁰¹ This is most obvious in S.

¹⁰² Note that it has been suggested to reconstruct the word “congregation of” in 4QpNah (4Q169 frgs. 1–2:8): “the congregation of] the elect [of God] (עדת בחירן] (א); see André Dupont-Sommer, “Résumé des cours de 1969–70: Hébreu et Araméen,” *Annuaire du Collège de France* 70 (1970): 399–414 (as cited in Gregory L. Doudna, *4QPeshar Nahum: A Critical Edition*, JSPSup 35, Copenhagen International Series 8 [London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001], 105) and Horgan, *Pesharim*, 162. Since it is believed that most of *Peshar Nahum* was composed to comment on events already past (see Berrin, *Peshar Nahum*, 301), this would be the sole instance where “congregation” is used to mean the sectarians’ community prior to Israel’s full restoration. The reconstruction is bolstered by the fact that in three other cases in the Qumran texts “congregation” is collocated to “chosen” (“elect” in the translation above): 4QpIsa^d 1:3, 4QpPs^a frgs. 1–10 ii:5 and iii:5. Note that all three are the “congregation of his chosen (*one*)” (עדת בחירו) rather than the “congregation of the chosen (*ones*) of God” (עדת בחירי אל), so that in the least, one would assume the text to have read “the congregation of his] chosen [(one)]” (עדת בחירון]. But neither is this reconstruction certain. In the sectarian scrolls, the expression “the people of the chosen of...” (עם בחירי...) is found twice (1QM 12:5 and 4Q285 frg. 1:4). While “the people of...” (עם) is obviously one letter shorter than “the congregation of...” (עדת) and could therefore be deemed too short for the lacuna, it

the term *Yahad* means the entire community of the sectarians, and not just a selection of it, then the combination of “congregation” with *Yahad* raises the question as to whether or not the sectarians viewed themselves as “the congregation,” as opposed to just “a congregation,” one among many possible similar congregations. Thus we read in *Psalm Pesher*^a that God chose the Teacher of Righteousness, a priest, to establish for him a “congregation of...” (... לבנות לו עדת] - 4Q171 frgs. 1–10 iii:16), not just “the congregation,” but one which apparently needed further defining so as to differentiate it from other congregations.¹⁰³ Similarly, as the rest of the names collected above suggest, there was such a need, when referring to the community of the sectarians as a “congregation,” to define it in some way. It does not seem to have been possible to just talk about “the congregation” unless it was in the context of the messianic age.

The only exception, as noted above, is D. However, even in that text the picture is not entirely clear. We have seen that in Sa the word “congregation” can be used at two levels: one to represent the entire community, and the other to isolate a smaller representational group. At one point, the author made sure to clarify, when he described the role of the Levites: they are “to bring in and take out the entire congregation” (להביא ולהוציא את כול העדה) (1:23). It may not be insignificant that the only time D is careful to clarify that it is referring to the entire congregation is in an eschatological context, describing the rise of the messiah, who in this case is called the “prince of the entire congregation” (נשיא כל העדה) (7:20–21). Still, D has several references to the “congregation” without any further qualifications, leaving the reader to assume that “congregation” does

should be remembered that the final *mem* is often significantly wider than the other letters (see Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4. I*, Plates XII–XIV; note the ones in line 6 and the blank space that follows), so that such a reconstruction is also possible. In light of such ambivalence in the reconstruction, 4Q169 frgs. 1–2:8 cannot be used as concrete evidence against the distinction I have discerned in the sectarian’s use of the word “congregation.”

¹⁰³ One could stipulate that the proper reconstruction should be the “congregation of God” (עדת אל), in contrast to the congregations who are the sect’s enemies. Still, the point is that the author could not just use “the congregation” as seems to have been sufficient in the eschatological texts.

indeed refer to the entire sectarian community (esp. 10:4–8; 14:10).¹⁰⁴

Even so, D's uniqueness in this matter may be nothing more than a reflection of its own distinctiveness as opposed to S.¹⁰⁵ George Brooke has summarized the differences between the two documents in the following manner:

The Rule [of the Community] appears to stem from a community of men living in a close-knit order (*yaḥad*), sharing their goods and a discipline in accordance with a strict penal code. The Damascus Document, by contrast, presupposes men and women living a normal family life, with private property, and a discipline consisting primarily of adherence to the laws of the Torah... We now have in the 4Q manuscripts an extensive pericope from the penal code that closely parallels that of the Rule in substance and in wording. However, the penalty of a reduction in the food ration (IQS vi.25) is absent in the Damascus Document, which suggests that it was applicable only to men living together in the *yaḥad*. On the other hand, the penal code of Damascus Document includes offenses such as “fornication” with one’s wife, apparently involving violation of some sexual ban, and murmuring against the Fathers and Mothers of the community. These offenses presuppose conventional family life... The plurality of social practices has also been inferred from CD vii.6–7, which distinguishes between members of the sect who walk in “holy perfection” and those who dwell in camps in the manner of the land, marrying and bearing children, while following the Torah. This may reflect a bifurcation in social patterns, celibate and family oriented, within the Covenant com-

¹⁰⁴ There is yet another mention of the “congregation” not already mentioned in the discussion above, in 20:2–3. Here however, the “congregation” is specifically said to be that “of the men of holy perfection” (עדת אנשי תמיים הקדוש), so that this example does not fit into the present discussion of the sectarians naming their community “the congregation” without any further description or qualification.

¹⁰⁵ For a concise survey of the way various scholars have interpreted the relationship between the two documents and the communities which stand behind them, see Charlotte Hempel, “Community Origins in the *Damascus Document* in Light of Recent Scholarship,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls - Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 317–18, as well as the following articles in addition to those listed in note 4 above: Regev, “The *Yaḥad* and the *Damascus Covenant*,” 233–62; Metso, “Whom Does the Term *Yaḥad* Identify?” 213–35.

munity, not unlike what Josephus records about the Essenes (*The Jewish War* 2.160–161).¹⁰⁶

Important to note is that D is not dealing with only one isolated community in the Judean Wilderness as seems to be the case with S, but with several communities, or camps, throughout the country. Furthermore, it would seem that those residing at Qumran were the exception, rather than the norm, even for S.¹⁰⁷ Thus, in D we learn that the “examiner of the camp” (המבקר למחנה - 13:7) has his own “congregation” (בעדתו - 13:10). And since the entire community is divided into several camps (7:6; 12:23; 13:20; 14:3, 9; 19:2), the implication is that there are several such “congregations.” In S, no such dynamic exists, as its focus is the one community only,¹⁰⁸ making it all the more peculiar that it never refers to its own community as “the congregation.” In contrast, D’s free use of the word “congregation” may in fact be possible specifically because it implies the multiplicity of camps. It may be that a “congregation” is nothing more than one of the camps. Alternatively, it may be that D could call the entire “Covenant community” “the congregation,” precisely because it comprised all the camps, and not just one specific one as in most other sectarian literature.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Damascus Document,” in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 168–69.

¹⁰⁷ It is possible that there may have been other communities, like the one at Qumran, that considered themselves to be part of the *Yaḥad* (see Collins, “The *Yaḥad*,” 81–96). The distinction nevertheless remains, however, that while S is applicable to the Qumranites, D is not. A more separatist attitude has been adopted by S that reflects one or several small communities isolated from the rest of the people.

¹⁰⁸ 1QS 6:1b–8 notwithstanding. “This passage clearly envisions several small “cell” communities” (Collins, “The *Yaḥad*,” 85), implying that they are part of a larger single community (see also Metso, “Whom Does the Term *Yaḥad* Identify?” 228, n. 43). At a minimum, there is evidence that S was copied at Qumran (Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields, VTSup 94 [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 439–52) strengthening the conclusion that it was in vigor for the sectarian community living there.

¹⁰⁹ This only further highlights the uniqueness of 4QMiscellaneous Rules (*olim* 4QSerekh Damascus, 4Q265) in contrast to D. Although it is a much shorter com-

The compositional history of D has been shown to be very complicated, and to date there is no consensus among scholars.¹¹⁰ Perhaps it could help explain why D differs from all other sectarian texts in its use of “congregation” and *Yahad*. Even if not, the evidence from the rest of the Qumran corpus shows that where the sect called itself the *Yahad*, it did not refer to itself as “the congregation.” This suggests that once they began using the term *Yahad* for self-identification, they ceased to use “the congregation.” Rather, “the congregation” ended up being used exclusively in those texts which talk about the eschatological or messianic period. More specifically, it seems to have been intended to identify that point in time anticipated in the future when the entire nation of Israel, with all of its tribes, will once again be unified. This is certainly made clear in Sa, as in M. In the latter, it is particularly noteworthy that all of the mentions of “the congregation” are in cols. 2–5, relating to the second stage of the war, beginning with the restoration of temple worship and its role in the conscription of soldiers for the War of the Divisions.

6.2.4. “The congregation” and all Israel

This connection between “the congregation” and reunified/restored Israel is further confirmed by a survey of the references to “all Israel” in the scrolls, or even to instances when “the tribes” (מטות, שבטים) imply all of Israel’s tribes. With respect to the latter, apart from texts which are based on the Bible, either quoting or reworking

position that D, it refers to the *Yahad* several times but never to the “congregation.” This confirms that it should not be considered as being directly related to D. See Joseph M. Baumgarten, “265. 4QMiscellaneous Rules,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXV - Halakhic Texts*, Joseph M. Baumgarten, et al., DJD XXXV (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 58, and the discussion in Hempel, *Damascus Texts*, 103–4.

¹¹⁰ For a summary of the different views put forward, see Hempel, *Damascus Texts*, 44–53, 87–88.

it,¹¹¹ or recounting its history,¹¹² the tribes (מטות, שבטים) of Israel are mentioned only in Sa (1:15; 1:29) and M (2:3, 7; 3:14, 4:10; 5:1–2).¹¹³ It is not mere coincidence that in the latter text they are listed in the same four columns where “the congregation” is also found. The only other occurrence of “the tribes” outside of these two texts in *Pesher Isaiah*^d where we find the mention of the “heads of the tribes of Israel for the e[nd of days]” (ראשי שבטי ישראל לא[חרית הימים]) (4Q164 frg. 1:7), but this example only further emphasizes the eschatological dimension of the reunification of the twelve tribes.¹¹⁴ Similarly, the reference to “all Israel” (כול ישראל) in the Qumran Scrolls, when not in a text reworking a biblical passage,¹¹⁵ in a passage condemning Israel’s wayward ways,¹¹⁶ or in an apologetic that God’s covenant for the sect is intended for the entire nation,¹¹⁷ are all in eschatological contexts.¹¹⁸ Consequently, there seems to be little doubt that “the congregation” (העדה) meant the restored nation of Israel expected in the eschaton. As Sanders summarized the matter:

¹¹¹ 4QRP^a (4Q158) frg. 4:3; 4QCommGen C (4Q254) frgs. 5–6:3; 4QRP^c (4Q365) frg. 35 ii:5; 4QapocrPent. A (4Q368) frg. 5:2; 4QapocrMoses^a (4Q375) frg. 1 i:8; 4QMMT^a (4Q394) frg. 8 iv:11; 4QMMT^c (4Q396) frgs. 1–2 iii:1; 4QMMT^d (4Q397) frg. 3:5; 4QProphecy of Joshua (4Q522) frgs. 22–25:3; and the several references in 11QT.

¹¹² 4QapocrJosh^b (4Q379) frg. 1:5; 4QapocrJer C^b (4Q387) frg. 4 i:1.

¹¹³ Abegg, *Concordance*, 1.442, 2.708. Omitted in this list is 4Q249c 4, where the word “their [tri]bes” (לשב[טיהם]) has been reconstructed; but see above, note 87.

¹¹⁴ It is most likely that the entire text is eschatological (Horgan, *Pesharim*, 125).

¹¹⁵ 4QapocrPent. B (4Q377) frg. 1 i:7; 4QapocrMoses^c (4Q408) frg. 2:2, frgs. 3+3a:4; 11QT 60:12.

¹¹⁶ CD 3:14; 4QD^a (4Q266) frg. 5 i:18.

¹¹⁷ CD 15:5; 16:1.

¹¹⁸ 4QpIsa^d (4Q164) frg. 1:1; 4QpNah (4Q169) frgs. 3–4 iii:3; 4Q285 frg. 4:2; 4Q491 frg. 16:4; and 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521) frg. 2 iii:5. Not included is the tentative reconstructions of “all Israel” (כול ישראל) in 1QApocrMoses^b? (1Q29 frgs. 3–4:3; *olim* 1QLiturgy of the Three Tongues of Fire; see Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik, “29. Liturgie Des ‘Trois Langues de Feu’,” in *Qumran Cave I*, Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik, DJD I [Oxford: Clarendon, 1955], 130–32; John Strugnell, “Apocryphon of Moses,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XIV - Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, Magen Broshi, et al., DJD XIX [Oxford: Clarendon, 1995], 111–36) and in 11QNew Jerusalem ar (11Q18 frg. 27:1; see Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, “11QNew Jerusalem Ar,” in *Qumran Cave 11 II*, DJD XXIII [Oxford: Clarendon, 1998], 305–55, esp. 345), as well as of “all [Israel]” (כול ישראל) in 4QBeatitudes (4Q525 frg. 10:7; see Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII*, 139–40).

“the sect did not, at least very often, think of itself as ‘Israel’ *during the time of its historical existence.*”¹¹⁹ It was not *the* “congregation of Israel” (עדת ישראל).¹²⁰

7. ISRAEL’S LEADERSHIP DURING THE ESCHATON

The foregoing survey of the similarities between M and Sa, both of which deal exclusively with the eschaton (also called the messianic age), has provided further confirmation for understanding the differences between cols. 1 and 2 of M as reflecting the two stages in the eschatological war. By reading Sa in light of these two stages, and relating it to cols. 2–9(14) of M, rather than to the entire document, one removes the alleged contradictions between them in their portrayal of who constituted Israel, both during the historical period of the sect as well as during the anticipated eschaton. Only after the War against the Kittim will the leadership take on its correct form, returning the priests and Levites to their proper roles, and allowing Israel to become once again “*the* congregation” it once was. While in Sa we discover some of the Levites’ new duties during the messianic age, in M we learn that one of the many responsibilities of the priests will be to provide leadership to the War of the Divisions.

¹¹⁹ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 254 (italics in the original).

¹²⁰ See also the discussion of the sectarians’ relationship to Israel in John J. Collins, “The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Pt. 5, the Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck and Jacob Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 25–42. “Even though the sect claims to have the right interpretation of the Torah, it does not usurp the name Israel...” (p. 34). Furthermore, in M, “it is apparent that the sectarians hoped that the distinction between Israel and the Sons of Light would have collapsed. A similar hope informs the so-called Messianic Rule, IQSa, [which] makes no distinction between Israel and teh community of the elect.” (p. 38).

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE CAVE 4 WAR TEXTS

So far in my investigation of M, I have determined that cols. 1–2 form a unified introduction to the rest of the document. Integral to the scroll is that the eschatological war will take place in two stages: the first is a short but violent War against the Kittim in the Land of Israel, fought by the sectarians and others in Judah who have not aligned themselves with the Kittim. In this war, the three restored tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin will still be divided between those faithful to God’s covenant, also called the “people of God” (עם אל), and those who have been unfaithful, namely the “violators of the covenant” (מרשיעי ברית). But this war, as dramatic as it may be, is only a prelude, an event marking the beginning of a new era in Israel’s history, that of the messianic age and the spreading of its universal rule. Having been miraculously established in the Land of Israel as a result of the War against the Kittim, it will then be the Sons of Light’s responsibility to bring it about in the rest of the world by a 33 year-long war of world conquest, the War of the Divisions. I have highlighted that in between the two, drastic changes will take place, two of its most important ones being that Jerusalem will be liberated of its wicked rulers so that proper temple worship can be reinstated, and that Israel’s exiles from all tribes will be gathered into the land, comprising a new and entirely unified “congregation of Israel” (עדת ישראל). A six-year preparatory period will allow the nation to ready itself for the 33 years of wars still to be fought. What was not conquered during that initial battle will be by the time these campaigns are over, establishing Jacob and his seed as God’s chosen, and only, people.

While these first two columns contain significant differences, allowing one to consider the possibility that they may have emanated from diverse sources and were only joined together in a late phase in

the redaction of the composition, it must be noted that they are not contradictory in any way. Differences do not necessarily mean contradiction, especially if, as I suggest, two successive stages in the war are being described. Furthermore, the way the first two columns complement each other is particularly evident in two areas. First, col. 1 makes it clear that the war being described is only a beginning, requiring a continuation, a kind of fulfilling. This matches up with the chronology of the war as described in col. 2, which is missing a beginning, a first stage already concluded. Second, the geography of conquered peoples and nations of the two columns complement each other, forming a single picture, one which is comprehensive of the entire world as seen through the lens of the Table of Nations being applied to an Ionian map. Such complementarity reflects, in my opinion, the effort of a single author. To separate them as if they were the result of a diachronic development in the scroll's composition is doing injustice to the text. This is not to say that it is impossible for the War of the Kittim and the War of the Divisions to have come from two different traditions which were combined in M. What I am emphasizing here is that cols. 1 and 2 need not have had a separate anterior history so that at some point they needed to be combined. This difference may seem minor, but it is vital for understanding the rest of the scroll, for it implies that these two columns are the only proper foundation upon which the rest of the composition must be interpreted.

My investigation of the other columns in M concluded that cols. 3–9 relate explicitly to the second stage, the War of the Divisions. About this there is no disagreement in scholarship. Similarly, I determined that cols. 15–19 reflect the War against the Kittim and its characteristics. This too has been noticed by all who have studied M. What I have highlighted, however, is that these columns include an innovation that stands in contradiction to the War against the Kittim as described in col. 1: rather than being against the Kittim and their few allies, the battle is now to be a universal one, against *all* foreign nations.¹ Such a war is irreconcilable with either col. 1 or 2.

¹ This, in my opinion, is one of the strongest arguments against supposing that col. 1 is the latest phase in the scroll's history of composition as suggested by Davies (*IQM*, 113). Such a contradiction between cols. 15–19 and col. 1 preclude

The enemies listed in col. 1 are limited to a few; similarly, the War of the Divisions is to systematically conquer the nations in a succession of campaigns lasting 33 years, not all of them at once in a single all-out battle. I see no other option than to consider cols. 15–19 as emanating from a different tradition than the one preserved in col. 1, and for some reason yet to be determined, appended to M. Finally, I explored the composite nature of cols. 10–14, noting that while much of its content reflected the same kind of war as that which is depicted in cols. 15–19, its overall structure is nonetheless adapted, albeit very poorly, to the War of the Divisions as described cols. 2–9. Thus, in cols. 10–14, as in cols. 15–19, there is evidence that the author, redactor, or compiler drew upon a separate tradition than the one(s) that inspired cols. 1–9.

1. THE EVIDENCE FROM THE CAVE 4 MATERIAL

So far, I have only sought to describe the composition as it is preserved, without seeking to answer the more difficult and much more theoretical question as to why or how it reached this final state. Absent from my discussion have been the Cave 4 manuscripts, except for when one or more of these pertained specifically to a matter at hand. It is now crucial to examine them in more detail to see what they can contribute to our understanding of the M Material. Below, I survey them in chronological order as per their copy date. While manuscript date does not imply composition date, it is nevertheless part of the overall picture one needs to consider. Ordering the material in this way helps keep this particular data in the forefront. The chronology will be followed regardless of whether the texts are of the same or a different recension than M. The goal is to provide a quick abbreviated survey of each document's content, and

col. 1 from being composed last for the purpose of being a summary of cols. 15–19 as he has suggested. Furthermore, if cols. 1 and 2 are a single entity, and col. 2 the basis for cols. 3–9, then for col. 1 to be the latest stage in the scroll's composition it would have to imply that all of cols. 1–9 are later than cols. 15–19. It is almost universally accepted, however, that cols. 15–19 are reliant on cols. 7–9 (see below, note 52). I am not suggesting, though, that col. 1 may not have undergone some later editing or redactional work to help it better fit the document as it evolved.

outline in broad strokes its basic similarities to and divergences from M.² Most important, however, is to differentiate what eschatological war traditions lie behind each document: the War against the Kittim of col. 1 or of cols. 15–19, or the War of the Divisions of cols. 2–9,³ or possibly some other tradition not yet encountered in M. This is different than determining whether the document is of the same or different recension as M. In some ways, it is also different than identifying possible ‘dualistic reworkings’ as some have tried to do.⁴ Instead, I am looking for common or diverging traditions in the various texts, rather than differences in the specifics between them.

1.1. 4Q493

The oldest manuscript is 4Q493, belonging to the first half of the first century BCE. The preserved text is quite short, but from the little there is, it is possible to determine that it is not a copy of the same recension as M, although in some ways it resembles 1QM 9. It has therefore been classified as a different recension than M. It contains some new elements, such as the “trumpet[s] of the Sabbaths” (הצוצרון [ת] השבתות - line 13) and different war machines like the “catapult and ballista” (החרף והמאבן - line 5) than those mentioned in M. Also interesting is a reference to temple sacrifices, specifically the *Tamid* and holocausts (התמיד ולעולות - line 14). When earlier I examined the battle sequence,⁵ I pointed out that 4Q493 preserved a simpler and shorter description of the battle procedures than in all the other documents. This in itself suggests an earlier composition than the other texts which also contain battle narratives. Finally, it is necessary to note that it is a kind of mini war manual, similar to what is preserved in cols. 7–9, as it does not contain the same kind of rules

² A similar survey of the Cave 4 material can be found in Duhaime, *War Texts*, 20–40.

³ Since cols. 10–14 are already a mixture of two of these traditions, it is cannot be used as a control factor.

⁴ See for example Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 43–50; von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 29–115; Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworkings,” 46–51. It is also what is behind much of Davies’ monograph on M (*IQM*).

⁵ See above, beginning on page 312.

(סרכים) as in cols. 3–6, nor a detailed account of the battle sequence as in cols. 15–19, nor a collection of prayers as in cols. 10–14. As it stands, 4Q493 parallels material in M dealing with the War of the Divisions. The absence of the High Priest and that the enemy are defined as the “nations” (line 4) rather than the Kittim confirm this observation.

1.2. 4Q496

4Q496 postdates 4Q493 a little, dating to the middle of the first century BCE. I have already pointed out that with respect to where it parallels the first three columns of M, it preserves a text which is almost identical. Thereafter, however, it is possible to discern greater divergence from the Cave 1 text, though still quite similar to it. Even so, I prefer classifying it as a different recension than M.⁶ When it can be determined, it contains material parallel to cols. 1–4 in M, specifically pertaining to the trumpets and the banners. 4Q496 frg. 15 was tentatively identified as being similar to 1QM 9, but from such a small amount of text as is preserved on this fragment, such a suggestion can only be tentative. Even more dubious is the association of frg. 97 with 1QM 12 or 19. Consequently, it is important to note that this slightly different recension of M contains material about both the War against the Kittim and the War of the Divisions, in the same order as in M, but without any of the liturgical elements as in cols. 10–19. One significant difference, however, needs to be highlighted. In frg. 10, twice there is a supralinear correction, adding the “prince” (נשיא - lines 3–4) into the sentence. Most likely this individual is related to the “prince of the congregation” (נשיא העדה) featured in *Sefer haMilhamah* (4Q285 and 11Q14). It may be that this updating of the text reflects an evolution in the thinking of the sect with respect to this leader’s role during the eschatological war. If so, then it is particularly noteworthy that these changes were not incorporated into M.⁷ Instead, the role of this individual appears to

⁶ See above, page 24.

⁷ In M, the Prince of the Congregation is mentioned only once (5:1). Even before the publication of 4Q496, this short passage was thought to be a late insertion

have been fleshed out in a different composition contemporaneous and parallel to M, *Sefer haMilhamah*.⁸

1.3. 4Q471

Also somewhat older than M is 4Q471 frg. 1.⁹ I have already examined this text in detail when dealing with temple liturgy, concluding that while it relates to 1QM 2, it is less certain whether it relates to the eschatological war or not.¹⁰ Although I suggest a slightly different reconstruction than the editors, I nevertheless concur with the Eshels that its composition predates that of M. And if one concedes that it is a War Text,¹¹ then preserved here is another example of the intimate connection between temple practice and conscription for war, as is found in the 1QM 2. As it deals with proper temple ritual, it can only relate to the War of the Divisions, though nothing in the text inherently implies it.

(Davies, *IQM*, 31–32).

⁸ For more about the Prince of the Congregation, *Sefer haMilhamah* and M, see above, page 352. A possible second anomaly in 4Q496 is the verb “we have acted wickedly” (הִרְשָׁענוּ - frg. 32:4). Not only is it not attested in M, such a theme of the Sons of Light doing wrong, or even confessing the sins of their forefathers is completely absent from all of M. The closest is an admission in the prayer “And He has taught us” (9:E–11:12), recited before launching the initial attack on the enemy, that Israel’s past victories were not due to its own accomplishments, for these were full of evil and sin (11:4). Alternatively, it could also relate to the reference to the sin of Nadab and Abihu (17:2) in the High Priest’s speech to the reserves who are to set out after some of the Sons of Light have fallen (16:15–17:3). Both of these are found within liturgical sections of M, something which 4Q496 does not otherwise seem to have. However, the poor preservation of the fragment precludes one from knowing what the actual context is, so that it remains impossible to ascertain that this statement confirms the presence of liturgy in 4Q496.

⁹ On the debate over whether 4Q471 is earlier or later than M, see above, note 71 on page 31.

¹⁰ See above, page 231.

¹¹ See above, note 126 on page 222.

1.4. 4Q492 and 4Q495

Contemporaneous with M are 4Q492 and 4Q495, two texts that reflect M closely enough to be reckoned as copies of a similar recension. The first of the two contains the prayer “And You, God,” and as we have already seen, it follows 1QM 19 almost exactly, not just with respect to the prayer itself, but with what follows it as well.¹² Thus, both the prayer and the subsequent rubric could be a copy of M.¹³ As for 4Q495, its frg. 1 has only one complete word and two fragments of words over two lines. Tentatively, it has been associated to 1QM 10:9–10. Fragment 2, on the other hand, is undoubtedly the same text as 1QM 13:9–12. Thus 4Q495 contains only liturgy, although possibly slightly different versions than what is preserved in M. The first, if the identification of frg. 1 is correct, is “And He has taught us” (9:E–11:12), a prayer which I have suggested was appropriate for the War against the Kittim as depicted in 1QM 15–19 (but not in 1QM 1). The second prayer, “God of our fathers” (13:7–17) is so generic that it could potentially have been used in either or both of the two stages of the eschatological war. When attempting to reconstruct 4Q495 frg. 2 on the basis of 1QM 13, there are at least two variants. The first is that line 2 either had some extra text or, alternatively, a *vacat* of at least 10 spaces.¹⁴ Second, in order to keep a similar line length throughout, in line 3 it is necessary to omit the phrase “and in his counsel to cause evil and guilt” (ובעצתו להרשיע וילהאשים) from 1QM 13:11. Even so, with so little text preserved, it is impossible to even postulate which of the two versions of the prayers may be the earliest. Unlike the previous texts (4Q493, 4Q496, and 4Q471), 4Q492 and 4Q495 include both liturgical elements and characteristics of the universal War against the Kittim.

¹² See above, page 282.

¹³ As for the prayer, Eshels called it the same as in 1QM 19 (“Recensions,” 352).

¹⁴ Abegg, “War Scroll,” 40.

1.5. 4Q491

Slightly later than M, though still predating the turn of the era, is 4Q491. As mentioned earlier,¹⁵ it has been suggested that this does not just represent a single document but three, two of which parallel M, though neither are of the same recension as M.¹⁶ Before looking at each of the two compositions separately, it is necessary to consider 4Q491 as a whole. Content-wise, some of 4Q491 contains material parallel to that which is found in almost every column in 1QM 5–17, though not necessarily always in the same order.¹⁷ Furthermore, while at times the text is very similar to that which is in M,¹⁸ at other times the similarities are almost exclusively thematic rather than textual.¹⁹ In addition, 4Q491 contains material not extant in M.²⁰ Like M, 4Q491 contains rules, narrative, rubrics and liturgy. However, there is nothing extant that is parallel to the introduction to the war as found in 1QM 1–2. Whether this is purely circumstantial or not is obviously impossible to know.

1.5.1. *Summary of previous scholarship*

The relationship between some of 4Q491 and M has undergone careful scrutiny. I only briefly summarize the results here. Frgs. 1–3 echoes material found in 1QM 5–9. These fragments deal with various rules for the army as well as basic tactical maneuvers for engag-

¹⁵ See above, page 20.

¹⁶ See Table 2.

¹⁷ Since it was impossible to reconstruct the order of the papyrus scroll because of its very poor state of preservation, Baillet organized as much of the material as possible according to the order in which it is found in M. However, not all material with parallels to M could be arranged in that way, because some of it was obviously dealt with in a different sequence (see below, especially about frgs. 1–3).

¹⁸ Such as with frgs. 8–10.

¹⁹ For example, frg. 4.

²⁰ Sometimes it is the content of an entire fragment, such as frg. 16 which includes a reference to the gathering of all Israel in Jerusalem and the nation being a kingdom of priests, none of which is found in M (see above, page 207, why it may be preserving the non extant portion at the bottom of col. 1). At other times, it is only a particular point in the midst of a broader discussion which otherwise resembles M. One such example is the reference to smiths and smelters (אנשי ההדש) ואנשי החרש (יה) in frg. 3:7.

ing the enemy in battle. Yet the kind of issues addressed and their order is at times different than in M. Where there are parallels, they have been examined, and the conclusion is that the treatment in 4Q491 frgs. 1–3 is generally shorter and simpler than that which is in M. This has prompted scholars to conclude that between the two, 4Q491 was composed earlier, and that M, while probably not working off of 4Q491 directly but a common source, is more elaborate.²¹ Frgs. 8–10 i, on the other hand, is an almost identical copy of 1QM 14:4–18, with only a few minor variants. Nevertheless, right from its initial publication, these variants were seen as evidence that 4Q491 frgs. 8–10 represents an earlier version of the prayer “Blessed be the God of Israel” (1QM 14:4b–15) and “Rise up! Rise up!” (1QM 14:16–E).²² Finally, frg. 11 ii shares affinities with 1QM 16:3–14 and 17:10–14, dealing principally with the fall of some of the Sons of Light in battle, as well as the speech of encouragement the reserves are to hear before being sent out to the battle field. Here too it is thought that M may have reworked 4Q491, implying that it is a later composition than 4Q491.²³ Thus wherever parallel material between 4Q491 and M has been compared, the conclusion is that 4Q491 represents an earlier recension of M.²⁴

1.5.2. *Implications of 4Q491 potentially being two documents*

Examining 4Q491 according to Abegg’s division into two War Texts (A and B) proves to be particularly informative.²⁵ Because his B

²¹ Florentino García Martínez, “Estudios qumranicos 1975–1985: panorama crítico (III),” *EstBib* 46 (1988): 351–54; Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 467.

²² Hunzinger, “Fragmente,” 149–50; Jacob L. Teicher, “A Spurious Version of the War Scroll,” *ZAW* 70 (1958): 257–58. However, see also Carmignac’s brief study of the variants (*Règle de la Guerre*, 270–72), in which he casts doubt on such a conclusion, suggesting that at times the M variants are less defective. Nevertheless, even he allows the possibility that M redactor may have infused the text with additional biblical allusions when copying the prayers.

²³ Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworkings,” 46–51.

²⁴ This is also Yshai’s conclusion (“הגגם,” 137). Accordingly, note Abegg’s paleographical dating of 4Q491 which suggests that it is earlier than M (see note 72 on page 33).

²⁵ For Abegg’s division of 4Q491 into three documents, see Table 3.

text, where it is similar to M, is parallel to its earlier part (cols. 5–9), I begin with it.

1.5.2.1. 4Q491B

While it has been suggested that 4Q491B has parallels to 1QM 12–13 in addition to cols. 5–9, this is not necessarily the case. Fragment 7 is said to be similar to 1QM 13:8–9. However, since this fragment has one letter on the first line and a single word on the second, such a proposal is only tentative at best. As for frgs. 5–6 and their equivocation to 1QM 12:1, it is dependent upon assuming a distant joint between the two fragments.²⁶ Content-wise, both fragments together preserve only three complete words, with the reading of two of them being tentative. Thus, while such a join may be possible, it is not certain, and it is only prudent to withhold the conclusion that these fragments have anything to do with 1QM 12–13.²⁷ Consequently, it can only be affirmed that 4Q491B preserves content parallel to 1QM 5–9.²⁸

With respect to the other fragments (16, 17, 19, 23) that do not parallel any of M's content, a few elements point to the overall topic(s) they may be dealing with. Fragment 16:4 mentions "all Israel" (כול ישראל) and "Jeru[sale]m" (ירושל[ם]). Most understand the line as referring to Israel's coming to Jerusalem.²⁹ Of particular interest is that the emphasis is on *all* Israel.³⁰ Possibly connected to Israel and Jerusalem is the mention of an offering (תרומה) in frg.

²⁶ This joint and the parallel to 1QM 12:1 was accepted by Yshai ("ספרות המלחמה," בקומראן, 76–78). However, since no prayers or speeches are preserved in 1QM 1–9 and all its parallel texts, it seems unlikely that 4Q491B should exceptionally include a prayer. Alternatively, if one rejects 4Q491B's division into 4Q491B and C (as does García Martínez; see above, note 67 on page 29), implying that the *Self-Glorification Hymn* (frgs. 11–12) is indeed part of the M corpus, could it be that frgs. 4–5 also belong to that Hymn? If so, it would appear that the Hymn was omitted when M was compiled, most likely because the Hymn in question did not relate the role of the priests. Another possibility is raised below, note 39.

²⁷ Abegg, "War Scroll," 51.

²⁸ See below, note 39, for an alternate understanding of frgs. 5–7.

²⁹ See Baillet's reconstruction "all Israel [will ga]ther (in) Jerusalem" (יקבצו כול ישראל ירושלים - *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 39).

³⁰ See especially D (15:4; 16:1) and *Sefer haMilhamah* (4Q285 frg. 4:2), and above, page 363.

19:3. There are also possible instructions to recite liturgy, such as to “exalt” (וְרִמְמוּ - frg. 16:5), to say a “blessing” (וּבְרָכָה - frg. 17:5), and “asking for forgive[ness]” (סְלִיחוֹתָ - frg. 23:4), even with the earliest reference to the “Book of Psalms” (סֵפֶר הַתְּהִלִּים - frg. 17:4).³¹ In light of all this, it would seem that some kind of religious ceremony at the Jerusalem temple for the entire nation of Israel is intended, possibly after the war.

Some overall conclusions and additional observations about 4Q491B as a whole can now be made. First, if one does not accept the suggested parallels with 1QM 12 and 13, then it appears that throughout the entire document there are no liturgical passages, either prayers or speeches.³² Second, when comparing the composition with the War of the Divisions in 1QM 3–9, one notices certain similarities: there is not a single reference to the Kittim, nor to the High Priest. All of Israel, with all of its tribes (frg. 16:4; frgs. 1–3:8–9), is present. The cavalry is mentioned as part of the army (frgs. 1–3:3). The Sons of Light are called a “congregation” (עֵדָה - frgs. 1–3:1, 5; frg. 16:2) which has connections to Jerusalem (frg. 16:4; see also the reference to the “house of the meeting” [בֵּית מוֹעֵד] in frgs. 1–3:9).

There is, however, at least one significant difference, namely the reference to “Korah and his congregation” (קֹרַח וְעֵדוּתוֹ - frgs. 1–3:1). Unfortunately, apart from this small phrase, little of the line is preserved. If one combines it with line 2, it seems as though the concern is one of judgment of those within the camp, a warning against unfaithfulness, a matter which is totally absent from cols. 3–9 in M.³³

³¹ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 41.

³² Though see below, note 39, for an alternate possibility.

³³ Note that both 4Q491B and 4Q496 might be hinting at the possibility of evil being committed by the Sons of Light, in passages that correspond to 1QM 3–9, or, in other words, to the War of the Divisions. While both these texts may be at odds with M depiction of the War of the Divisions, they are in agreement with each other (but see note 39). There are a couple of other matters which initially appears to be incongruent with 1QM 3–9 and the War of the Divisions, and more suitable to the War against the Kittim. The first is the mention of “that day” (הַיּוֹם הַהוּאָה - frgs. 1–3:9, 11). We have seen that the theme of the “day” is especially suited to the War against the Kittim in both col. 1 and cols. 15–19 (cf. esp. 18:5 where the same expression appears). However, while in M, it is a very specific day that is being intended, one during which the Kittim will fall. In contrast, 4Q491B seems to use it

1.5.2.2. 4Q491A

These characteristics of 4Q491B stand out even more when contrasted to those of 4Q491A. In many ways, 4Q491A's content is exclusive of that which is in 4Q491B. Instead of rules and guidelines, 4Q491A has only battle narrative and liturgy, just as 1QM 15–19 with which it shares many distinctives. The enemy are the Kittim (frgs. 8–10 ii:8–12; frg. 11 ii:1, 5–8, 19; frg. 13:3–5), but also “all the nations” (כול הגוים) - frg. 15:6).³⁴ There is no mention of the congregation of Israel nor of its tribes. The Sons of Light will suffer reversals (frgs. 8–10 ii:11; frg. 11 ii:8–10) and will need to be encouraged by motivational speeches (frgs. 8–10 ii:15–17; frgs. 11 ii:12–18; frg. 13:1–3; frg. 15:5–12) which are to be delivered by both the High Priest (frg. 11 ii:11) and the Appointed Priest (frgs. 8–10 ii:13). Reserves will be sent in to relieve those units who have suffered losses on the front (frg. 11 ii:10).³⁵ The victory is assured because of “God's outstretched [hand]” (יד אל נטויה) (frg. 15:6) on “this day” (היום הזה) - frg. 11 ii:16; cf. 1QM 15:12). Finally, it is interesting to note that frgs. 8–10 i, although paralleling 1QM 14 (and not cols. 15–19), nevertheless belongs to 4Q491A, the one with liturgy, rather than 4Q491B which deals with the War of the Divi-

to contrast the times of war to those of peace, and the unusual regulations that accompany war time. The second is the “hand of God” that “shall smite” (יד אל) (frgs. 1–3:4). However, a similar statement is found in 1QM 3:8 on one of the trumpet inscriptions: “the mighty hand of God in the war to cause all the slain of unfaithfulness to fall” (יד בבורת אל במלחמה להפיל כול חללי מעל) (frgs. 1–3:4). Thus, while the “hand of God” is not as major of a theme in the War of the Divisions as in the War against the Kittim, it is nonetheless not absent from it. Yshai came to the conclusion that frg. 1:1–5 is a speech of encouragement to be recited to the soldiers at war (“ספרות בקומראן, המלחמה בקומראן,” 31). While this is a possibility, neither is it required by the text. All of frg. 1:1–5 could be part of a description of the war and what is expected to take place. Since no speeches or prayers are found in any of 1QM 1–9 and parallel texts, the identification of 4Q491 frg. 1:1–5 as a speech is suspect. Yshai herself admits that the speech would be very different than all others found in M (“ספרות בקומראן, המלחמה בקומראן,” 45).

³⁴ Note also “an assembly of na[tions] (He has) gathered together for destruction” (קהל גו[א]ים) אסף לכלה) in frgs. 8–10:3.

³⁵ When comparing the name of the “reserves” (מערכה אחרת חליפה למלחמה) - 1QM 16:12; 4Q491A frg. 11 ii:10) to that which is instructed in 4Q491B frgs. 1–3:12 (“And they shall go out [in turns to the war]” (ויצאו [חליפות למלחמה]), one wonders if the name is a kind of interpretive midrash of the instructions.

sions. Could this be because frgs. 8–10 i, like the other fragments of 4Q491A, have affinities with the War against the Kittim of cols. 15–19, rather than with the War of the Divisions, the subject matter of 4Q491B?

1.5.2.3. Conclusions about 4Q491

These mutually exclusive aspects between 4Q491A and 4Q491B hardly seem coincidental. The division of 4Q491 into these two documents was not made on the basis of content, but primarily on paleographical and orthographic grounds. That they should end up reflecting the distinction between the War against the Kittim (4Q491A) and the War of the Divisions (4Q491B) is surely not circumstantial. Particularly interesting are frgs. 16, 17, 19, and 23 which Baillet assumed were to be associated with that which came at the end of M and a return to Jerusalem.³⁶ Yet, as we have seen, these contain vocabulary and events that are incompatible with the War against the Kittim but which are consistent with the War of the Divisions only.³⁷ Also striking is that although 4Q491A is clearly about the War against the Kittim, never are the Kittim mentioned in its prayers and speeches, in the same way that they are not mentioned in any of the prayers and speeches in 1QM 15–19. Also interesting is that in 4Q491, all of the liturgy is in A and not B. In other words, the liturgy in 4Q491 is always in the context of the War against the Kittim, and never of the War of the Divisions.

1.6. 4Q494

Finally, the youngest of all the War Texts from Cave 4 is 4Q494, thought to be another copy of M's recension. I have already consid-

³⁶ Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 39.

³⁷ It could possibly be argued that all these fragments, like frg. 16 (see above, page 206), are dealing with the Sons of Light's return to Jerusalem after their victory over the Kittim as in 1QM 1:3. If so, then the special care taken by the author to point out that *all* Israel will come to Jerusalem is all the more noteworthy. Whatever the case, the events described are to take place after the War against the Kittim.

ered this text when looking at temple worship,³⁸ this being the only topic covered in what is still extant. Little more needs to be added, except to point out that it probably preserves that which came at the bottom of 1QM 1. Unfortunately, it is not the transition from the War against the Kittim to the War of the Divisions as one would have preferred. As preserved, 4Q494 relates only to the War of the Divisions.

1.7. *Interpreting the evidence from the Cave 4 materials*

Admittedly, the evidence from Cave 4 is fragmentary, and one needs to be most cautious in drawing conclusions based on what is extant. Nevertheless, a basic yet important observations can now be made about the two stages of the eschatological war. Nowhere in all the War Texts is there any confusion between these two stages, nor even between the two traditions about the War against the Kittim. The characteristics of each stage in the eschatological war, as we have been able to identify them above, are kept distinct in all of the War Texts, not just in M.³⁹ Thus, there are no example of rubrics for the

³⁸ For issues pertaining to reconstructing the text and its differences with M, see page 221.

³⁹ The only wrinkle to the otherwise consistent handling of the material may be in 4Q491B frgs. 1–3:1 with the mention of Korah, and in 4Q496 frg. 32 where there is an admission of guilt. Both elements do not seem to be consistent with the overall picture of the War of the Divisions as portrayed in M. Even so, neither do these unexpected components invalidate the distinction between the two stages, as it is impossible to know what may have once been integral to the War of the Divisions only to be removed either when it was integrated into M, or as M was redacted to incorporate additional material. For one such possibility, see above, note 26. An alternate possibility might be that 4Q491B frgs. 5–7 which have been tentatively associated to the liturgy in 1QM 12:1 and 13:8–9 preserve prayers that were once part of an earlier version of M, before cols. 10–14 were appended, potentially incorporating them into the new collection? Similarly, since 4Q491B frgs. 16, 17, 19, and 23 may preserve instructions for the ceremony of the Sons of Light's return to the temple, could it be that such a ceremony included prayers to be said, such as asking for forgiveness (frg. 23:4), blessing (frg. 17:5), and the reading of Psalms (frg. 17:4)? These liturgical elements were apparently removed when M allegedly made use of 4Q491 as a source. A temple context is also the background for 4Q471 to which the *Self-Glorification Hymn* (4Q471b) may be related. Could it be for this reason that, if 4Q491 frgs. 11–12 are in fact part of 4Q491B (see above, note 67 on

War against the Kittim that refer to the war as being against generic enemies, nor descriptions of the War of the Divisions as being against the Kittim. The only overlap is in M's liturgical section, cols. 10–14, and its parallel texts (4Q491 frgs. 8–10 i; 4Q495).⁴⁰

One possible explanation for such consistency is that the various War Texts worked off of common sources.⁴¹ But even so, it is somewhat surprising that the different compositions did not end up combining the sources in different ways, so that some of the characteristics of the War of the Divisions would be found in a description of the War against the Kittim and/or vice versa, or that there would be a different scenario altogether for the eschatological war. The most probable way for this not to have happened is for all of our War Texts to trace their history back to a single common source, one which first brought the various traditions together, not just about the two stages, but also about the parallel traditions on the War against the Kittim. However, only M preserves all these elements in a single document. Furthermore, only two other compositions contain more than just a single tradition: 4Q496 combines the War against the Kittim as in 1QM 1 with the War of the Divisions, and 4Q491 combines the War of the Divisions with the universal War against the Kittim. Thus, the only text which could represent what such an early source may have been is M. All our other War Texts preserve only portions of a single tradition. While this may be purely circumstantial, one must nevertheless entertain the possibility that some of our Cave 4 texts, especially the shorter ones (4Q471, 4Q492–5), may in fact be the remains of short non-M compositions, albeit closely related to M. Instead of being copies of M or its recensions, they may have been sources or copies of sources preserving a single aspect that was

page 29), its author decided to incorporate the *Self-Glorification Hymn* into his 'temple liturgy' for the eschatological war? Accordingly, one could postulate that 4Q471 was a source for 4Q491B, itself being used in turn as a source for M, which is why, if the 'temple liturgy' of 4Q491B was omitted by the compiler of M, the Hymn was also removed.

⁴⁰ Even so, from what is preserved in 4Q495, none of its contents betrays anything specific to any one stage of the eschatological war, nor of an amalgamation of both stages into one.

⁴¹ It could be, for example, that the Cave 4 materials contain some of the sources, or copies of the sources, used in the composition and/or redaction of M.

eventually incorporated into M, such as liturgy for the War against the Kittim (4Q492, 4Q495), war rules (4Q493), and guidelines for temple worship (4Q471, 4Q494).⁴²

Although it is extremely tendentious to imply anything about M's compositional history based on the dating of the Cave 4 fragments, neither should it be ignored. In fact, one notes an interesting trend: all texts predating M contain materials parallel to its cols. 1–9 only. 4Q493 is clearly about the War of the Divisions, as is 4Q471. 4Q496, like M, already has the sequence of an initial War against the Kittim followed by the War of the Divisions. Only in texts contemporaneous or later than M do we find the liturgical sections and the detailing of procedures for the War against the Kittim. Contemporaneous with M is 4Q492, our earliest non-M attestation to the alternate tradition of the War against the Kittim, the one which is universal in scope.⁴³ Even more interesting is that the only other document other than M with this newer tradition is 4Q491, but it does so by keeping it distinct from the War of the Divisions. In fact, 4Q491A and 4Q491B may not even be the same document. That these postdate M argues against the thesis put forward earlier that the reason all the War Texts keep both the two stages and the three traditions distinct is because they all reflect an earlier source which combined them all. Rather, it appears that M combined the War of the Divisions with the universal War against the Kittim, while its source(s), like 4Q491, kept them separate.⁴⁴ At the very least, when M was copied, it was still known that it was incorporating two different traditions.

It is significant to note that the prayers in 4Q491 frgs. 8–10 i are part of 4Q491A. These prayers parallel those in 1QM 14, about which we concluded that while the rubric introducing them was composed specifically for the War of the Divisions, the prayers themselves were drawn from the same tradition as 1QM 15–19, namely,

⁴² This is similar to Yshai's conclusion about the Cave 4 War Texts ("ספרות סמלית, המלחמה בקומראן," 326–237).

⁴³ As mentioned above, what is extant of 4Q495 is so generic that it could potentially fit any eschatological war.

⁴⁴ This conclusion is just as valid even if one accepts Abegg's evaluation that 4Q491 might predate M slightly.

the universal War against the Kittim.⁴⁵ In fact, 4Q491A is exclusively about that war, further strengthening our conclusion, both about the origins of the liturgies in 1QM 10–14, but also that these columns are most likely a later appendix to an earlier scroll comprised of only cols. 1–9.⁴⁶ Thus, our examination of M’s content, the paleographical dates of the Cave 4 material, and the breakdown of 4Q491 into two separate documents, all concur that cols. 10–19 are a late addition to an earlier document that was comprised principally of cols. 1–9.

Two additional observations can be made when considering manuscript dates. First, the tradition of the War against the Kittim based on Dan 11 is no longer found after M was copied.⁴⁷ Instead, from then on, only two traditions seem to be preserved, that of the War of the Divisions and the universal War against the Kittim. However, this may only be circumstantial, as it simply means that no copy of 1QM 1 postdating M was found or preserved. One could argue that 4Q494 was likely to have included it. Second, and more significant, is that since scholars have determined that 4Q491, a different recension than M, reflects an earlier stage in the compositional history

⁴⁵ See the discussion above, beginning on page 294.

⁴⁶ Note that Yshai has cast doubt on the association of 4Q491 frg. 10 i to frgs. 8–9 (‘‘ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,’’ 79–80). Should this be the case, the position of these fragments as preceding frg. 10 is no longer required. Since the rubric in frgs. 8–9 is clearly instructions for after the victory, one would expect it to come at the end of the description of the battle against the Kittim (frgs 10 i, 10 ii, 11 ii and 13) rather than at its beginning. In fact, there is reason to suppose that this may indeed have been the case. The rubric in frgs. 8–9:1–2 preserves just three words. Line 2 has only the generic closing statement of M’s rubrics ‘‘and they will ans]wer and say’’ (וע]נו ואמר) - cf. 13:2; 14:4; 15:7; 16:15; 18:6). Line 1 has the single word ‘‘together’’ (יחד). However, the only other place where ‘‘together’’ is found in an introductory rubric is in 4Q492 frg. 1:12, ‘‘... together in their standing over the slain of...’’ (יחד בעומדם על הלליון), a text that is parallel to 1QM 19. Yshai did not consider 4Q492 as a potential parallel text, but based on this unique commonality between the rubrics of 4Q491 frgs. 8–9 and 1QM 19 (via 4Q492 frg. 1), it would seem that 4Q491 frgs. 8–9 is not preserving the prayer that was after the rubric in 1QM 14:2–4a, but the one that came after the rubric in 1QM 19:9–13. This would further strengthen the idea that cols. 10–14 drew upon the same material as cols. 15–19.

⁴⁷ Even if 4Q491B frg. 16 preserves that which is not extant at the bottom of 1QM 1 (see note 88 on page 207), it does not contain anything relating to the War against the Kittim, but only to the return of the exiles which is to take place prior to the first sabbatical year.

than what is preserved M,⁴⁸ all recensions different than M predate it, so that from the time M was copied onward, there is no evidence that any newer recensions than M came into being. This is consistent with both its *de luxe* format and its having been chosen for safekeeping by being hidden in Cave 1.

2. CONCLUSIONS

In my introduction, I stated that I wanted to reach conclusions for which any theory of compositional history for M would need to account. The present chapter summarizes everything the scope of this present study has been able to determine, beginning with a slightly different reading of 1QM 1–2 and its implication for understanding the rest of the composition. This has led me to identify two stages in the eschatological war, albeit represented by three different traditions. It is the import of the third tradition, that of the universal War against the Kittim, that has confused what would otherwise be a coherent composition. For although this universal War against the Kittim shares many similarities with the one described in 1QM 1, ultimately it stands in contradiction to it and to the War of the Divisions that follows.⁴⁹

What appears to be an appendage to 1QM 1–9 content-wise has been strengthened by two pieces of data: first, this third tradition is not attested until the time M was copied; and second, by the way 4Q491 kept it separate from the material about the War of the Divisions which is attested in the earliest War Texts. Furthermore, it appears likely that no new development in the thinking about the eschatological war took place after M was copied, or that if it did, it

⁴⁸ Including, possibly, its copy date. See above, page 373.

⁴⁹ Note that this universal War against the Kittim also stands behind *Sefer haMilhamah* (4Q285, 11Q14), but in a different way than in 1QM 10–19. In M, the tradition has been adapted to the perspective that the messianic age is to come only after the victory over the Kittim. In *Sefer haMilhamah*, the messianic age has already arrived prior to the war since “all Isra[el]” (וכול ישראל) - 4Q285 frg. 4:2; see also line 7) is involved. In fact, the simple involvement of the “prince of the congregation” (נשיא העדה) implies it, since Israel is now a “congregation” (עדה) - 4Q285 frg. 10:2; 11Q14 frg. 1 ii:15).

was not recorded. It would seem, therefore, that the early layer of M was composed sometime in the second half of the second century BCE,⁵⁰ while its last stage, principally the addition of cols. 15–19, but also 10–14,⁵¹ is contemporaneous to M itself.⁵²

Initially then, M was comprised of cols. 1–9, focusing solely on the wars that needed to be carried out during the messianic age.⁵³ Its introduction included a brief description of the initial War against the Kittim based on Dan 11 (col. 1) because its unfolding was expected to be the sign *par excellence* that the messianic age was in fact beginning. This primitive M functioned as a companion to Sa and Sb, the latter two being for the home front and the former for the battlefield. This complementarity would have been much more obvious had it not been for cols. 10–19 which confused M's cohesiveness.

To this primitive scroll, cols. 10–19 were added. These columns drew on a separate tradition, that of the war against Gog, in their formulation of the prayers and the rubrics, possibly as it had already been developed in other compositions. This new conception of the War against the Kittim, however, was conceived on the basis of M's primitive text and the rules it contained for the War of the Divisions. In the same way that the sectarians wished for their present community to be ordered in a way that resembled as much as possible how they believed it would one day be during the messianic age, so

⁵⁰ See above, pages 102 and 160, as well as note 126 on page 127, and note 75 on page 351.

⁵¹ One should expect some harmonizing redactional work to have been carried out when cols. 10–19 were appended in an attempt to better harmonize the new composition. This is not, however, the focus of the present study.

⁵² That cols. 15–19 are a later composition than cols. 1–9 has been often suggested by scholars, for a variety of reasons. See Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 166; Gaster, *Dead Sea Scriptures*, 315, n. 1; Rabin, "המבנה הספרותי," 31–47; Yshai, "הדגים," 121–39; Zhu-En Wee, "Model for Composition," 263–83. Also noteworthy is Duhaime's conclusion that when comparing M to Greco-Roman war manuals: "the most striking parallel is found in the arrangement of the first part, dealing with organization and tactics (cols. 1.end–9.bottom)," and it appears that cols. 10–19 are "the result of a compilation" (*War Texts*, 59).

⁵³ Of course, it could be that the earlier document contained more than just these columns, but that the additional material which has not been preserved was removed or incorporated when cols. 10–19 were appended (for one such possible scenario, see above, note 39).

was it with their perception of the eschatological war: for the War against the Kittim to be successful, it needed to be carried out as closely as possible to that which would be required for war during the messianic age. The dependence of cols. 10–19 on cols. 1–9 is most clearly seen in the following: the war-cycle of cols. 7–9 (and its even more primitive version in 4Q493) was adapted to include the reversals of the Sons of Light during which some will be slain by the enemy, together with the subsequent speeches of encouragement. Yshai noted that the battle narratives in 1QM 7:9–9:9 are much longer than all the other accounts (1QM 16:2–10; 17:10–15; 4Q491 frg. 10 ii, frg. 11 ii).⁵⁴ Their shortening may well have been due to the need of incorporating this new material.⁵⁵ Fortunately for us, the longer ‘master version’ was nonetheless preserved in M.⁵⁶

3. HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In my opinion, this is as far as the evidence allows us to conclude with any kind of certainty. About what caused the addition of this alternate vision of the War against the Kittim to M, one can only theorize. Likewise, one can postulate as to how cols. 10–19 were

⁵⁴ Yshai, “ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 116. She points out that it is also longer than in 4Q493. However, she notes that it is for different reasons (pp. 252–54). Whereas in all the other accounts the basic war cycle is identical, 4Q493’s version is simpler. Since 4Q493 is our oldest copy of the War Texts, there is a good chance that it preserves a more primitive battle narrative than what later became accepted as standard.

⁵⁵ I have also noted that the war in 1QM 15–19 may not be outlined in as much detail simply because in the war against the Kittim, the army would not have had the necessary time to prepare itself for such an elaborate set-up. For example, the weaponry would be simpler, there would be no cavalry, nor any special formations, etc. (see the discussion beginning on page 324).

⁵⁶ I agree with Yshai’s rearrangement of some of 4Q491’s fragments in the following order: 22, 18, 10 ii, 13, 14+15 (“ספרות המלחמה בקומראן,” 304–5). Arranged in this way, they describe portions of two war cycles, just as 1QM 16–17 and 4Q491 frg. 11 ii do. She does not include frg. 11 ii in the sequence, because she considers it to be a separate and independent version (pp. 102–136). From a literary perspective, there is much merit to such a stance. However, should one wish to arrange all the 4Q491 fragments that deal with battle narrative in sequence, then frg. 11 ii can only fit between frgs. 22 and 18. In such a case, there would be three war-cycles, each one ending with a speech of encouragement.

composed. But this extends even further into the realm of speculation. Nevertheless, I offer here below a potential scenario of M's compositional history, beginning with what I believe to be the most probable and moving to the more conjectural.

In a recent study, Hanan Eshel has demonstrated that at Qumran there is another text which seems to have undergone revisions in light of a new emerging reality, one also connected to the Kittim: *Pesher Habakkuk* (1QpHab).⁵⁷ For that composition, the new reality were the Romans, appearing on the scene in the first century BCE, and whom the pesher calls "the Kittim." Could this not also stand behind M's being updated with a new tradition about the War against the Kittim? The physical evidence, when taken at face value, suggests that the change in perspective about the Kittim would have taken place shortly after the middle of the first century BCE, or in other words, shortly after Pompey's conquest of Judea in 63 BCE. Eshel also points out that the new layer in *Pesher Habakkuk* no longer expresses the hope that in the near future the Kittim will lose their power.⁵⁸ Could it be that this too contributed toward the new vision of the War against the Kittim?

There are two possible pieces of evidence that suggest that this could in fact be the case. The first is the introduction and emphasis on the Sons of Light facing reversals and losses. While it is explicit in cols. 16–17 and has been understood as being the outworking of what is read in col. 1 about the seven rounds (1QM 1:13–15), in fact col. 1 is ambiguous on the matter. Lines 1–7 are completely silent about any kind of unusual suffering the Sons of Light will have to face. Rather, one gets the impression that the war fought against the Kittim will not be anything out of the ordinary, except for the victory which will be entirely miraculous. It is only after lines 8–9a, which describe the messianic age, that one reads of the suffering the Sons of Light will have to face in their confrontation with the Kittim (lines 9b–12a) and its seven rounds (lines 12b–15). Davies has suggested that these latter lines (9b–13 or 15) are a later addition to an earlier text for the purpose of harmonizing the introduction with cols. 15–

⁵⁷ Hanan Eshel, "שני הרבדים," 143–52.

⁵⁸ Hanan Eshel, "שני הרבדים," 152.

19.⁵⁹ This is indeed an attractive proposition.⁶⁰ At the same time, one notices that the mention of “carnage” (נהשיר) in col. 1 (lines 9, 10, and 13) is also ambiguous: without line 12, it could be implied that the carnage in question is that of the Sons of Darkness only, and not the Sons of Light as it presently stands. Similarly, when the seven rounds are described in col. 1, the implication is that the Sons of Darkness will be able to repel (למושב - line 13) the Sons of Light, but not necessarily overcome them.

In light of these differences between col. 1 and cols. 15–19, could it be that col. 1 generally reflects the political realities of the Hasmonean period when victory over the Seleucid enemy seemed increasingly likely, while cols. 15–19 reflect a much more somber picture of a confrontation against an army—the Romans—known to be much superior? It would appear that when col. 1 was composed and reinterpreting Dan 11 to fit the current political situation, the author perceived the Seleucid power to be waning while Hasmonean success was on the rise. Therefore, while his vision of the future still foresaw a time of trouble and a very difficult war to be fought, the war was nonetheless little more than the result of a concerted human effort, which God himself would bless by granting a miraculous victory in the seventh round. In other words, the vision of victory over the Kittim was believed to be the natural outcome of the way the international scene was playing itself out: the Maccabean uprising would eventually be successful in bringing about Israel’s redemption. In contrast, the war in cols. 15–19 betrays a much more somber

⁵⁹ Davies, *IQM*, 119–20.

⁶⁰ If it is correct, the following two observations need to be highlighted. First, it is obvious that the later redactor fully understood how the earlier author had crafted his introduction on the basis of Dan 11:40–45, as he too turned to that passage for inspiration, using the expression “a time of tribulation” (עת צרה) from Dan 12:1 as a proof text for the suffering the Sons of Light will have to endure in their confrontation with the Kittim. Second, the placement of these lines in the introduction may also be instructive: they come after the short description of the messianic age (lines 8–9a) during which Israel’s military and spiritual rule will extend itself over the entire world with the War of the Divisions. This may suggest that the author envisioned a second and final confrontation with the Kittim after the War of the Divisions (see also note 61), and would explain why cols. 15–19 were appended to the end of the primitive composition, and not after col. 1 before the description of the War of the Divisions (cols. 2–9) as one could have expected.

outlook. Human casualty is inevitable, and victory, humanly speaking, impossible. The human element has become all but irrelevant. Instead, victory is totally and solely dependent upon God's mercy. The sudden focus on the liturgical aspects of the war, above and beyond the ceremonial, only emphasizes this mistrust in human ability and the complete dependence upon divine intervention.

The second hint is the shift from a war against a few nations to one against all the nations in the world. I have shown how the geography of cols. 1 and 2 are complementary, and that they emphasize Shem's allotment. However, if in cols. 15–19 the Kittim are indeed the Romans, then the sequence of campaigns in 1QM 2:10–15 (Shem, Ham, Japheth) no longer has its same value. When the sectarians considered the Seleucids to be the Kittim, the first ten years of the War of the Divisions against the descendants of Shem were then a natural follow-up to the victory. They were to continue exterminating what was left of the enemy's power base centered just north of them, the very same enemy that had just been defeated during the War against the Kittim. If, however, the Kittim are identified as the Romans, then conquering Shem's territory relates little if at all to the initial victory. The Romans, being centralized in Japheth's territory, would only be attacked in the third and final decade of the War of the Divisions.⁶¹ On the other hand, if one considers that by the time the Romans became the dominant power in Judea, they were already ruling parts of Shem, Ham, and Japheth's territories, so that conquering them would have been akin to winning a war against the various nations of the world. Still, this does not account for the emphasis in cols. 15–19 on a war against *all* the nations. However, if conquering the Romans was considered impossible, as *Pesher Habakkuk* seems to intimate, then one can possibly understand why the vision of being able to conquer them was associated to another seemingly impossible event that had nonetheless been prophesied:

⁶¹ Could the Romans being from the territory of Japheth, the last of the sons of Noah to be conquered (1QM 2:14) explain why the author might have imagined a final confrontation with the Roman Kittim after the War of the Divisions (see note 60)? Could it be that the designation of the Kittim of Asshur as the sons of Japheth (and not Shem as Asshur should be) in 1QM 1:6 is a late harmonistic gloss as an effort to adapt col. 1 to the Romans' conquest of the Eastern Mediterranean world?

Israel defeating an assembly of nations during the war against Gog (Ezek 38–39). It is impossible to know how they would have combined the two elements. Maybe the Kittim, now identified as the Romans and ruling over much of the world, were in fact considered to be this assembly of nations? Or maybe the Romans were thought to be just one of the nations assembled with Gog? No matter how the sectarians perceived it, it was now believed that this ultimate battle would be the one to forever free Israel of its oppressors.

Thus, as the Romans came onto the Qumranites' political horizon, a new vision of the eschatological war became necessary, especially of the one that was expected to launch the messianic age. Daniel chapter 11 no longer provided sufficient inspiration, for it was too limited in its outlook and expectations. Instead the new vision had to turn to an alternate yet nonetheless common belief about the eschatological war, one more universal in its scope: the war against Gog. But even more than when battling the declining Seleucids, facing the almighty Roman empire could only be considered if one could expect God's miraculous intervention. Consequently, it may be surmised that liturgy, and not just proper order, became essential, if not vital, for victory. Yet in what we could determine about the primitive text of M, there apparently was no liturgy. Nonetheless, it may have existed in other traditions, as is evidenced in the reference to the "bo]ok of the rule of his time" (ספר סדרך עתו) - 15:5) which contained the High Priest's prayer for war time.⁶² Thus it became necessary to add this liturgical component. But neither could it be added to the War against the Kittim only, without it being a reflection of how the messianic war, our War of the Divisions, was expected to be carried out. Thus, two accounts including liturgy had to be composed, one for the War of the Divisions and one for the War against the Kittim. Yet while the frameworks could be composed to specifically fit their respective stages in the eschatological war, there was no existing liturgical collection intended for the War of the Divisions, at least not to the extent of what is currently in cols. 10–14. And what little there was for the War against the Kittim seemed ill-

⁶² See also above, note 39, for another possibility of war liturgy that may have existed prior to the composition of cols. 10–19.

suited for the foreboding future.⁶³ Thus, the redactor chose to draw upon an already existing corpus of prayers, of which those that had been composed with an eye towards an eschatological war, were inspired either by the tradition of the War against the Kittim or by the biblical description of the war against Gog.⁶⁴ Possibly, when lacking prayers, he composed some new ones.⁶⁵ These he inserted into his two accounts as seemed best to him.

Such a reconstruction, however, is little more than conjecture. Less speculative is that the new understanding of the War against the Kittim was motivated by the arrival of the Romans in Judea. Should this be the case, it implies that while the initial portion of M is to be dated to the last half of the second century BCE, its cols. 10–19 are to be dated no earlier than to the middle of the first century BCE. Interestingly, as we have noted above, none of our documents preserving this latter tradition of a universal War against the Kittim predate the middle of the first century BCE.⁶⁶ Consequently, while M does not appear to be an autograph of this newly reworked vision of the Qumranites expectations for an impending eschatological war,⁶⁷ it is nonetheless almost contemporaneous with it.⁶⁸

⁶³ The only prayer which might have been composed with the War against the Kittim specifically in mind is “And He has taught us” (9:E–11:12), since it is the only prayer specifically mentioning the Kittim. Yet it communicates no sense of impending doom as is characteristic of the liturgical sections in cols. 15–17. One may wish to surmise that this prayer was part of the “bo[ok of rule for his time” mentioned in 15:5 (on this matter, see especially Rabin, “המבנה הספרותי,” 31–47). A second prayer which may have been part of this composition is “And You, God” (12:7–16; 19:1–8), since it was deemed important enough to be repeated in both accounts. This may explain why these would be the only two prayers to be referenced in both units (cols. 10–14 and 15–19).

⁶⁴ Others, as we have seen, may not even have had their genesis in a war context, such as “God of our fathers” (13:7–17) and “For You have appointed us” (13:18–14:1); see the discussion above, beginning on page 287.

⁶⁵ Possibly such as one of the two parallel prayers “Blessed be God” (13:2b–3) and “Blessed be your name” (18:6b–8).

⁶⁶ Note Davies who also concluded that cols. 15–19 were composed during the Roman period (*IQM*, 89).

⁶⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 28–29.

⁶⁸ This is all the more so if one chooses the earlier absolute dating of M as per Baillet or Yardeni (see note 70 on page 31).

SUMMARY AND SYNTHESIS

After much work on M in the initial years after its discovery in 1947, interest in this scroll soon abated. Most subsequent scholarship relied on the works of Yigael Yadin and Jean Carmignac who treated the scroll as a single literary composition, or of Philip Davies who sought to outline the various literary units of the document and reconstruct its compositional history. The publication of texts related to M from Caves 4 and 11 in the 1980's and 1990's renewed the attention it received somewhat. Yet surprisingly, while the majority view was that M was a composite document with a complicated compositional history, no one sought to evaluate previous theories on the scroll's evolution in light of the new data. This therefore was one of the purposes of the present study. In the course of research, however, my understanding of the eschatological war as described in M crystallized into something different than hitherto suggested, with implications for understanding the scroll's compositional history. In particular, I see a greater cohesiveness between cols. 1 and 2 than is currently assumed. Since this has important consequences for understanding the scroll's development, it became an essential part of the present study.

After a brief introduction, I began the discussion in Chapter One by surveying the War Texts, briefly describing their physical appearance, basic contents, and when necessary, some of the relevant issues connected to them. One of the goals of that chapter was to define the basic relationship between the Cave 1 text and the documents from Caves 4 and 11. A second objective was to highlight their chronological relationship with respect to manuscript date. In my opinion, there are three documents that resemble M closely enough so as to be called copies of a same recension (4Q492, 4Q494, and 4Q495), with another four that differ sufficiently to be defined as being different recensions of M (4Q471, 4Q491, 4Q493,

and 4Q496). I disagreed with Rony Yshai's assessment that the Cave 4 documents are for sure not copies of M. However, I do agree with her that it is possible that some if not most of the Cave 4 texts could be different compositions on the same subject matter as M, possibly its sources or material related to them. Two other texts, 4Q285 and 11Q14, are in my opinion a different composition altogether. Chronologically, all the Cave 4 documents that predate M preserve recensions that are different than M, while copies of the same recension as M are either contemporaneous with it or later.

Chapter Two examined the sense divisions in all the texts, with particular focus on M, in an effort to best understand how its scribe divided it into large units of meaning. Although it has been argued that the scribe used only one level of sense division, I came to the conclusion that there were two different levels, with the major division marking larger units of text that revolve around a similar theme. This has implications in the way one outlines M, so that my outline differs slightly from those put forward before me. The examination of sense division in the M Material from Caves 4 and 11 revealed that the same system of sense division was not used in all the copies, nor were all instances of sense division found in the parallel texts. At times, however (especially with 4Q492), it is possible to determine what may have motivated such changes.

Having outlined M, I then devoted the next two chapters to examining cols. 1 and 2 in detail, since in my opinion they are key for understanding the rest of the scroll. I began in Chapter Three by highlighting col. 1's dependence upon Dan 11:40–45, the last portion of Daniel's prophecy that had not been fulfilled. This dependence had been already dealt with in a most effective manner by David Flusser, but his research seems to have been overlooked by much of recent scholarship. While it is acknowledged that M's author was inspired by Dan 11, it is often denied that it formed the structural and historical basis for the scroll's introduction. I therefore expounded Flusser's points and showed how those who have denied such a relationship have misunderstood the opening lines of col. 1. An immediate implication of col. 1's dependence upon Dan 11 is that its com-

position must have taken place shortly after the book of Daniel was itself composed, once it was realized that those verses were not fulfilled with Antiochus IV Epiphanes' death as had been expected.

In light of this dependence upon Dan 11, it is obvious that the Kittim in M are the Seleucids, and not the Romans as in *Pesher Habakkuk* and *Pesher Nahum*. Yet I noted that the unique expression "Kittim of Assyria" (1QM 1:2) as an epithet for the Seleucids poses an interesting dilemma: in all other sources the Kittim are the Assyrians' enemies, and always refer to western Mediterranean Sea faring nations or peoples. Furthermore, in Dan 11:30, the Kittim are already identified as the Romans. I suggested that the resolution of these apparent contradictions comes from understanding that the term "Kittim" does not always carry eschatological meaning, but can also be used as a simple geo-political marker. While there is no doubt that the author of the M was inspired by Num 24:24 in his use of this word in an eschatological manner, this does not seem to be the case in other Second Temple Period literature until near the middle of the first century BCE. Outside of the Qumran sectarian texts, the earliest allusion to Balaam's eschatological prophecies, save for the use of the word Kittim, is in the *Psalms of Solomon*, composed after Pompey's conquest of Judea. In other non-Qumran texts, it is doubtful that the use of the word "Kittim" carried any eschatological connotation at all, except possibly in 1 Maccabees. Even in Daniel, where one would most expect it to be an eschatological allusion to Num 24:24, the role assigned to the Kittim is not that of Num 24:24. I suggest, therefore, that the author of Dan 11 used the term as an epithet for the Romans, not out of a desire to identify the Kittim of the eschaton, but simply as a literary device, and was most probably inspired by Isa 23 rather than Num 24. Consequently, M is the earliest witness of an attempt to identify who the Kittim of Num 24:24, the Kittim of the eschaton, are. I also noted that fighting with the Kittim are a few nations who are in league with them, all of them immediate neighbors of Israel.

Opposing the Kittim are the three tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin. Both the combination and the order of their listing is unique at Qumran, although it is also found in the *Prayer of Joseph* (4Q371 frg. 1). On the basis of this other text, Hanan Eshel revived André

Dupont-Sommer's theory that these are the violators of the covenant, part of the Sons of Darkness, rather than the Sons of Light as commonly assumed. Consequently, I reviewed all the arguments and the uses of these three tribes in the Qumran Scrolls. My conclusion is that the uniqueness of the expression is to highlight that it will not be just the sectarians fighting the War against the Kittim, but all who have returned from exile and who have not aligned themselves with the Seleucids, these being called the "people of God."

I also examined the geography of the war as described in col. 1. Emphasized throughout is that the Sons of Light are in the wilderness. I concur with recent scholarship that this probably means that they are in spiritual exile, rather than actual physical exile. This is strengthened by the fact that after the victory, they "go up" (1QM 1:3), implying to Jerusalem, this being a sign that the spiritual exile of God hiding his face from his people will have ended.

The War against the Kittim is expected to take seven rounds, during three of which the Sons of Light will have the upper hand, but will be repulsed three times by the Sons of Darkness, before the final victory in the seventh round, due mainly to God's intervention, the "hand of God" of Isa 31:8. Column 1 makes it clear, however, that this War against the Kittim is only a first stage in a longer conflict, as is also evident in Mic 5:4–5 (E:5–6). Repeatedly, this conflict against the Kittim is referred to by the word "day" (four instances in lines 9–12), and is even called "the day of their war against the Kittim" (יום מלחמתם בכתיים) - line 12).

In Chapter Four, I examined col. 2 in similar detail. First I wrestled with the chronology of events. The numbers are quite confusing, as there are supposedly only 33 years of war left (line 6), yet soon thereafter there is mention of 35 years (line 9), divided into two periods of 6 and 29 years (lines 9–10). The common understanding is that the six years refer to the fighting during the "War against the Kittim" (מלחמה בכתיים - cf. 1QM 1:12), with the 29 years being about the subsequent wars, called the "War of the Divisions" (מלחמת תערך המחלקות - 1QM 2:10). However, a closer look at the meaning of תערך המלחמה (line 9) seems to suggest that preparations for war are meant, rather than actual fighting. Consequently, the 29 years of fighting

are to take place after 6 years of preparations, with all 35 years relating to the War of the Divisions. How these years relate to the 33 is more problematic, but it is often assumed that the six years precede the 33 year period, with the 29 years being the number of non-sabbatical years during the 33 year period.

The campaigns for all 29 years are listed at the end of the column, complete with the intended enemy and the length of time each one is supposed to take. I showed how in this description M has adopted the contemporary vision of the Table of Nations through the lens of a three part Ionian map, just as in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The purpose behind this seems to be two-fold: first to show that Israel will eventually conquer the entire known world, and second, to demonstrate that only Jacob and his descendants are the rightful heirs of Abraham. Interestingly, the list of enemies is complete only when taking those defeated in col. 1 into consideration, an important indication that the two columns belong together. One peculiarity is that the strict schedule assumes that there can be no defeat or even set-backs for the Sons of Light, almost as if victory is guaranteed ahead of time. This too is consistent with the prophecy in Mic 5:4–7 (E:5–8).

Column 2 opens up with a description of who is to be present during the sacrifices at the temple. This passage is interesting for two reasons, first because it stands in contrast to col. 1 where the Sons of Light are still in exile and outside of Jerusalem, and second because when compared to 4Q494 and 4Q471, a certain progression in the sectarian's thoughts is discernible, as the laity is added to the priest and Levites as those who must be present. It also highlights the fact that all 12 tribes of Israel are present, in contrast to col. 1 where only three of the tribes are mentioned.

Thus col. 2 has a very different description of the eschatological war than in col. 1. Instead of a short war, it is one that will last many years; instead of three tribes fighting, all 12 are involved; instead of being exiles in the wilderness, the Sons of Light are now in the temple; instead of a battle in the Land of Israel, the war is now a succession of international campaigns beyond Israel's borders with the purpose of conquering the world. How col. 2 complements col. 1 is most evident in three points: first, col. 1 only claims to be the begin-

ning of a longer conflict while col. 2 clearly assumes an earlier stage; second, the list of the peoples conquered in col. 2 is complete only if one assumes that those in col. 1 have already been defeated; third, the prophecy in Mic 5:4–7 (E:5–8) clearly anticipates a two-phase war, with an initial conflict in Israel, followed by the conquest of the aggressor's homeland. An implication is that between the two columns, and as a result of the War against the Kittim, Jerusalem will be delivered from its evil rulers and the exiles will return to the land. That a war should mark the beginning of the messianic age and the end of the exile is found in several other compositions, including the *Florilegium* (4Q177), the *Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (85–90), and the *Psalms of Solomon*. This too supports that the author intended a two-stage eschatological war: first the War against the Kittim, followed up by the War of the Divisions.

In Chapter 5, I examined the rest of M to see about which of the two stages it is dealing. The easiest to identify were cols. 15–19, since they have numerous affinities with col. 1 and the War against the Kittim, most obvious being their frequent use of the word “Kittim.” Also easy to identify were cols. 3–9 which are about the War of the Divisions, since they never mention the Kittim, but assume that the army is comprised of all 12 tribes and based in Jerusalem. More problematic were cols. 10–14, the liturgical section of M. I therefore examined each prayer in detail, to see if its contents betray any specifics that could apply to only one or the other of the two stages of the eschatological war. The first prayer (1QM 9:E–11:12) contains several interesting elements. First, it alludes to an additional ceremony required by Deut 20, during which a priest and other officers are to encourage the troops. Since the officers' role is never mentioned again in M, it would appear that the sectarians, like the rabbis, implemented Deut 20:2–8 in two stages, and that the prayer was a way for them to fulfill the second stage (Deut 20:2–4). While it is possible that this ceremony could be carried out in the context of the War of the Divisions as prescribed in col. 7, it is an almost perfect fit with the instructions for before the War against the Kittim in col. 15. This being the case, I concluded that the prayer was to be said before engaging the battle, and it alluded to an earlier ceremony

that was to take place prior to the army's arrival on the battle field. A second peculiarity of the prayer is that it cites Num 24:17–19, part of the same prophecy that mention the Kittim as being Israel's final aggressors. In fact, it is the only mention of the Kittim in cols. 3–14 (1QM 11:11). There is little doubt, therefore, that this prayer was originally intended for the War against the Kittim, and not the War of the Divisions. The next prayer (11:13–12:5) has its own uniqueness in that it talks about a war that will be against “ene]mies of all the lands” (א[ו]יבי כול הארצות) - 1QM 11:13) and appeals to the imagery of the war against Gog in Ezek 38–39. As noted, this emphasis on “all nations” is also found in cols. 15–19 (15:1; 19:10), an element which is inherently incompatible with the War against the Kittim as described in col. 1 where the Kittim are joined by only a few of their allies, principally small nations who are Israel's immediate neighbors. It appears, therefore, that the perspective of the War against the Kittim in cols. 15–19 is different than and incompatible with the one in col. 1. The third prayer (12:7–16) is exceptional in that it is the only prayer which is repeated almost verbatim in col. 19 (and in 4Q492 frg. 1). It too is inspired by the war against Gog. Yet the version in col. 12 differs slightly from col. 19 and 4Q492 frg. 1. I pointed out that the few variants it contains could all be an attempt to adapt the prayer for the War of the Divisions. It would seem, therefore, that this prayer originated in a context similar to that which inspired the War against the Kittim in cols. 15–19, but was modified to make it better fit the War of the Divisions.

I highlighted that from this point on (cols. 13–14) the prayers are no longer listed one after another without any introduction. Rather, there are two rubrics (12:E–13:2; 14:2–4a) that introduce two different sets of prayers. Fortunately, exact parallels to these two rubrics are found in cols. 15–19 (17:E–18:6a; 19:9–13). I highlighted that while there are many similarities between the parallel rubrics, there are also irreconcilable differences, suggesting that the rubrics in cols. 13–14 are for a different battle or war than those in cols. 18–19. After the first rubric which describes what must be done at the point of victory, there are several prayers. The first two (13:3–6) are especially suited for the setting as described, but the last two (13:7–14:1) seem almost superfluous. In fact, one of them (13:7–17) hardly

seems to be intended for a war context at all. The second rubric (14:2–4) and its parallel account (19:9–13) leave no doubt that we are dealing with the exact same point in a battle, confirming that both rubrics cannot be about the same war. Since cols. 15–19 are about the War against the Kittim, cols. 13–14 can only be about the War of the Divisions. Yet the prayers that follow (14:4b–E) betray an outlook ill-suited for the War of the Divisions, and contain several lexical elements that are specific to the War against the Kittim in cols. 15–19.

From this survey, it became clear that cols. 3–9 are about the War of the Divisions, cols. 15–19 about the War against the Kittim, and that while the framework of cols. 10–14 was intended for the War of the Divisions, the prayers themselves originate from different contexts, including, among others, the War against the Kittim. In my opinion, this conclusion is confirmed by another detail: the absence of casualties among the Sons of Light in cols. 10–14, something which is possible only during the War of the Divisions. At the same time, I contend that it is important to realize that the tradition behind cols. 15–19 and which is inspired by Ezek 38–39 is different than the one in col. 1 which is based on Dan 11. Thus while there are two stages to the eschatological war, there are at least three distinct traditions that stand behind M. Since cols. 1 and 15–19 are both similar and contradictory about the War against the Kittim, the only conclusion possible is that cols. 15–19 are an appendage to an earlier document that already contained col. 1. It is more reasonable to assume that a later redactor appended an additional section to the scroll even if it was not in perfect harmony with the original document, rather than to posit that a redactor crafted an introduction to tie together a document he had just compiled, but that he did so in such a way so as to introduce new inconsistencies into the narrative.

Several other matters in cols. 3–19 proved to be useful in understanding the scroll as a whole. The first is the use of trumpets at war. While at first there does not seem to be much coherence between the various passages that deal with them, a basic pattern or cycle of trumpet use during battle can be discerned: “summoning” (מקרא), “formation” (סדר), “second alarm” (תרועה שנייה), “slain” (חללים) together with the horns, “slain” by themselves after the horns have

ceased, and “return” (משׁוּב). This pattern is repeated for every “line” (מערכה). It can be modified when needed, such as when a line suffers defeat and it is necessary to call out (“summoning”) the next line before calling the ones on the front to fall back (“return”). Allowing for some interchangeability between the trumpet names and their inscriptions as attested in M, this pattern holds true for all battle accounts, be they in cols. 7–9 or 15–19, as well as those found in the Cave 4 manuscripts. The only exception is 4Q493 which has a more primitive account, a sign that it is probably an earlier recension than M. By understanding this cycle in trumpet use, it can be determined that the battle narrative in cols. 7–9 describe a single launching of the different units of skirmishers followed up by a general pursuit. One would expect nothing less in a war where victory seems assured from the beginning, as is the case in the War of the Divisions. In contrast, cols. 15–19 uses this procedure for sending out the skirmishers but adapts it to describe the seven rounds in the War against the Kittim. Accordingly, there are three such cycles of two rounds each, since they begin with the launch of an attack and end with it being repelled, until God intervenes and the final pursuit can be launched. In this way, all seven rounds belonging to the War against the Kittim (1QM 1:13–14) are described. A second matter is the role of the High Priest during the eschatological war. He is only mentioned in cols. 2 and 15–19, although some have suggested that the mention of “the priest” (הכֹּהֵן) in 7:12 and 10:2 are in reality a reference to him. I contend that a more satisfactory explanation is that this priest is in fact the “Appointed Priest” (הכֹּהֵן הַחֲרוּץ), as it enables one to harmonize all the different accounts concerning priestly roles. While both the High Priest and the Appointed Priest are present on the battle field during the War against the Kittim, the High Priest then resumes his duties at the temple so that only the Appointed Priest continues on with the War of the Divisions.

In Chapter Six, I briefly looked at the relationship between M and Sa. The similarities between the two documents have long been noticed, but what had not been as clearly understood is the relationship of Sa to M’s two stages in the eschatological war. I point out that Sa clearly implies a restored nation of Israel, a situation that

is incompatible with the War against the Kittim, but most fitting to the War of the Divisions. Thus, the “convocations for war” (תעודות המלחמה) mentioned in Sa most likely apply to the War of the Divisions only, and not the War against the Kittim, just as they do in M. The two documents are therefore complementary: while M outlines the rules for those out on the battle field during the second stage of the eschatological war, Sa gives the guidelines to be followed by those who remain on the home front.

The *Rule of the Congregation* also helped in highlighting another characteristic of M. In the same way that Sa focuses on the duties of the Levites, M is concerned solely with the priests’ role at war. Just as the Levites in Sa are to supervise matters of ritual purity, so at war, the priests are to make sure that all ceremonial aspects of the war are properly respected, including proper armor and weaponry, as well as the correct use and timing of the war trumpets. A survey of the entire scroll demonstrated that while the author assumes that other leadership is present, his focus is solely on priestly roles. Even in the battle descriptions, there are never any instructions given specifically to the soldiers. This brought out one of the differences between M and *Sefer haMilhamah* (4Q285/11Q14): the latter is interested in the role of the “prince of the congregation” (נשיא העדה), a figure who is mentioned in M only in passing.

Another matter the comparison between M and Sa highlighted is the sectarians’ use of the word “congregation” (עדה). A survey of the Qumran texts revealed that the only documents in which it is used in an unqualified way to refer to themselves are D, Sa, Sb, *Peshar Isaiah*^a (4Q161), and M Material (1QM, 4Q285, 4Q491, 4Q496). Surprisingly, all of them are foundational texts for the Qumran community, and all except for D describe the anticipated eschatological future of the sect. It seems therefore that in the sectarian compositions, the term “congregation” became a *terminus technicus* for restored Israel with all of its 12 tribes. This is further confirmed by a reference to all of Israel’s tribes as a single unit: when not inspired by biblical base texts, they are mentioned only in Sa and M.

In the final chapter, I considered the data from the Cave 4 War Texts. I surveyed the contents of each document to see which of the two

stages of the eschatological war and which of the two traditions about the War against the Kittim can be found. An initial observation resulting from my survey was that all of the documents preserve the same strict distinction between the different stages and traditions as M does. Of the texts copied earlier than M, 4Q493 and 4Q471 are both about the War of the Divisions, while 4Q496 preserves the transition between the War against the Kittim to the War of the Divisions as it is found in 1QM 1–2. It is only when we get to texts that are contemporaneous with M or later that we have the second tradition of the War against the Kittim, the one based on Ezek 38–39: 4Q491, 4Q492, and 4Q495. Particularly interesting is 4Q491. It has been divided by Martin Abegg into two separate War Texts on paleographical and morphological grounds. Unbeknownst to him, the division also represents different traditions: his A text contains only material related to the War against the Kittim as found in cols. 15–19 of M, while his B text contains only matters pertaining to the War of the Divisions. Furthermore, 4Q491 frgs. 8–10 i, which contains a prayer parallel to the one in 1QM 14, belongs to his A text, giving extra support to my conclusion that the material in 1QM 10–14, while adapted to the War of the Divisions, was drawn in part from the same tradition of the War against the Kittim that shaped cols. 15–19. 4Q494, the last of the Cave 4 texts, preserves a portion of the temple practice belonging to the War of the Divisions. Based on all these observations of the Cave 4 texts, especially in light of my foregoing study of M, I concluded that there once was a primitive form of the composition comprised of some form of cols. 1–9 only, and that sometime shortly after the middle of the first century BCE, cols. 10–19 were added.

This conclusion raised two questions: first, why were these columns added, and second, why was it necessary to change the War against the Kittim from what it was in col. 1? I ventured to give an answer by drawing on a possible parallel in *Pesher Habakkuk* recently noted by Hanan Eshel, one which also pertains to the Kittim. In that composition, Eshel has isolated two layers in its composition, a first one that predates the Roman conquest of Judea in 63 BCE, and a second, later one, in which there is no longer any hope that in the near future the Kittim will lose their seemingly invincible power. I

suggested the same event motivated the addition of cols. 10–19 to a more primitive M text. With the arrival of the Romans onto the sectarians' political horizon, Dan 11 no longer provided sufficient inspiration for the impending confrontation, because it was too limited in its outlook and expectations. Instead a new vision had to be devised, one which would be more universal in its scope, even more bold and miraculous, just as an ultimate war against the almighty Romans would need to be. Such a vision was found in the biblical prophecy of the war against Gog (Ezek 38–39). Only with God's miraculous intervention could there be any hope of victory: since such could only be secured through prayer and liturgy, elements that were missing in the primitive text, these were duly added. As fate would have it, it was this new understanding of the eschatological war that was written up in a *de luxe* format, and subsequently chosen for safekeeping when it was hidden in Cave 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, Martin G. "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity." Pp. 136–47 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment." *JBL* 113 (1994): 81–91.
- . "The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4: A Critical Edition." Ph.D. diss. Hebrew Union College, 1992.
- . "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness." Pp. 61–73 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Craig Evans, A. and Peter W. Flint. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Aharoni, Yohanan. *Arad Inscriptions*. JDS. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981.
- Albek, Hanoch. סדר מועד. Vol. 2 of ששה סדרי משנה. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1952.
- Albright, William F. "The Oracles of Balaam." *JBL* 63 (1944): 207–33.
- . "Some Books Reviewed by the Editor." *BASOR* 143 (1956): 34.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Early Jewish Geography." Pp. 977–88 in *ABD*, vol. 2. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of the Jewish Opposition to Rome." Pp. 17–32 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "Notes on the *Imago Mundi* in the Book of Jubilees." *JJS* 33 (1982): 197–213.
- Alexander, Philip S., and Geza Vermes. "285. 4QSefer Ha-Milhamah." Pp. 228–46; Pl. XII–XIII in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Stephen J. Pfann, Alexander, Broshi, Chazon, Cotton, and etc. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4. I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
- . "Some Archaeological Sites and the Old Testament: Qumrân." *ExpTim* 66 (1955): 257–62.
- . "An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4Q Ordinances)." *JSS* 6 (1961): 71–73.
- Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Amoussine, Joseph D. "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Pêshèr de Nahum (4QpNahum)." *RevQ* 4 (1963): 389–96.
- . "A propos de l'interprétation de 4Q161 (fragments 5–6 et 8)." *RevQ* 8 (1974): 381–92.

- Amusin, Joseph D. "The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q161; 4Q169; 4Q166)." *HUCA* 48 (1977): 123–52.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David N. Freedman. *Micah*. AB 24E. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Ashley, Timothy R. *The Book of Numbers*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Asmussen, Jes P. "Das iranische Lehnwort *nashir* in der Kriegsrulle von Qumrân." *AcOr* 26 (1961): 3–20.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*. JSJSup 84. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 49. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2000.
- Baillet, Maurice. "22. Un apocryphe de David (?)." Pp. 81–82 in *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân*. Maurice Baillet, Jozef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- . "Les manuscrits de la grotte 4 de Qumrân." *RB* 79 (1972): 217–26.
- . *Qumrân Grotte 4. III*. DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- . "Le volume VII de 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert': Présentation." Pp. 75–89 in *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by Mathias Delcor. BETL 46. Paris: Duculot, 1978.
- Baker, David W. "Kittim." P. 93 in *ABD*, vol. 4. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Barag, Dan. "New Evidence on the Foreign Policy of John Hyrcanus I." *Israel Numismatic Journal* 12 (1992–93): 1–12.
- Bardtke, Hans. "Die Kriegsrulle von Qumran Übersetzt." *TLZ* 80 (1955): 401–20.
- Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . "הקרב בין תלמי לתירוס לאלכסנדר ינאי בבקעת הירדן, ושאלת זמנה של מגילת מלחמת בניי אור." *Cathedra* 93 (1999): 7–56.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. "28a. Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa)." Pp. 108–18; Pl. XXIII–XXIV in *Qumran Cave I*. Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, and Jozef T. Milik. "28b. Recueil Des Bénédictiones (1QSb)." Pp. 118–30; Pl. XXV–XXIX in *Qumran Cave I*. Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- . "29. Liturgie Des 'Trois Langues de Feu'." Pp. 130–32; Pl. XXX in *Qumran Cave I*. Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef T. Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- . *Qumran Cave I*. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Baukham, Richard. "The Messianic Interpretation of Isa. 10:34 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2 Baruch and the Preaching of John the Baptist." *DSD* 2 (1995): 202–16.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "265. 4QMiscellaneous Rules." Pp. 57–78 in *Qumran Cave 4 XXV - Halakhic Texts*. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Torleif Elgvin, Esther Eshel, Erik Larson, and etc. DJD XXXV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- . "Damascus Document." Pp. 166–70 in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Beale, Gregory K. *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John*. New York: University Press of America, 1984.

- Becker, Jurgen. *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Ben Dov, Jonathan. "מחזורי השמיטה והיובל בקומרן ויהסם אל השנה בת 364 יום." *Meghillot* 5–6 (2007): 49–59.
- Bernstein, Moshe, and Eileen Schuller. "4QNarrative and Poetic Composition." Pp. 151–204 in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVIII - Miscellanea, Part 2*. Moshe Bernstein, Monica Brady, James Charlesworth, Peter Flint, Haggai Misgav, Stephen Pfann, Eileen Schuller, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and James Vanderkam. DJD XXVIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- Berrin, Shani L. *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran*. STDJ 53. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Birnbaum, Salomon A. *The Hebrew Script*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Boccaccio, Petrus. "Recensiones: Review of E. L. Sukenik שבידי ויהסם אל השנה בת 364 יום." *Bib* 37 (1956): 227–30.
- Brooke, George J. "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community." Pp. 117–32 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . "The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim." Pp. 135–59 in *Images of Empire*. Loveday Alexander. JSOTSup 122. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- . "Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." Pp. 105–29 in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac*, vol. I. Edited by Zdzislaw J. Kapera. Kraków: Enigma, 1993.
- Broshi, Magen. "247. 4QPeshar on the Apocalypse of Weeks." Pp. 187–91 in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Stephen J. Pfann, Alexander, Broshi, Chazon, Cotton, and etc. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Brownlee, William H. "Kittim." Pp. 45–46 in *ISBE*, vol. 3. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Budd, Philip J. *Numbers*. WBC 5. Waco: Word Books, 1984.
- Carmignac, Jean. "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans la « Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres »." *RB* 63 (1956): 234–60, 375–90.
- . "Interprétations de Prophètes et de Psaumes." Pp. 43–128 in *Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*, vol. 2. Jean Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée. Autour de la Bible. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963.
- . "Les Kittim dans la « Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres »." *NRT* 77 (1955): 737–48.
- . "Qu'est ce que l'apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumrân." *RevQ* 10 (1979): 3–33.
- . "Le Recueil des Bénédiction." Pp. 29–42 in *Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*, vol. 2. Jean Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée. Autour de la Bible. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963.
- . "La Règle de la Congrégation." Pp. 9–27 in *Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*, vol. 2. Jean Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée. Autour de la Bible. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963.

- . *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres*. Autour de la Bible. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958.
- . “La Règle de la Guerre.” Pp. 81–125 in *Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés*, vol. 1. Jean Carmignac and P. Guilbert. Autour de la Bible. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961.
- Charles, Robert H. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. London: A&C Black, 1902.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Pesharim and Qumran History*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Dennis. T. Olson. “Prayers for Festivals.” Pp. 46–105 in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*. Vol. 4A of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1997.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. “Blessings (1QSb).” Pp. 119–31 in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994.
- . “Rule of the Congregation (1QSa).” Pp. 108–17 in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . “The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books.” Pp. 25–42 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Pt. 5, the Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Alan J. Avery-Peck and Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . “Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pp. 97–111 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- . “Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?” Pp. 25–51 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . “The Yahad and ‘the Qumran Community’.” Pp. 81–96 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. JSJSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Cross, Frank M. *The Ancient Library at Qumran*. 3rd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- . “The Development of the Jewish Scripts.” Pp. 133–202 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. W. F. Albright Festschrift. Edited by George Ernest Wright. New York: Doubleday, 1961.

- . “Testimonia (4Q175 = 4QTestim).” Pp. 308–27 in *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*. Vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scroll: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Davies, Philip R. *IQM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*. BibOr 32. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.
- . “The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document.” *JJS* 33 (1982): 287–301.
- . “The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document.” Pp. 27–43 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “Review of *Gott und Belial*.” *RB* 78 (1971): 447–50.
- Demsky, Aharon. “Who Came First, Ezra or Nehemiah? The Synchronistic Approach.” *HUCA* 65 (1994): 2–19.
- Di Lella, Alexander. *The Hebrew Text of Sirach; a Text-Critical and Historical Study*. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Dimant, Devorah. “An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385^B = 4Q385 16).” STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . “New Light from Qumran on Jewish Pseudepigrapha: 4Q390.” Pp. 405–47 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21, 1991*. Edited by J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11,2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . *Qumran Cave 4 XXI - Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*. DJD XXX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- . “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance.” Pp. 23–58 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman. STDJ 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . “ירושלים והמקדש בהזוון החיות (חנוך החבשי פה-צ) לאור השקפות כת מדבר יהודה.” *Shnaton* 5–6 (1982): 177–93.
- . “לא גלות שבמדבר אלא גלות שברוח: הפשר אל ישעיהו מ 3 בספר היחד.” *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 21–36.
- Doudna, Gregory L. *4QPeshar Nahum: A Critical Edition*. JSPSup 35. Copenhagen International Series 8. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- . “The Legacy of an Error in Archaeological Interpretation: The Dating of the Qumran Cave Scroll Deposits.” Pp. 147–57 in *Qumran - the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates*. Edited by Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg. STDJ 57. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Driver, G. R. “Review of E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (1955).” *JTS* 8 (1957): 141–43.
- Duhaime, Jean. “Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran.” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 32–56.
- . “Étude comparative de 4QM^a fgg. 1–3 et IQM.” *RevQ* 14 (1991): 459–72.
- . “The War Scroll from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises.” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 133–51.
- . “War Scroll.” Pp. 80–203 in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Prin-

- ceton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995.
- . *The War Texts: IQM and Related Manuscripts*. CQS 6. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. “Le Commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte (4QpNah): traductions et notes.” *Sem* 13 (1963): 55–88.
- . *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by Geza Vermes. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1961.
- . *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte*. Paris: Payot, 1959.
- . “Observations sur le Commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte.” *Journal des savants*, October-December 1963, 201–26.
- . “Résumé des cours de 1969–70: Hébreu et Araméen.” *Annuaire du Collège de France* 70 (1970): 399–414.
- . “« Règlements de la guerre des fils de lumière »: Traduction et notes.” *RHR* 148 (1955): 25–43, 141–80.
- . “‘Règlement de la guerre des fils de lumière’: Traductions et notes.” *RHR* 148 (1955): 25–42, 141–80.
- . “Le rouleau de la guerre des fils de lumière.” *Evidences* 62 (1957): 32–47.
- Eshel, Esther. “4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn.” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 175–203.
- . “Isaiah 11:15: A New Interpretation Based on the *Genesis Apocryphon*.” *DSD* 13 (2006): 38–45.
- Eshel, Esther, and Hanan Eshel. “471. 4QWar Scroll-Like Text B.” Pp. 439–45; Pl. XXX in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Stephen J. Pfann, Alexander, Broshi, Chazon, Cotton, and etc. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- . “4Q471 Fragment 1 and *Ma’amadot* in the War Scroll.” Pp. 611–20 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11,2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . “Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch’s Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls.” Pp. 215–40 in *Emanuel - Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . “Recensions in the War Scroll.” Pp. 351–63 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery*. Edited by Lawrence Harvey Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- Eshel, Esther, and Menahem Kister. “471a. 4QPolemical Text.” Pp. 446–49; Pl. XXXI in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Stephen J. Pfann, Alexander, Broshi, Chazon, Cotton, and etc. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- . “A Polemical Qumran Fragment.” *JJS* 43 (1992): 277–81.
- Eshel, Hanan. “4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period.” Pp. 102–10 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period.” Pp. 53–65 in *Reading 4QMMT*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . “The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim.” Pp. 29–44 in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea*

- Scrolls*. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz. STDJ 37. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . “Review of J. Duhaime, *The War Texts: IQM and Related Documents*.” *JSJ* 37 (2006): 110–12.
- . “השומרונים בתקופה הפרסית וההלניסטית: התהוותה של עדה דתית.” Ph.D. diss. Hebrew University, 1994.
- . מגילת קומראן והמדינה החשמונאית. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004.
- . “שני הרבדים ההיסטוריים המתועדים במגילת פשר חבקוק.” *Zion* 71 (2006): 143–52.
- . “תולדות של הקבוצה בקומראן והרמזים ההיסטוריים שבמקילות.” *Qad* 30 (1997): 86–93.
- . “תפילת יוסף מקומראן, פפירוס ממצדה והמקדש השומרונים בהר גריזים.” *Zion* 56 (1991): 125–36.
- Eshel, Hanan, and Esther Eshel. “4Q448, Psalm 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa^a.” *JBL* 119 (2000): 645–59.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. “עֲדָה - *‘ēdā* - V. Qumran.” Pp. 480–81 in *TDOT*, vol. 10. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Translated by David E. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Falk, Daniel K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Judean Antiquities 1–4*. Vol. 3 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Finkielsztejn, Gerald. “More Evidence on John Hyrcanus I’s Conquests: Lead Weights and Rhodian Amphora Stamps.” *BAIAS* 16 (1998): 33–63.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20)*. 3d ed. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2004.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Flusser, David. “Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll.” Pp. 140–58 in *Qumran and Apocalypticism*. Vol. 1 of *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*. Translated by Azzan Yadin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . “Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in Peshar Nahum.” Pp. 214–57 in *Qumran and Apocalypticism*. Vol. 1 of *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*. Translated by Azzan Yadin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . “היסודות האפוקליפטיים של מגילת המלחמה.” Pp. 434–52 in פרקים בתולדות ירושלים. Edited by A. Oppenheimer, U. Rappaport, and M. Stern. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi / Ministry of Defense, 1980.
- Frye, Richard N. “Assyria and Syria: Synonyms.” *JNES* 51 (1992): 281–85.
- García Martínez, Florentino. “Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pp. 162–92 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Vol. 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 1998.
- . “Estudios qumranicos 1975–1985: panorama critico (III).” *EstBib* 46 (1988): 351–54.
- . “Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The ‘I’ of Two Qumran Hymns.” *ETL* (2002), 321–39.
- . *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 63. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

- . “Temple Scroll.” Pp. 927–33 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *1Q1–4Q273*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude. “11QNew Jerusalem Ar.” Pp. 305–55; Pls. XXXV–XL, LIII in *Qumran Cave 11 II*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- . “14. 11QSefer Ha-Milhamah.” Pp. 243–51, Pl. XXVIII in *Qumran Cave 11 II*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- . *Qumran Cave 11: II 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Gaster, Theodor Herzl. *The Dead Sea Scriptures*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1956.
- . *The Dead Sea Scriptures*. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Gazor-Ginzberg, Anatole M. “The Structure of the Army of the Sons of Light.” *RevQ* 5 (1965): 163–76.
- Gärtner, Bertil E. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament; a Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- Ginsberg, Harold L. “The Hebrew University Scrolls from the Sectarian Cache.” *BASOR* 112 (1948): 19–23.
- . *Studies in Daniel*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948.
- Gmirkin, Russell. “Historical Allusions in the War Scroll.” *DSD* 5 (1998): 172–214.
- . “The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered.” *DSD* 3 (1996): 89–129.
- Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. WBC 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *I Maccabees*. AB 41. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Graf, David F. “Dedan.” Pp. 121–23 in *ABD*, vol. 2. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 21–37*. AB 22A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Grintz, Yehoshua M. “אנשי היחד, איסיים, בית (א)סין.” *Sinai* 32 (1953): 11–43.
- . פרקים בתולדות בית שני. Jerusalem: Y. Marcus, 1969.
- Harl, Marguerite. *La Genèse*. La Bible d’Alexandrie 1. Paris: Cerf, 1986.
- Harrington, Clyde E., and William S. LaSor. “Euphrates.” Pp. 202–4 in *ISBE*, vol. 2. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Harrington, Daniel J. “‘Holy War’ Texts Among the Qumran Scrolls.” Pp. 175–83 in *Studies in Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. di Lella. *The Book of Daniel*. AB 23. Garden City: Doubleday, 1978.
- Hayden, Roy E. “Persia.” Pp. 776–80 in *ISBE*, vol. 3. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Hempel, Charlotte. “Community Origins in the *Damascus Document* in Light of Recent Scholarship.” Pp. 316–29 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls - Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated*

- Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures.” Pp. 67–92 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, vol. II. Peter Flint, W. and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *The Damascus Texts*. CQS 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of IQSa.” *DSD* 3 (1996): 253–69.
- Holst, Søren. “Verbs and War Scroll in the Hebrew Verbal System and the Qumran War Scroll.” Ph.D. diss. Copenhagen University, 2004.
- Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 8. Washington: CBQMS, 1979.
- . “Psalm Peshar 2 (1Q16 = 1QpPs).” Pp. 25–29 in *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*. Vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls - Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Hölscher, G. *Drei Erdkarten: Ein Beitrag zur Erdkenntnis des hebräischen Altertums*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophische-historische Klasse 1944/48, 3. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1949.
- Hunzinger, Claus-Hunno. “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran.” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51.
- . “Replik.” *ZAW* 70 (1958): 258–59.
- . “Le travail d’édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân.” *RB* 63 (1956): 67.
- Ibba, Giovanni. *Il “Rotolo della Guerra” Edizione critica*. Turin: Silvio Samorani, 1998.
- Isaac, E. “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch (Second Century B.C. –First Century A.D.).” Pp. 5–89 in *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Jepsen, E. “Bemerkungen zum Danielbuch.” *VT* 11 (1961): 386–91.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. Translated by F. H. & C. H. Clave. London: SCM, 1969.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- de Jonge, Marinus. “The Testament of Levi and ‘Aramaic Levi’.” Pp. 244–62 in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- de Jonge, Marinus, and H. W. Hollander. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. SVTP 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Jongeling, Bastiaan. *Le Rouleau de la Guerre des manuscrits de Qumrân*. SSN 4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962.
- Kanael, Baruch. “Jewish Coins and Their Historical Importance.” *BA* 26, no. 2 (1963): 38–62.
- Kapfer, Hilary E. “The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes Toward the Temple as a Test Case.” *DSD* 14 (2007): 152–77.

- Knauf, Ernst A. "Kedar." Pp. 9–10 in *ABD*, vol. 4. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Knibb, Michael A. "Exile in the Damascus Document." *JSOT* 25 (1983): 99–117.
- . "The Interpretation of *Damascus Document* VII, 9b–VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b–14." *RevQ* 15 (1991): 243–51.
- . "A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390." Pp. 164–77 in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls - Studies in Honour of A.S. Van der Woude on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne. VTSup 49. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on the Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200 - 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.
- Korpel, Marjo C. A. "Introduction to the Series Pericope." Pp. 1–50 in *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch. Pericope 1. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000.
- Kugel, James. "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings." *HTR* 86 (1993): 1–63.
- Kugler, Robert A. "The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites." Pp. 465–79 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Kuhn, Karl G. "Beiträge zum Verständnis der Kriegerrolle von Qumrân." *TLZ* 1 (1956): 25–30.
- Lange, Armin. "Kriterien essenischen Texte." Pp. 59–69 in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Testfunde von Toten Meer*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Hartmut Stegemann. Bonifatius: Paderborn, 2003.
- LaSor, William S. "Coelesyria." P. 728 in *ISBE*, vol. 1. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Levine, Baruch A. *Numbers 21–36*. AB 4A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Levy, D., and J. Milgrom. "עֲדָה 'ēdā." Pp. 468–80 in *TDOT*, vol. 10. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Translated by David E. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Licht, Jacob. מגילת ההדיות ממגילות מדבר יהודה. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1957.
- . מגילת הסרכים ממילות מדבר יהודה: סרך היחזק, סרך העדה, סרך הברכות. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965.
- . "משעת עולם ועם פדות אל." Pp. 49–75 in *ספר זכרון לאליעזר: מחקרים במלילות הגנוזות: ספר זכרון לאליעזר*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Hekhal Ha-Sefer, 1961.
- . "תורת העתים של כת מדבר יהודה ושל מחשבי קיצין אחרים." *ErIsr* 8 (1967): 63–70.
- Lim, Timothy H. "Kittim." Pp. 469–71 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *Pesharim*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3. New York: Sheffield Press, 2002.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah 21–36*. AB 21B. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

- Machiela, Daniel A. "Divinely Revealed History and Geography in the Genesis Apocryphon Columns 13–17." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, Philadelphia, 2005.
- . "'Each to His Own Inheritance': Geography as an Evaluative Tool in the Genesis Apocryphon." *DSD* 15 (2008): 50–66.
- Magen, Ytzhak. "הַר גְּרִיזִים: עִיר-מִקְדָּשׁ." *Qad* 23 (1990): 70–96.
- Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Maier, Johann. "Temple." Pp. 921–27 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Martin, Malachi. *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Bibliothèque Du Muséon 44–45. Leiden: Publications Universitaires, 1958.
- Martola, Nils. "The Priest Anointed for Battle." *Nordisk Judaistik. Scandinavian Jewish Studies* 4 (1983): 21–40.
- de Menasce, J. P. "Iranien Naxčir." *VT* 6 (1956): 213–14.
- Mertens, Alfred. *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte des Texte vom Toten Meer*. SBM 12. Stuttgart: Echter, 1971.
- Meshorer, Ya'akov. *A Treasury of Jewish Coins from the Persian Period to Bar Kokhba*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2001.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement." *RevQ* 79 (2002): 429–44.
- . "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule." Pp. 85–93 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Whom Does the Term Yaḥad Identify?" Pp. 213–35 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. JSJSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Michaud, Henri. "Une apocalypse nouvelle." *Positions Luthériennes* 3 (1955): 64–76.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles." Pp. 165–80 in *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke. JSJSup 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . "Qumran's Biblical Hermeneutics: The Case of the Wood Offering." *RevQ* 16 (1994): 449–56.
- Milik, Jozef T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- . *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- . "II. Textes Non Bibliques, 16: Commentaire de Psaumes." Pp. 81–82 in *Qumran Cave I*. Dominique Barthélemy and Jozef Tadeusz Milik. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- . "Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens." *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144.
- . "Review of E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*." *RB* 62 (1955): 597–601.
- Millard, Alan R. "Medes, Media." Pp. 297–99 in *ISBE*, vol. 3. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

- Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC 19. New York: Scribner, 1927.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII, 3–19)." *RB* 80 (1972): 200–216.
- Müller, W. W. "Havilah." Pp. 81–82 in *ABD*, vol. 3. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Najman, Hindy. "Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism." *DSD* 13 (2006): 99–113.
- Nielsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Books of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- . *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. "Benedictions and Instructions for the Eschatological Community (11QBer; 4Q285)." *RevQ* 16 (1993): 77–90.
- . *Peshet Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea (1QpHab)*. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1986.
- . *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. STDJ 12. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Noth, Martin. *Numbers*. Translated by James D. Martin. The Old Testament Library 4. London: SCM, 1968.
- O'Brien, Julia M. *Priest and Levite in Malachi*. SBLDS 121. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Oesch, Josef M. *Petucha und Setuma: Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des Alten Testament*. OBO 27. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Olley, John W. "Texts Have Paragraphs Too: A Plea for Inclusion in Critical Edition." *Text* 19 (1998): 111–25.
- Olson, Dennis. T. "Words of the Lights." Pp. 107–53 in *Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*. Vol. 4A of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1997.
- von der Osten-Sacken, Peter. *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*. SUNT 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Oswalt, John. *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1–39*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds. *Exegetical Texts*. The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- , eds. *Texts Concerned with Religious Law*. The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 1. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Perrot, Charles. "Petuḥot et setumot: Étude sur les alinéas du Pentateuque." *RB* 76 (1969): 50–91.
- Pfann, Steven J. "249g. 4Qpap CryptA Serekh Ha-'Edah^h." Pp. 563–68 in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Stephen J. Pfann, Alexander, Broshi, Chazon, Cotton, and etc. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

- . “Cryptic Texts.” Pp. 515–701 in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Stephen J. Pfann, Alexander, Broshi, Chazon, Cotton, and etc. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Pitard, Wayne T. “Aram-Naharaim.” P. 341 in *ABD*, vol. 1. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- van der Ploeg, Jean. “La règle de la guerre: traductions et notes.” *VT* 5 (1955): 373–420.
- . *Le rouleau de la guerre*. STDJ 2. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Puech, Émile. “Une nouvelle copie du livre de Jubilés: 4Q484 = pap4QJubilés¹.” *RevQ* 19 (1999): 262–64.
- . *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*. DJD XXV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Purvis, James D. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*. HSM 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. HSS 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- . “Observations on the Reading of ‘a Text About Joseph’ (4Q372, 1).” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 603–4.
- . “Prayers for the Festivals from Qumran: Reconstructions and Philological Observations.” Pp. 383–93 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen. OLA 118. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2003.
- . *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*. JDS. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1996.
- . “לחקנת המהדורות של מגילות מדבר יהודה (ב).” *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 79–89.
- Rabin, Chaim. “Hittite Words in Hebrew.” *Or* 32 (1963): 113–39.
- . “המבנה הספרותי של מגילת מלחמת בני אור ובני חושך.” Pp. 31–47 in *מחקרים במגילות של ספר זכרון לאליעזר ליפא סוקניק הגנוזות*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Hekal haSefer, 1961.
- Rappaport, Uriel. *ספר מקבים א*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004.
- Redditt, Paul L. “Daniel 11 and the Sociohistorical Setting of the Book of Daniel.” *CBQ* 60, no. 3 (1998): 463–74.
- Regev, Eyal. “The *Yahad* and the *Damascus Covenant*: Structure, Organization and Relationship.” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 233–62.
- Roberts, Bleddyn J. “The Jerusalem Scrolls.” *ZQW* 69 (1950): 224–45.
- Rosenthal, Judah M. “Biblical Exegesis of 4QpIs.” *JQR* 60 (1969): 27–36.
- Rost, Leonhard. “Zum ‘Buch der Kriege der Söhne des Lichtes gegen die Söhne des Finsternist.’” *TLZ* 80 (1955): 205–8.
- Roth, Cecil. *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- . “Star and Anchor: Coin Symbolism and the End of Days.” *ErIsr* 6 (1960): 13*–15*.
- Rouillard, Hedwige. *La péricope de Balaam (Nombres 22–24). La prose et les ‘Oracles’*. EBib NS 4. Paris: Gabalda, 1985.
- Rowley, Harold H. “The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *PEQ* 88 (1956): 92–109.
- Sanders, Ed P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Schäfer, Peter. *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981.

- . “Rabbi Aqiva and Bar Kokhba.” Pp. 113–30 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, vol. 2. Edited by William Scott Green. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . “Ordinances and Rules.” Pp. 145–75 in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994.
- Schmidt, Francis. “Jewish Representations of the Inhabited Earth During the Hellenistic and Roman Periods.” Pp. 119–34 in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays*. Edited by A. Kasher and U. Rappaport. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi / Israel Exploration Society, 1990.
- . “Naissance d’une géographie juive.” Pp. 13–30 in *Moïse Géographie: Recherches sur les représentations juives et chrétiennes de l’espace*. Edited by A. Desreux and F. Schmidt. Études de psychologie et de philosophie 24. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1988.
- Schuller, Eileen. “431. 4QHodayot^c.” Pp. 199–208; Pl. XII; Foldout Pl. III in *Qumran Cave 4 XX - Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Esther Chazon, Torleif Elgvin, Esther Eshel, Daniel Falk, Bilhah Nitzan, Elisha Qimron, Schuller, David Seely, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Moshe Weinfeld. DJD XXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- . “4Q372 I: A Prayer About Joseph.” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 349–76.
- Schultz, Brian. “The Kittim of Assyria.” *RevQ* 23 (2007): 63–77.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Vol. 2. New revised ed. Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. “The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium.” *RevQ* 10 (1979): 83–91.
- . “‘To Join Oneself to the House of Judah’ (Damascus Document IV,11).” *RevQ* 10 (1981): 435–46.
- Scott, James M. *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity*. SNTSMS 113. Cambridge: University Press, 2002.
- Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees – Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. JSJSup 117. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Segal, Moshe H. “The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of Its Composition.” Pp. 138–43 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin. ScrHier 4. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965.
- Segert, Stanislav. “Kition and Kittim.” Pp. 165–72 in *Periplus: Festschrift für Hans-Günter Buchholz zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag*. Edited by Paul Åström and Dietrich Sürenhagen. Jonsereud: Paul Åström Forlag, 2000.
- Shatzman, Israel. *The Armies of the Hasmoneans and Herod: From Hellenistic to Roman Frameworks*. TSAJ 25. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991.
- . “על הצבא במגילת מלחמת בני אור בבני חושך.” Pp. 105–31 in *היהודים בעולם ההלניסטי והרומי*. Edited by Isaiah M. Gafni, Aharon Oppenheimer, and Daniel R. Schwartz. Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1996.
- Siegel, Jonathan P. “The Scribes of Qumran: Studies in the Early History of Jewish Scribal Customs, with Special Reference to Qumran Biblical Scrolls and to the

- Tannaitic Traditions of Masseketh Soferim." Ph.D. diss. Brandeis University, 1971.
- Simons, J. "The 'Table of Nations' (Gen. X): Its General Structure and Meaning." Pp. 155–84 in *OtSt*, vol. 10. Edited by P. A. H. de Boer. Leiden: Brill, 1954.
- Singer, Itamar. "Sea Peoples." Pp. 1059–61 in *ABD*, vol. 5. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sirah*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Eugene Ulrich. "Isaiah." Pp. 7–143 in *Qumran Cave 4 X - the Prophets*. Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, Russel E. Fuller, Judith E. Sanderson, Patrick W. Skehan, and Emanuel Tov. DJD XV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Sperber, D. "Mishmarot and Ma'amadot." Pp. 89–93 in *EncJud*, vol. 12. Jerusalem: Keter, 1971.
- Stallman, Robert C. "Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *JSP* 10 (1992): 163–89.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. *The Library of Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "Some Remarks to *IQSa*, to *IQSb*, and to Qumran Messianism." *RevQ* 65–68 (1996): 479–505.
- Stern, Menahem. "Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and Other Classes." Pp. 561–630 in *The Jewish People in the First Century - Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Volume 2. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. CRINT. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- . *From Tacitus to Simplicius*. Vol. 2 of *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980.
- . "ירושלים שבארץ אשור בקטע מהיבור של ההיסטוריון אסיניוס קוודרטוס." *Tzion* 42 (1977): 295–97.
- Studel, Annette. "4QMidrEschat: « A Midrash on Eschatology » (4Q174 + 4Q177)." Pp. 531–41 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11,2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . *Der Midrash zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})*. STDJ 13. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . "אחרית הימים In the Texts from Qumran." *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225–46.
- Stone, Michael E., ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Vol. 2 of *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple Period and the Talmud*. CRINT, Section 2. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel. "Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus." *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–33.
- Strugnell, John. "Apocryphon of Moses." Pp. 111–36; Pls. XIV–XV in *Qumran Cave 4 XIV - Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. Magen Broshi, Esther Eshel, Joseph Fitzmyer, Erik Larson, Carol Newsom, Lawrence Schiffman, Mark Smith, Michael Stone, John Strugnell, and Ada Yardeny. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- . "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'." *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276.

- Sukenik, Eleazar L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Translated by D. A. Fineman. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955.
- . אוצר המגילות הגנוזות שבידי האוניברסיטה העברית. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1954.
- . מגילות גנוזות מתוך גניזה קדומה שנמצאה במדבר יהודה. סקירה ראשונה. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1948.
- . מגילות גנוזות מתוך גניזה קדומה שנמצאה במדבר יהודה. סקירה שנייה. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1950.
- Swete, Henry B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. 2 ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "A. Calendrical Documents and Mishmarot." Pp. 1–166 in *Qumran Cave 4 XVI - Calendrical Texts*. Shemaryahu Talmon, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessner. DJD XXI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- . "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert." Pp. 162–99 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. ScrHier 4. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965.
- . "קָזָן." Pp. 78–86 in *TDOT*, vol. 13. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Translated by David E. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, and Israel Knohl. "(4Q321) B^a - מקומראן לוח מגילת לוח מקומראן - קטעים של מגילת לוח מקומראן." *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 505–21.
- . "(4Q321) B^b משמרות - מקומראן 4 במערות לוח מגילת לוח ממערות 4 בקומראן." Pp. 65*–71* in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*. Edited by Michael V. Fox, Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, Avi Hurvitz, Michael L. Klein, Baruch J. Schwartz, and Nili Shupak. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- . "A Calendrical Scroll from a Qumran Cave: *Mišmarot* B^a, 4Q321." Pp. 267–301 in *Pomegranates & Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Tantlevsky, I. R. "The Term « Kittim » in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pp. 279–83 (Russian) in *Jews and Greeks: Dialogue [Sic] Throughout Generations*. Edited by A. Lvov. St. Petersburg, 1999.
- Teicher, Jacob L. "A Spurious Version of the War Scroll." *ZAW* 70 (1958): 257–58.
- Thiering, Barbara E. "*Mebaqqer* and *Episkopos* in the Light of the Temple Scroll." *JBL* 100 (1981): 59–74.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. "4Q499 48+47 (par 4Q369 1 II): A Forgotten Identification." *RevQ* 18 (1997): 303–6.
- . "In Search of the Scribe of 1QS." Pp. 439–52 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "On the Unidentified Fragments of DJD XXXIII and PAM 43.680: A New Manuscript of 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition, and Fragments of 4Q13, 4Q269, 4Q524 and 4QSb (?)." *RevQ* 21 (2004): 477–85.
- . "Working with Few Data: The Relationship Between 4Q285 and 11Q14." *DSD* 7 (2000): 49–56.
- Torrey, Charles C. "'Yāwān' and 'Hellas' as Designations of the Seleucid Empire." *JAOS* 25 (1904): 302–11.

- Tov, Emanuel. "The Background of Sense Divisions in the Biblical Texts." Pp. 312–50 in *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch. Pericope 1. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000.
- . "Scribal Markings in the Texts from the Judean Desert." Pp. 41–77 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . "Scribal Notations in the Texts from the Judean Desert." Pp. 323–49 in *The Texts from the Judean Desert - Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- . *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Scribal Practices and Physical Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pp. 9–33 in *The Bible as Book - the Manuscript Tradition*. Edited by John L. Sharpe III and Kimberley van Kampen. London: The British Press, 1998.
- . "Scribal Practices Reflected in the Documents from the Judean Desert and in the Rabbinic Literature: A Comparative Study." Pp. 383–403 in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*. Edited by Michael V. Fox, Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, Avi Hurvitz, Michael L. Klein, Baruch J. Schwartz, and Nili Shupak. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- . "Scribal Practices Reflected in the Texts from the Judean Desert." Pp. 403–29 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 1. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "Sense Divisions in the Qumran Texts, the Masoretic Text, and Ancient Translations of the Bible." Pp. 121–46 in *The International Symposium in Slovenia* (~~GMGE~~ -R&H. ~~UDRYH~~ -62 76XS 6KHIIH6 6KHIIH6\$ FD demic Press, 1998.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd. rev. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Treuer, John C. "The Discovery of the Scrolls." *BA* 11, no. 3 (1948): 46–57.
- . *The Untold Story of Qumran*. Westwood, N.J.: Flemming H. Revel, 1965.
- Treves, Marco. "The Date of the War of the Sons of Light." *VT* 8 (1958): 419–29.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "Identification of a Scribe Active at Qumran: 1QPs^b-4QIsa^c-11QM." *Meghillot* 5–6 (2007): *201–10.
- . "Impressions and Intuition: Sense Division in Ancient Manuscripts of Isaiah." Pp. 279–307 in *Unit Delimitation in Biblical Hebrew and Northwest Semitic Literature*. Edited by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch. Pericope 4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees*. CSCO 511, Scriptorum aethiopicum 88. Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1989.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . *From Joshua to Caiaphas*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- . "The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4." Pp. 635–48 in *The Madrid Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

- . “Messianism and Apocalypticism.” Pp. 193–228 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, vol. 1. The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 1998.
- . “Putting Them in Their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool.” Pp. 46–69 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of This Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and Kampen John. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- . *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- VanderKam, James C., and Jozef T. Milik. “Jubilees.” Pp. 1–185 in *Qumran Cave 4, Vol. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Harold Attridge, Torleif Elgvin, Jozef Milik, Saul Olyan, John Strugnell, Emanuel Tov, James VanderKam, and Sidnie White. DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Vargon, Shmuel. ספר מיכה: עיונים ופירושים. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1994.
- de Vaux, Roland. “Archéologie.” Pp. 3–4 in *Les ‘petites grottes’ de Qumrân*. Edited by Maurice Baillet and Josef Tadeusz Milik. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- . “Archéologie.” Pp. 3–22; pls. I–III in *Qumrân Grotte 4. II*. Edited by Roland de Vaux and Josef Tadeusz Milik. DJD VI. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- . “Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport Préliminaire sur les 3e, 4e, et 5e Campagnes.” *RB* 63 (1956): 533–34, 569–72.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Allen Lane, 1997.
- . “Quelques traditions de la communauté de Qumran d’après les manuscrits de l’université hébraïque.” *Cahiers Sioniens* 9 (1955): 26–48.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. HUCM 8. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983.
- Webster, Brian. “Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert.” Pp. 351–446 in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert - Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- Weinert, Francis D. “4Q159: Legislation for an Essene Community Outside of Qumran.” *JSJ* 5 (1974): 179–207.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1–15*. WBC 1. Waco: Word Books, 1987.
- Wenthe, Dean O. “The Use of Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM.” *DSD* 5 (1998): 290–319.
- Werman, Cana. “התורה והתעודה’ הכתובה על הלוחות.” *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 473–92.
- . “Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature.” *DSD* 13 (2006): 229–55.
- . “Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period.” *DSD* 4 (1997): 211–25.
- . “‘The תורה and the תעודה’ Engraved on the Tablets.” *DSD* 9 (2002): 75–103.
- . “ספר יובלים בהקשר הלניסטי.” *Zion* 66 (2001): 275–96.
- . “על מועדי הכפרה במגילת המקדש.” *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 89–119.
- . “תעודה: לבירור טיבו של המונח.” Pp. 231–43 in *יובל לחקר מגילות ים המלח*. Edited by Gershon Brin and Bilhah Nitzan. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2001.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 13–27: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- William Whitney Jr., K. “The Place of the ‘Wild Beast Hunt’ of Sib. Or. 3,806 in Biblical and Rabbinic Tradition.” *JSJ* 25 (1994): 68–81.

- Winter, Paul. "Twenty-Six Priestly Courses." *VT* 6 (1956): 215–17.
- Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg, and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scroll: A New Translation*. New York: HarperCollins, 1996.
- van der Woude, Adam S. *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*. SSN 3. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957.
- . "Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran (11 Q Ber)." Pp. 253–58 in *Bible und Qumran*. Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968.
- Xeravits, Géza G. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*. STDJ 47. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Message of the Scrolls*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1957.
- . *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated by Batya and Chaim Rabin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- . *The Temple Scroll*. Vols. 1–3 and Supplement. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983.
- . "חדשות מעולמן של המגילות." Pp. 40–54 in *הדגם של המגילות*. Edited by Jacob Liver. Jerusalem: Kiriat Sepher, 1957.
- . *מגילת מלחמת בני אור בבני חושך ממגילות מדבר יהודה*. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1955.
- Yardeni, Ada. "247. 4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks: Paleography and Date." P. 188 in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI - Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Stephen J. Pfann, Alexander, Broshi, Chazon, Cotton, and etc. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Yshai, Rony. "הדגם של תיאור מלחמת הקץ בספרות קומראן." *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 121–39.
- . "1QM, 4Q496–4Q491 בקומראן: האסכטולוגיה בקומראן." *Meghillot* 5–6 (2007): 129–47.
- . *ספרות המלחמה בקומראן: כתיב היד 4Q496–4Q491 (מהדורה ופירוש) והשוואתם למגילת (1QM) המלחמה*. Ph.D. diss. University of Haifa, 2006.
- Zhu-En Wee, John. "A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns XV–XIX of the War Scroll (1QM)." *RevQ* 21 (2003): 263–83.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1–24*. Translated by James D. Martin. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

GENERAL INDEX

- Aaron 119, 223–25n131, 341, 344–45
Abihu 119, 123, 371n8
Abraham 191, 194–201, 395
Absalom 357
Acra 127
Adriatic Gulf 188n38
Aegean 134, 155, 157
Aegean Gulf 188n38
Aegean Sea 188n38
Africa 188
Akiva 141
Alcimus 159n247
Alexander Jannaeus 102, 141n188,
153n238, 160
Alexander the Great 133, 145–
150nn214, 215, 153–55nn238, 157,
196
Amalekites 126
Amanus 195
ambush 306
Ammon 93–94, 99, 101–2, 108, 124–
26, 202, 238, 240
Ammonites 92, 201
Amos 166
angel(s) 67, 77, 97, 208, 279, 280n110,
329, 331
animals 209
Antiochus IV Epiphanes 92n12, 94n18,
101, 102n45, 133, 158, 276n95, 393
apocalyptic 95, 119, 140, 141n190, 146,
176, 182n26, 199, 270
Aqiva 141n186
Arabia 199–200
Arabian 199–200
Arad Ostraca 134nn157–58, 138, 146
Aram 189–95, 197, 200, 203
Ararat 193
archangel 92, 95, 97, 238, 240, 244
armor 400
army(ies) 11, 30n67, 64, 78, 80, 87, 93,
123–24, 130, 134nn159–60, 138–
39, 147, 155, 173, 177, 181, 207,
215, 221, 223, 241–42, 244–49,
251, 259, 261–62, 266–67, 270–74,
276, 278–81n113, 291–93, 295–96,
298, 302, 304, 310, 311n176, 312–
13, 315, 318–20, 322–26, 329, 337,
342–49, 351, 373, 376, 385n55,
387, 396–97
Arpachshad 186, 190, 192–95, 197
Arrian 347n70
Asia 148n215, 155, 199
Asia Minor 137, 186, 188
Asshur 125n111, 190, 192–93n58, 196–
97, 203, 388n61
Asshur/Assyria 196
Assyria 87, 93–95, 97, 124–33n153,
135, 143–44, 146–47n212, 149–
50n226, 154, 156–58, 161n254,
170, 190n45, 192, 202–3, 238, 240–
42, 285, 291, 296, 393
Assyrian 101, 133, 159, 196
Assyrians 131, 133, 144–45, 157, 202–
3, 393
author(s) 3, 34–35, 42, 44, 88, 90–95,
97, 99, 101, 107, 110–12, 117, 120,
122–23, 126, 129–31, 138n174,
145–51, 155–156, 158, 163, 165–
66, 172, 174, 176–78, 180–182n26,
185–86, 189–92, 194–200, 202,
203n78, 205, 211, 220–221,
229n150, 246n17, 252, 262,
266n66, 271, 276–77, 280n110,
281n113, 300, 308–10, 316, 321–
22, 325, 328n5, 338, 342, 347–48,
360, 367–68, 378n37, 380n39, 387–
88n61, 392–93, 396, 400
author/editor 42n1, 43–48, 50–52, 54–
57, 60, 65–66, 72, 78, 81
autograph 390
Azazel 199
Azotus 126

- Babylon 110, 133n153, 162, 164, 194n59, 200, 251
- Babylonian 108, 120, 281
- Balaam 134n155, 139–40, 141n190, 142–43, 145–48, 150, 152–53n238, 155, 157, 221, 393
- Balak 221
- ballista 369
- banner(s) 26, 53, 57, 78, 245–46, 280, 286n122, 295, 344–45n63, 344–45, 347, 349–51, 370
- banquet 332
- battle(s) 7, 10, 20, 26, 37, 60, 65, 80, 87, 89, 96–97, 99–100, 122–24, 137, 138n176, 159n248, 160, 161n254, 162, 167–68, 173–74, 176, 178, 185, 203n78, 207, 236–38, 243–44, 246–47, 249, 251–54n42, 255n45, 258, 260, 262–64, 266–68, 270–72n83, 274, 276–78, 279n104, 282, 283n118, 286–90, 292–93, 294n138, 295, 297n142, 298, 300, 302–3, 305–18, 322–26, 330n13, 331–32, 343, 345n64, 346, 347nn70, 72, 348–50, 352, 366–70, 374, 377, 382n46, 385, 389–90, 395–400
- battlefield 248, 263n60, 264, 270, 320, 350, 384
- Bedouin 10, 15–16
- Belial 87–88, 93, 124, 170, 208, 238, 242, 244, 274, 285–88, 289n129, 290, 295–96, 298, 315, 319, 333n22
- Ben Kosiba 141
- benediction 353
- Benjamin (tribe of; sons of) 86, 103–7, 108n65, 109–11, 113–17, 119–24, 165, 170, 174, 204, 238, 337, 366, 393
- Bereshit Rabba* 199
- Bethlehem 11
- Bible 43, 48, 119, 125, 127–28, 131n142, 134n160, 143–44, 150, 167n277, 173, 190n47, 191, 196, 201, 223, 224n129, 226n135, 229, 251, 262–63, 264n61, 333, 340, 353, 363
- BibleWorks 9
- bless 284–87, 289, 291, 292nn133–34, 294, 387
- blessing(s) 79, 204, 258, 285–87n125, 289, 290, 296, 297n144, 298, 303, 318–19, 339, 343, 376, 379n39
- blind 329, 331
- blood 291–92
- blow 272n83, 285, 309, 346
- blowing 259, 310, 311n176, 313, 343, 346, 348
- bones 106
- border(s) 127, 183, 193, 195, 247, 263n60, 277, 395
- boundary(ies) 161n254, 184, 186, 188, 191n51, 193, 195, 197, 247
- calendar 127, 230, 232
- camp(s) 53n32, 79, 92, 110, 246–49, 259, 278, 282, 291–93, 329, 330n13, 347, 361–62, 376
- campaign(s) 93–94, 101, 122, 147, 160, 161n254, 162, 169, 184, 198, 200, 202–3, 236, 241, 249, 312, 338, 366, 368, 388, 395
- Canaan 184
- captivity 106–7, 109
- casualty(ies) 242, 301, 315, 388, 398
- catapult 369
- cavalry 57, 78, 87, 246, 253–54, 281n113, 312, 325, 329, 349, 351, 376, 385n55
- cave(s) 6, 10, 15–16, 39–40
- Cave One 1, 6–8, 11, 15, 37, 39–40, 42, 46, 61, 72, 370, 383, 391, 402
- Cave Four 1–3, 5–9, 16–17, 24, 25n43, 27, 31n71, 34–40, 60–61, 71, 82, 90, 170n1, 221, 305n158, 309, 311, 366, 368–69n2, 378–82, 391–92, 399–401,
- Cave Five 40
- Cave Eleven 1–3, 5–9, 16, 27, 40, 391–92
- celibate 334, 361
- century(ies) 31, 33, 37–41, 101, 104, 113–14, 116, 123n105, 127n126, 131, 135–36, 140–43, 145, 147–48, 149nn219–20, 152–53n236, 154n239, 158, 160–61, 163–64, 168, 192, 207, 209, 210n97, 211,

- 351n75, 358, 369–70, 384, 386,
 390, 393, 401
 ceremony 262, 264–65, 268–71, 273,
 344, 347, 351, 376, 379n39, 396
 chain 116
 Chaldeans 194
 chief(s) 127n125, 205, 216, 219, 223,
 246
 children 198, 361
 chronology(ies) 6, 31n70, 77, 88, 93,
 95, 101, 115, 136–37, 161, 165,
 171, 176, 178, 182n26, 196, 211–
 12, 237, 238n176, 252n36, 333,
 336–37, 367–68, 394
 citizen 329
 city 128, 157, 168, 199, 280, 283
 civilian 347n70, 348, 352
 clothes 234n163, 291, 345
 clouds 281
 coalition 99, 158, 241, 250
 coast 93, 128, 137, 139, 157, 188
 Coele-Syria 191, 195, 197, 203
 coins 141, 153, 154n238
 combat 174, 258, 278, 306, 315n188,
 325n213, 340, 344n62, 345
 commandment(s) 115, 248, 260–61,
 265, 269, 271, 320–21
 commissioned 279–80
 community(ies) 39–40n96, 104–5, 115,
 118–19, 123–24, 136, 139, 160,
 214, 246n18, 280, 327–28, 331,
 334, 340, 342, 348–49, 354,
 355n87, 356, 358n97, 359–62n108,
 365n120, 384, 400
 compiler(s) 34–35, 182n26, 282,
 288n128, 303, 311, 321, 368,
 380n39
 congregation(s) 36n85, 53, 66, 97, 118,
 168n285, 172–74, 176–77, 183,
 205–7, 209, 216–17n115, 219, 222,
 228–30n151, 233, 235–36, 245–47,
 279–80n111, 306, 329–30, 338,
 341–42, 344n62, 346n68, 347–50,
 353–60n103, 361n104, 362–66,
 370, 376–77, 383n49, 400
 conquer 98, 162n254, 169n288, 183,
 203, 236–37, 275, 277, 292, 368,
 388, 395
 conquered 153n237, 156–57, 169, 184,
 193, 195–96, 201–3, 239, 249, 255,
 339, 366–67, 388n61, 396
 conquering 203, 339, 388, 395
 conquest(s) 137, 148, 153n238,
 154n238, 157–58, 195–98, 202–3,
 212n101, 237, 366, 386, 388n61,
 393, 396, 401
 conscripted 248, 330
 conscripting 328
 conscription 77, 215, 221, 235, 241,
 247, 254, 326, 329, 338, 343, 363,
 371
 corpses 291
 counsel 341
 council 329–30, 333–34n26, 338, 341,
 355
 country(ies) 4, 92, 147, 236, 362
 course(s) 5, 25n48, 57, 66n50, 81, 113,
 121, 141, 205, 211, 216–17, 222–
 23, 225–28, 230, 232–33n160,
 243n8, 290, 303, 305, 330, 346,
 384n53, 391
 covenant 86, 93, 101, 103, 111, 121–
 26, 159n247, 165, 167–69n288,
 174, 177n22, 202, 214, 238, 258,
 295, 337, 364, 366, 394
 crossroad(s) 106–8
 cult 173n12, 217, 221, 225, 343, 347
 cultic 340–42, 348
 cursed 286–87, 390
 curse(s) 79, 258, 285–87n124, 303, 343
 Cush 200
 cycle(s) 176, 182n26, 183, 206n85,
 233, 238, 244, 253n38, 307–10,
 312–15n190, 315nn188, 190, 316–
 17, 325, 385, 398–99
 Cypriot 144, 157
 Cyprus 128, 133–34n159, 149n217

 Damascus 164
 Darius 133
 darkness 30n67, 98, 170–71, 203, 239,
 293, 339
 Dasht-e Kabir 196
 Dasht-e Lüt 196
 daughters 64
 David, King 104, 249n25

- dawn 98, 171
 Dead Sea 10
 Dead Sea Scrolls 3, 5, 9, 15n14, 40n96,
 42, 43n3, 45, 60n43, 103, 115,
 116n88, 118, 173n12, 235n171,
 242, 246n18, 276n96, 340, 355
 deaf 331
 death 29, 92n12, 101, 102n45, 119, 148,
 158, 353, 393
 Dedan 199–200n71
 defeat(s) 89, 96–97, 144, 168, 198, 203,
 238, 241, 244, 248, 276, 283, 293,
 302, 317, 320, 395, 399
 defeated 87, 99, 126, 130, 151,
 153n238, 170, 202, 253, 288n126,
 292, 388, 395–96
 defilement 346
 delimitation 42, 43n3, 45–47, 51, 56,
 60n43, 61, 65–66, 68, 72
 delimitter(s) 42–43, 45–48, 50–52, 55–
 57, 60–61, 64, 65n49, 68–70, 72–
 73, 78–79, 81–82, 288n128
 deployment 57, 322
 deputy 216, 219, 224n130, 228,
 229n150
 desert(s) 162, 196, 212–13
 dew 281
 divination 108
 divine 97, 101, 198–99, 203, 214, 238,
 280n110, 343, 388
 dominion 93, 95, 97, 100, 125, 131, 170,
 244, 277, 285, 295
 dream(s) 198–99, 324
 dualistic 123, 287n124, 333, 369
 duality 97

 Eber 143–44, 146–47n214, 150, 156–57
 Eber-hannahar 144
 Ecbatana 186
 editor 27, 34–35, 42, 106, 109–10, 165,
 182n26, 222, 282n115, 287n124,
 310n172, 354n87, 356, 371
 editor/redactor 246n18
 Edom 92–94, 99, 101–2, 124–26, 202,
 238, 240
 Edomites 201
 Egypt 89–90, 92–95, 98–99, 101, 129,
 132–33, 135, 148n215, 158, 169,
 202n77, 242, 251, 333n22, 339
 Egyptian 144, 148–49, 151
 Elam 190, 192–93, 197, 200
 elders 224, 284, 285n121, 319
 end of days 139–40, 160, 161n254,
 207, 209, 213, 235, 331n17, 364
 enemy(ies) 57, 87, 89, 93–94, 98,
 99n37, 105, 113–14, 122–23, 125–
 27n126, 129, 135, 137, 150, 152,
 153n237, 154–56, 158, 170–71,
 175, 181, 183, 201–4, 210–11, 238–
 42, 248–50, 252–54, 267, 271, 275–
 76, 289, 291–93, 295, 301, 306,
 311n176, 312–13, 315–17, 322,
 347, 353, 360n103, 368, 370,
 371n8, 374, 377, 380, 385, 387–88,
 393, 395, 397
 Enosh 27
 Ephraim 109, 116n88
 eponym(s) 190, 191–92, 195, 197
 era 31n70, 33, 38–39, 41, 153n237,
 366, 373
 Erythrean Sea 194n59
 eschatological 6, 8, 10, 28, 30n67, 33–
 36, 38–39, 41, 86, 88, 91, 93–94,
 98, 100, 103, 110, 117, 121–24,
 129, 134n159, 135, 137, 139–40,
 141n190, 142–44, 148, 150–58,
 160–62n254, 164–65, 169–72, 176,
 181–83, 195, 199, 201–3, 206n85,
 208, 210–11, 213–15, 219n119,
 236–38, 240, 244, 249–52n36, 254–
 55n45, 258, 265, 268–69n76, 274–
 76, 279n106, 282n116, 287–88,
 290, 294–95, 298n148, 301–2,
 312n176, 318, 320, 323–24n209,
 326–27, 328n5, 331n16, 332,
 333n22, 336–37, 339–40, 352,
 353n83, 354, 358–60n103, 363–66,
 369–72, 379–80n40, 381n43, 383,
 385, 389–91, 393, 395–96, 398–402
 eschaton 152, 153n238, 155, 204, 332–
 34, 364–65, 393
 Essau 201
 Essenes 362
 Euphrates 144, 147, 188–95, 197, 251
 Europe 188
 exile 105, 107–10, 113–14, 117, 120–
 23, 163–69, 195, 204, 209, 213–14,

- 237–38, 246n18, 280–81, 325, 337, 394–96
 exiled 164, 205, 210, 238, 325
 exiles 103, 111, 117, 162, 164–65, 168, 206n85, 207–9, 211–12, 214, 246, 366, 382n47, 395–96
 family(ies) 66, 117, 200, 228–30n151, 235–36, 329–30, 341, 348–50, 355, 361
 father(s) 66, 118, 216–17n115, 219, 222, 228–30n151, 233, 235–36, 246, 286–87, 288n127, 289, 295, 299, 303, 329–30, 341, 355, 361, 372, 390
 fear 264, 266, 301, 320, 346
 fearful 259, 262–65, 267–68, 321
 fearfulness 264
 feast 116–17
 festival(s) 117–18
 forgiveness 376
 fornication 198, 361
 Gaius Popilius Laenas 133
 Galilee 191
 gate(s) 116n89, 216, 234, 309, 343
 geniza 40
 Gentile(s) 135, 139, 211–12, 329, 336–38
 geo-political 146, 151, 153n236, 155–56, 186, 197, 393
 Gerizim, Mount 104
 Gog 167, 176, 275–76n96, 281, 294–95, 305, 324, 326, 384, 389–90, 397, 402
 Goliath 104
 Great Sea 353
 Greco-Roman 343n60, 344, 346, 384n52
 Greece 128, 134, 148n215, 155, 163, 166n274
 Greek(s) 133, 134n156, 138–39, 141, 146, 154n238, 155–57, 166
 Gulf 188n38, 200
 Hagarites 126
 halakhah 166
 halakhic 248
 Ham 171, 184–85, 188–89, 197–98n65, 200–202n77, 241, 388
 Ḥasidim 127
 Hasmonean(s) 33n72, 102, 127, 141, 145, 153n237, 154n238, 162n254, 166–69, 387
 Havilah 200
 Head Priest 216, 219n119, 224, 285, heaven 210, 279n107
 Hebrews 144–45, 147, 156
 Herodian 31, 33n72, 105
 Hezekiah 130
 High Priest 119, 158n247, 159n247, 219, 221, 224–25, 228, 229n150, 234, 254, 267, 270, 271n80, 272–73, 275–77, 292, 297n142, 298, 304, 315n188, 318–24, 370, 371n8, 376–77, 389, 399
 holocausts 216, 221, 369
 horsemen 279n107, 281n113, 351
 horses 87, 246, 253, 281, 351
 Hul 190
 hymn(s) 22, 26, 29n67, 213n103, 259, 274, 286–88, 297, 303
 Hyrcanus 104, 127, 168
 idol(s) 106
 idolatry 115
 Idumea 126
 incense 173n12, 216
 India 193, 196
 infantry 57, 253n39, 254, 281n113
 Ionian 186, 367, 395
 Ipsus 137
 Iran 196
 iron 212
 Ishmael 184, 190, 192nn52, 54, 199–201
 Ishmaelites 126
 island(s) 128, 134n160, 139, 188n38
 Israel 29, 64, 86, 89–90, 92–96, 98–100, 102n45, 106–7, 112, 113n78, 115, 122–25n111, 127, 129–30, 131n144, 134–35, 137, 140, 144, 150, 152, 153n238, 154–57, 161n254, 164–67, 169–71, 174, 176–77, 183–84, 185n31, 189, 192–93, 197–207, 209–14, 217, 229, 236, 238–42, 244–49, 253–54, 258,

- 263n60, 275–77, 280, 284–85, 287, 291, 294–95, 325, 329, 331, 333–39, 342, 344, 354–55, 357n93, 359, 363–66, 371n8, 373n20, 374–77, 378n37, 383n49, 387, 389, 393, 395–97, 399–400
- Israelite(s) 211, 226, 334, 337, 354
- Jacob 106–7, 140, 197, 199, 201–2, 204n81, 340, 366, 395
- Jamnia 126
- Jannaeus 102, 141, 153, 160
- Japheth 87, 171, 176, 184–85, 188–89, 196–98n65, 201–2, 240–42, 285, 388
- javelins 325
- Jawan 128
- Jeremiah 115
- Jerusalem 11, 15n15, 31, 95, 101, 106–12, 115, 127, 137, 153n238, 158–60, 161n254, 162–64, 168–69, 198, 206–14n105, 233n160, 236, 238, 240–41, 246–49n25, 254–55, 279–80, 283, 306, 318, 339, 343, 366, 373n20, 375–76, 378, 390, 394–96
- Jewish 102, 122, 138n174, 153, 168, 199, 212–13, 232, 324, 332
- Jews 93, 110, 114, 122–24, 127, 138, 140, 145, 147n214, 158n247, 166, 169, 192, 195, 202, 210, 212, 238, 251
- Jonathan 159n247
- Jordan 15n15
- Joseph 104–7, 109, 114, 116n88
- Josephus 117, 128, 134–35, 139, 141, 143–44, 147, 154, 155n240, 157, 186, 188–89n43, 192n53, 194, 197, 234n163, 362
- Joshua 243n8, 347n72
- Judah 86, 103–18, 120–24, 161n254, 165, 170, 174, 204, 238, 281, 337, 366, 393
- Judaism 122, 138
- Judah Maccabeus 126–27, 168n286, 247
- Judea 101, 110, 114, 122, 124, 137, 145, 147, 156–57, 158n247, 159n247, 169, 191, 386, 388, 390, 393, 401
- Judean Desert 49, 60n43, 70, 163
- Judean Wilderness 43, 324–25, 362
- judges 330, 341
- Kadmonites 190, 192, 196, 202
- Kavir 196
- Kedar 199
- Keturah 184, 190, 192nn52, 54, 199–201
- Khirbet Qumran 5, 10, 16
- Kition 128
- Kittim 43n4, 46n18, 80, 87, 89–90n7, 91n10, 93–95, 97, 99–100, 102n47, 119, 122–25n111, 127–39, 142–58, 160, 161n254, 162n254, 168–70, 175–78, 183, 196, 201–3, 205–7n88, 214, 215n109, 235, 237–38, 240–55, 268–70, 273–77, 280–86, 288, 290–96, 298–305, 306n161, 312, 314, 315n190, 317–18, 323–26, 338–39, 353, 365–67, 369–70, 372, 376–90n63, 393–94, 396–401
- Kohath 116n88, 345
- Korah 376, 379n39
- lacuna(e) 15n14, 88, 322, 359n102
- Laenas 133
- lame 329–30, 339
- Lanarca 128
- lances 313
- Lathyrus 134n159, 160, 161n254, 162
- leather 11–12
- Levi 86, 103–24, 165, 170, 174, 204, 238, 337, 340–41, 344n62, 366, 393
- Levites 66, 113, 116n88, 117, 119, 121, 122n103, 203n78, 205, 215–17, 219–31, 234–35, 239, 266, 284–85, 289, 292, 297n143, 309, 310n172, 314n182, 319, 330, 340–43, 345–49n74, 360, 365, 395, 400
- Levitical 108, 219, 226–30, 233n160, 234, 266, 342, 344, 346, 349
- lion 203
- liturgical 20, 24, 47, 203n78, 245, 253n39, 255n45, 284, 286, 293, 297n145, 298, 304, 320, 322, 326, 370, 371n8, 372, 376, 379n39, 380–81, 388–89, 390n63, 396
- liturgy(ies) 10n3, 34, 253n39, 258, 274, 297n142, 299, 301, 324, 371–73,

- 376–78, 379n39, 380n39, 381–82,
 389, 402
 Lot 201
 lot(s) 17, 31, 96n25, 100, 208, 242, 285,
 286n122, 288n126, 312, 314–
 15nn188–89, 316n191
 Lud 186, 189–90n46, 192–93n58, 195
 luxe 72, 383, 402
 Lydians 188
ma'amad 226–28, 230–31, 234
 Maccabean 102, 126, 153n237, 166–68,
 387
 Maccabees 92n13, 138–39, 145–
 48n215, 151–53n235, 154n238,
 155–57, 163, 393
 Macedon 151
 Macedonia 134, 146–47
 Macedonian(s) 128, 138–39, 146–48,
 151, 157
 Madai 188, 196
 Manasseh 109, 116n88
 Manichaean 199
 map 186, 367, 395
 maritime 139, 147
maskil 250
 Masoretic Text 147, 149, 153n235, 189
 Medes 188, 197
 Media 196–97
 Medians 197
 Mediterranean 128, 134–35, 147–48,
 151–52, 156–57, 188, 191
 Mediterranean Sea 137, 139, 393
 men of the pit 250
 Merari 345
 Mesha 190
 Mesopotamia 144, 186, 191, 193–94,
 197
 messiah 30n67, 160, 212, 332, 336, 360
 Michael 92, 95, 97, 238, 240, 244
 Midian 104
 Moab 92–94, 99, 101–2, 124–26, 202,
 238, 240
 Moabites 201
 Moses 224n129, 259, 279n104
 Mount Ararat 193
 Mount Gerizim 104
 mountain(s) 92, 95, 106, 113n78, 193,
 195, 224n129
 mysteries of God 317
 Nadab 119, 123, 371n8
 Naharaim 189–95, 197, 200, 203
 Nebuchadnezzar 107–8
 Neo-Assyrian 133, 196
 Neo-Persian 156
 Nile 188
 Nineveh 193
 Noah 183–84, 186, 188–89n42, 198–
 99, 201–2, 343, 388n61
 non-biblical scrolls 60n43
 non-sectarian 103, 108–09, 111–12,
 122, 134n159, 152, 209, 324n209
 Old Greek 133, 154n238
 Ostraca 134nn157–58, 138, 146
 Padan Aram 191
 papyrus 16, 24–27, 373n17
paragraphos(oi) 69–70n60, 78
 Paran 200
 patriarch 114, 120
 peace 331, 339, 377n33
 Pentateuch 144, 149, 149n219,
 153n235, 354n87, 358
 Perseus 146
 Persia 133, 190, 192, 197
 Persian 119, 147n212, 156, 166, 200
 Persians 133, 196, 202
 pesharim 134–37, 160, 162
 peshet 56n39, 118–19, 159–60,
 161n254, 162, 386
 petuhah 44
 Philip V 146
 Philistia 93, 101–2, 124–26, 145, 202,
 238, 240
 Philistines 139
 Philo 140
 pit, men of the, 250
 plunder 92
 Pompey 137, 153n238, 154n238, 158,
 212n101, 386, 393
 Popilius 133
 potter 212
 prayer(s) 24, 26, 30n67, 35–36, 38n91,
 57, 60, 64, 79–80, 104–5, 107, 245,
 249n26, 253n39, 255, 258–61, 263–
 67, 269–84, 286–91, 294–304,
 311n176, 318–323, 328n6, 346–47,
 370–72, 374, 375n26, 376, 377n33,

- 378, 379n39, 381, 382n46, 384,
389–90, 396–98, 401–402
- priest(s) 11, 36n85, 66, 87, 106, 108,
119, 158n247, 159n247, 166, 168,
205–07, 215–17n114, 219–26n138,
227n143, 228–30n151, 231n155,
233–35, 254, 259–61n55, 262n55,
263, 264–68n73, 270–77, 284–85,
289, 291–92, 297nn142, 143, 298,
302n152, 304, 309, 310n172,
311n176, 315n188, 316, 318–24,
340–41, 343–53, 357, 360, 365,
370, 371n8, 373n20, 375n26, 376–
77, 389–90, 395–96, 399–400
- Priest Anointed for Battle 261n55,
263n60, 264n60
- Priest Appointed for Battle 254n40,
261, 270, 272, 297n143, 304, 318–
21n206, 323, 377, 399
- prince(s) 160, 162, 204, 246, 280,
287n124, 330, 341, 344n62, 347,
353, 355, 358n95, 360, 370–71n8,
383n49, 400
- Prince of the Congregation 160, 162,
204, 287n124, 353, 358n95, 370–
71n8, 383n49, 400
- prophecy(ies) 91, 92n13, 94, 101–2,
122, 130, 133n153, 143–48, 151,
153–54n238, 156, 161n254, 169,
203–4, 237, 252n36, 258, 274, 392–
93, 395–97, 402
- prophet 101, 203
- psalm(s) 211, 213n103, 291, 297
- Psalm of Return 292–93
- Pseudo-Moses 108
- Ptolemaic 132, 135n163, 151
- Ptolemies 129, 148n215, 162n254
- Ptolemy Lathyrus 134n159, 160,
161n254, 162
- Qumran 34, 39, 41, 53, 109, 111, 114–
15, 120–21, 136, 139, 149,
151n230, 152–53, 156, 163n258,
165, 198, 207, 209, 211, 213n103,
219n119, 237, 274, 331, 338, 340,
354, 362, 386, 393
- Qumran community 40, 115, 123, 160,
354
- Qumran corpus 17, 124, 167, 209, 223,
241, 243, 355, 363
- Qumran library 109
- Qumran scrolls 10, 44n8, 45n11, 119,
131, 136, 162, 250, 364, 394
- Qumran sect 105, 109–11, 113, 116n86,
121–22, 137, 153, 181, 232, 327,
358
- Qumran sectarian texts 142, 144, 214,
393
- Qumran settlement 163
- Qumran texts 114, 143, 198, 207, 235,
341, 354, 357, 359n102, 400
- Qumranites 111–13, 117, 120, 123,
135, 137n172, 138, 154, 155n243,
157–58, 160, 184, 232, 234, 244,
263n60, 264, 268–70, 273, 352,
362n107, 389–90
- Rabbath Ammon 108
- Rabbi Akiva 141
- Rabbinic literature 46n16, 227, 231,
268, 319
- rabbinical 226, 230, 247–49, 264n61,
268, 319, 331n15
- rabbis 263, 268–69n76, 271, 273, 321,
396
- Rav Yoseph 199
- recension(s) 1–2, 6, 20, 24–26, 33–34,
37–39, 41n97, 54, 60–61, 64, 68–
71, 86, 90, 142n191, 206, 215, 353,
368–70, 372–74, 378, 380, 382–83,
391–92, 399
- Red Sea 200
- redaction 37, 145n204, 175n17, 236–
37, 305, 367, 380n41
- redactional 170n1, 175, 237, 368n1,
384n51
- redactor 2, 6, 170n1, 175, 227, 276,
282, 300, 303, 368, 374n22,
387n60, 390, 398
- remnant(s) 204n81, 239, 294–96n140,
315, 333n23, 334
- Republic 136
- reserves 119, 242, 252–53, 272n83,
307n164, 312, 323–24, 371n8, 374,
377
- retirement 328

- reversal(s) 240, 254, 301–2, 307, 312, 317, 377, 385–86
 revolt 102, 166–68
 riders 87
 righteous 208, 211
 righteousness 67, 98, 108, 170, 212, 339
 rod 210–13
 Roman(s) 40, 128–29, 132–33, 135–39, 145, 146n210, 148–49, 150n222, 151, 153n238, 154n238, 155n243, 157–58, 161n254, 162n254, 212n101, 343n60, 344, 346, 352, 384n52, 386–90n66, 393, 401–2
 Roman Republic 136
 Rome 134, 136, 138n174, 151, 154n238, 158
 rule 93n14, 100, 129, 131, 203, 211, 212n101, 213–14, 238, 240, 295–96, 333n22, 366, 387n60
 rule(s) 20, 34, 46, 52, 53–54n33, 64, 78, 118, 209, 215, 224, 245, 247, 254, 255n45, 284–85, 292, 299, 322, 329, 331, 341, 352, 369, 373, 377, 381, 384, 389, 390n63, 400
 ruler(s) 155n243, 166, 167n279, 169n288, 212, 335, 366, 396

 Sabbath(s) 171, 216, 306n160, 357, 369
 sabbatical 175–78, 180–83, 202, 205–6, 233n160, 236, 239, 382n47, 395
 sacrifice(s) 116–17, 168n286, 174, 214, 216, 220–21, 225, 226n133, 230, 234, 369, 395
 Sages 231
 Salu 104
 Samaritan 104, 109–10, 120
 Samaritan Pentateuch 144, 149, 153n235
 Samaritans 109–10
 Saul 173
 scepter 140
 scribe(s) 8, 24n40, 27n56, 28, 30n67, 42, 44–45, 48n23, 50–52, 53n30, 54, 56n39, 60–61, 64–65n49, 67, 69, 116n88, 392
 script(s) 11, 17, 20, 23–24, 28n58, 29, 31
 Scripture 154n238, 259, 298n147

 scroll(s) 3, 5–6, 8–13, 15–17, 20, 25–27, 31n70, 39–40, 42, 43n3, 44–46, 48n22, 49n24, 57, 60, 68, 71–73, 77, 80–82, 86, 88, 96n27, 97, 100, 103, 107, 113, 115, 116n88, 118–19, 121n103, 126, 130–31, 135n161, 162, 170, 173n12, 204, 214, 219, 229, 235n171, 242, 245, 246n18, 250, 255n44, 276n96, 305, 312, 318, 323–24, 340, 343n60, 344n62, 346, 349, 352, 354–55, 359n102, 363–364, 366–367, 368n1, 373n17, 382, 384, 391, 394, 398, 400
 sea 3, 5, 9, 15n14, 17, 40n96, 42, 43n3, 45, 60n43, 92, 95, 103, 115, 116n88, 118, 134, 137, 139, 157, 161n254, 173n12, 188n38, 194n59, 200, 235n171, 242, 246n18, 276n96, 340, 353, 355, 361n105, 393
 Sea Peoples 134n155
 sect 5, 39, 105, 109–13n78, 115, 116n86, 120–22, 136–37, 146n210, 153, 159n247, 163–65, 202, 214n105, 232, 235, 247, 263, 296n140, 320, 328, 331–35, 337, 343, 357–59, 360n103, 361, 363–65n120, 370, 400
 sectarian 40, 103, 105, 108–09, 112, 115, 118–23, 126, 132, 134n159, 138–39, 142, 144, 152, 164, 167, 207, 209, 211, 214, 245n16, 246n18, 274, 279n107, 280n111, 324–25, 328, 331–35, 353, 356, 359n102, 361–63, 393, 400
 sectarian(s) 34, 40, 110, 113–14, 122–24, 127, 131, 135–36, 153, 156, 158, 159n247, 163n258, 164, 169, 181, 204, 232, 236, 238, 263, 265, 269n76, 306n161, 327, 328nn5, 6, 337–38, 341, 343, 354–60, 361n104, 365n120, 366, 384, 388–89, 394–96, 400, 402
 seed 366
 Seleucid(s) 128–29, 131–32, 134, 135n163, 137, 139, 145, 148n215, 150–51, 153–57, 157–58n247,

- 161n254, 162n254, 163, 166–67,
169, 196, 202–3, 387–89, 393–94
- Sennacherib 130, 161n254, 162
- sense division(s) 42–43, 44–45n9, 46–
53n32, 55–57, 60–61, 64–73, 77–
82, 86, 88n3, 215, 221, 275, 277–
78, 282, 286n123, 288n128,
294n137, 392
- Septuagint 134n159, 143n194, 144,
146n210, 147, 149, 152, 153n235,
154n238, 191
- Serekh 46n18, 245n14
- service 10n3, 171–72, 177, 180–82,
206, 215, 226–27, 230, 232, 234–
35, 329–30, 340, 345, 355
- Shechem 104
- Shem 171, 184–86, 188–89, 191–202,
241–42, 388
- Shemhazai 199
- ship(s) 133, 143–44, 148–51n230,
152nn232–33, 153n235, 154n238,
157, 162n254
- Simon Maccabeus 167n279
- sin(s) 107, 198, 371n8
- sinner(s) 199, 212
- skirmishers 78, 80, 87, 253–54,
307n164, 309, 313, 317, 325, 329,
343, 399
- slain 244, 252n32, 291, 293, 307–10,
313, 314n187, 316n192, 317n192,
346, 377n33, 382n46, 385, 398
- sling(s) 313, 325
- snow 210
- solar calendar 127, 230, 232
- solar year 232–33
- soldier(s) 35, 36n85, 86–87, 139, 176,
215, 235, 241, 248, 253, 259, 261–
67, 271, 273, 298, 301–2, 304,
311n176, 312–13, 318–22, 328–30,
345, 349, 351, 363, 377n33, 400
- son(s) 114, 118–20, 125, 184–85, 188–
89, 191–93, 195, 197–98, 200–1
- son(s) of Aaron 224–25, 341, 345
- son(s) of Ammon 94, 124n108, 125
- son(s) of Aram 190, 191–92, 194, 197
- son(s) of Arpchshad 190
- son(s) of Asshur 190
- son(s) of Assyria 87, 242
- son(s) of Benjamin 86, 103, 114–15,
118, 120–24, 165, 174
- Sons of Darkness 10, 77, 86, 91n8, 96–
97, 99–100, 103, 114, 122, 124,
158–59, 177n22, 245, 250, 276n94,
277, 288n126, 293–94n138, 316–
17n192, 387, 394
- son(s) of Elam 190
- son(s) of Ham 171, 184, 188, 200, 241
- son(s) of Ishmael 184, 190, 192nn52,
54, 199, 200–1
- son(s) of Israel 115, 354n87
- son(s) of Jacob 106–7, 340
- son(s) of Japheth 87, 171, 184, 188,
196, 240–42, 285, 388n61
- son(s) of Jawan 128
- son(s) of Joseph 114n79, 116n88
- son(s) of Judah 86, 103, 114–15, 118,
120–24, 165, 174
- son(s) of the Kadmonites 190n47
- son(s) of Keturah 184, 190, 192nn52,
54, 199–201
- son(s) of Kohath 116
- son(s) of Kittim 87
- son(s) of Levi 86, 103, 118–24, 165,
174, 341
- son(s) of Levites 116
- Sons of Light 10–11, 86, 89, 93–101,
103, 110–14, 119, 121–24, 127,
159, 161n254, 162–64, 168–71,
174, 201, 204–05, 208, 212–14,
236–38, 240, 242, 244–45, 248–49,
252nn32, 34, 253, 277, 280n110,
281n113, 283, 287, 289, 292–93,
295, 301–2, 304, 307, 315–18, 320–
21, 324–25, 337, 339, 365–66,
371n8, 376–377, 378n37, 379n39,
385–87n60, 394–95, 398
- son(s) of Lud 190
- son(s) of Madai 188
- son(s) of Noah 343, 388
- son(s) of Persia 190n47
- son(s) of Reuben 114n79
- son(s) of righteousness 98, 170, 339
- son(s) of Salu 104
- son(s) of Shem 171, 184–86, 188–89,
192, 196, 200–2, 241–42
- son(s) of Zadok 341
- song 278–79

- speech(es) 35–36, 57, 65, 79, 87, 119, 162, 254–55, 258–61n55, 262n55, 264, 266–69, 271–73, 278, 297–98, 300–302, 311n176, 312, 314, 316, 318, 319–22, 346–48, 371n8, 374, 375n26, 376–78, 385, 390
- spoil 281
- spouter of lies 357
- stars 98, 140–41, 153
- Suetonius 141
- sword 97, 130, 198–99, 210–11, 244, 291, 301
- Syria 101, 131–32, 144, 146, 156, 163, 191, 192n53, 195–97, 203
- Syrian(s) 133, 191
- tabernacle 224
- Table of Nations 171, 183–86, 188, 190n45, 194–201n75, 221, 237, 367, 395
- Tacitus 141
- Tamid* 216n110, 221, 226, 369
- Targum(im) 134n159, 138n174, 144, 146n210, 154n238
- Taurus 193, 195
- Teacher of Righteousness 158n247, 360
- temple 77, 104–5, 109, 111, 116, 126–27, 158n247, 168, 173n12, 174–76, 205–8, 211, 213–17, 219–21, 224–28, 230–41, 247, 283, 318, 323–24, 332, 335, 342–43, 345, 348, 366, 369, 371, 376, 379, 380n39, 381, 395, 399, 401
- tent 80, 106
- Tigris 193, 196, 203
- Toger 190
- toponym(s) 188, 190–92
- Torah 361, 365n120
- Transjordan 201
- tribe(s) 86, 103, 105–7, 109–18, 120–22, 124, 140n183, 169–70, 176–77, 199, 204–7, 212–13, 216–17, 219, 222–23, 225, 229, 236, 238, 240, 245–46, 249, 253, 280–81, 325, 329, 330, 333n23, 336–37, 340, 344–45, 347, 354, 363–64, 366, 376–77, 393–96, 400
- tribulation(s) 92, 96, 202, 208, 240, 242–43, 248, 387n60
- trumpet(s) 26, 37n86, 54–55, 57, 77–78, 87, 99, 244n12, 246, 252n31, 253n38, 259, 285, 305–14n187, 318, 325, 343–44, 346–48, 349n74, 369–70, 377n33, 398–400
- Uz 190
- variant(s) 23, 24n40, 25n48, 26, 28, 33, 39, 61, 64, 66–67, 105n61, 126, 215, 228n144, 260n54, 272, 278–79, 281n113, 330n10, 372, 374, 397
- Varro 352
- Vulgate 133n150, 134n159, 144, 146n210, 154n238
- War against the Kittim 97, 119, 134n159, 160, 162n254, 175, 177–78, 183, 201–3, 205–7, 214, 215n209, 237–38, 240–55, 268–70, 273–74, 276–77, 280–82, 284–86, 290, 292–96, 298–300, 302–6, 312, 314, 315n190, 317–18, 323–26, 339, 365–67, 369–70, 372, 376–77n33, 378–86, 388–90, 394, 396–401
- War of the Divisions 54, 171–72, 176–78, 180, 182–83, 200–205, 207n88, 214–15n109, 221, 231, 235, 238, 241, 245–55, 268–71n79, 274–76, 279–83, 286, 290, 292–96, 298–300, 302–4, 312–13, 315n188, 190, 320–26, 338, 352, 363, 365–68, 370–71, 376, 377n33, 378–84, 387n60, 388–89, 394–401
- warrior(s) 138–39, 157, 223
- weapons 173, 176, 313, 325, 329, 344, 349–51n75
- weaponry 11, 57, 87, 313, 325–26, 344, 351n75, 385n55, 400
- week(s) 115, 119, 178, 183, 226, 230, 232–33n160
- wilderness 43, 95, 103, 110–11, 127, 159–60, 161n254, 162–65, 168, 190, 192, 196, 208, 212, 246, 264, 324–25, 333–34, 358n95, 362, 394–95
- wisdom 212
- wise 297, 373, 375, 383

- woman(en) 247–49n25, 329, 361
 wood 106, 116–17n90
 world 10, 98, 106, 128, 134, 148, 151,
 155–58, 167n277, 170, 175, 184,
 186, 188–89, 197–98, 200–202,
 211, 236–37, 250, 275, 277, 336,
 339–40, 366–67, 387n60, 388–89,
 395
- Yahad* 209, 329, 333–34, 338, 341,
 354–56, 359–61, 362n107, 363
 Yahweh 203
 year(s) 42, 87, 124, 137, 161, 170–72,
 174–78n24, 180–85, 190, 199–202,
 205–6n85, 216, 230n151, 232–
 33n160, 236, 238–41, 243, 247n19,
 251, 275, 277, 325, 329, 332–33,
 335–36, 339, 343, 366, 368,
 382n47, 388, 391, 394–95
- Yoseph 199
- Zadok 341
 Zagros 193
 ziaḥ 45
 Zimri 104
 Zion 106–7, 112, 208, 251, 280

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN TEXTS

Arad Ostraca, 134nn157–58, 138, 146

HEBREW BIBLE

- Genesis, 191–92
 ch. 10, 184–86, 190n45, 192, 197, 201
 10:1, 189
 10:1–32, 183
 10:2–4, 129n137
 10:2–29, 189
 10:4, 128, 134n157, 196
 10:5, 134n158
 10:7, 200
 10:22, 196
 10:22–23, 171, 175, 186, 189–91
 14:8, 173
 15:7, 194
 15:19, 192, 196
 17:9, 193
 19:36–38, 201
 22:21, 191
 ch. 25, 184n28, 200
 25:3, 199
 25:6, 200
 25:18, 200
 ch. 36, 201
 49:9, 204
- Exodus
 6:25, 229
 17:8–5, 279n104
 19:10–15, 342
 34:28, 224n129
- Leviticus
 16:1, 118
- Numbers, 149n221
 10:9, 259, 273
 14:33–34, 333n22
 23:3, 221
 ch. 24, 139–40, 142, 151–53n235, 157, 393
 24:14, 140
 24:15–19, 139–40, 142–43
 24:15–24, 139, 146
 24:17, 140n182, 141
 24:17–19, 274, 397
 24:23–24, 133, 140
 24:24, 133–34, 143, 145–47n214, 148–49n217, 150–52n233, 153n235, 154, 155–57, 393
 25:14, 104
 28:10, 221
 31:8, 104
 31:26, 216, 229
 32:13, 333n22
 32:28, 229
- Deuteronomy, 260
 ch. 20, 260–61, 263, 265–68, 273
 20:2, 260–61, 263n60, 267, 272, 319–20, 396
 20:2–4, 259–62, 263n60, 264n61, 265–66, 269–70, 272–73, 320–21, 396
 20:2–8, 249n26, 261n55, 264n61, 267, 269, 271, 273, 321n207, 396
 20:2–9, 247
 20:3, 320

- 20:3–4, 260, 261n55, 263–64n60,
268, 271, 301, 319, 321
20:4–7, 269
20:4–8, 269
20:5–7, 261n55, 263n60, 268n73
20:5–8, 261–65, 267–69, 271, 273–74
20:8, 259, 261n55, 262, 265, 268n73,
270–71
23:10–15, 247, 259n51
24:5, 247
- Joshua
ch. 6, 347n72
ch. 10, 243n8
21:1, 229
24:2–3, 144
- Judges
20:20, 173, 173 n8
20:22, 173n8, 173n10
- 1 Samuel
ch. 17, 104, 173, 249n25
17:2, 173n8
17:8, 173n8
- 2 Samuel
10:8, 173n8
10:8–9, 173n9
- 2 Kings
17:16–20, 107
17:19, 107
19:35, 101, 130
24:2, 124
- Isaiah
10:22–11:4, 159
10:24–27, 159, 162
10:28–32, 161n254
10:34, 160
10:34–11:1, 160
11:14, 93n14, 124–26, 131, 158
21:11–15, 159n248
ch. 23, 393
23:1, 134n158, 143, 146, 150
32:12, 134n158, 143, 146, 150
23:12–13, 133, 151–53n235
23:13, 144n200, 151, 154n238
- 31:8, 97, 130–31, 203, 326n216
31:18, 244, 274, 394
33:21, 140n200, 151, 154n238
34:8, 251
52:9, 163
61:2, 251
63:4, 251
66:19, 186n34
- Jeremiah
2:10, 128, 143, 146, 150
6:23, 173n8
9:25, 125
25:21, 125
25:26, 166, 167
46:3, 173
46:10, 251
50:42, 173n8
- Ezekiel
11:17, 209n95
20:35, 108, 162–3
21:26, 107–8
27:6, 128, 133n151, 134, 143, 146,
154n238
27:10, 150
30:9, 144n200, 151–52n232
32:22, 150n226
chs. 38–39, 176n20, 275, 305, 324,
326, 389, 398, 401–2
38:5–6, 275
38:7, 276
38:8, 275
38:12, 198
38:15, 275, 281n113
38:16, 275, 281
38:18–19, 275
38:21, 275
38:22, 275
38:23, 275n93
39:4, 275
39:9, 176
- Hosea
5:5, 107n64
6:10, 107n64
- Joel
2:5, 173

- Amos
8:11, 166
- Micah
ch. 5, 305
5:4–5, 130–1, 203, 326n216, 394
5:4–7, 138, 394–96
5:6–7, 203n80
5:7, 204
- Psalms, 376
83:7–9, 125–26, 175
Ps. 118, 292n132
- Lamentations
2:3, 95
- Esther
8:13, 251
- Daniel, 92nn12–13, 93–95, 98–99, 101–2, 112, 122, 124, 132–33, 139, 145, 148–50, 152–54n238, 155–58, 161n254, 169n288, 392–93
ch. 9, 115, 164
9:27, 131n142
ch. 11, 91, 94, 98–102, 122, 125–26, 130–32, 137–38, 145, 148–52, 153–54nn235, 238, 156, 158, 169, 242, 305, 326, 382, 384, 387, 389, 392–93, 398, 402
ch. 11–12, 91, 99, 101, 102n45
11:10, 131n142
11:17, 131n142
11:30, 133, 134n159, 140n193, 144, 146n210, 149nn217, 221, 150, 152n233, 156–57, 393
11:32, 125, 149, 165, 167
11:36, 131n142
11:40, 91, 131n142
11:40–41, 93
11:40–45, 95, 100–1, 132, 178n24, 387n60, 392
11:40–12:3, 89–92, 98–99, 101, 161n254, 252n36
11:41, 93, 125
11:42, 93n14, 95
11:42–44, 94
11:44, 94–96, 99, 132
- 11:44–45, 339
11:45, 90, 95, 130–31, 161n254
ch. 12, 95
12:1, 96–97, 101, 242n5, 244, 387n60
12:1–3, 95, 101
12:2, 123
12:3, 98
- Ezra, 342n58,
1:5, 229
3:2, 229
6:22, 131n143, 133, 147n212, 156
- Nehemiah
8:13, 229
10:35, 117
10:39, 224n129
ch. 12, 226n134
- 1 Chronicles
ch. 1, 185, 192, 201
1:5–33, 184
1:7, 128, 134n157, 134n159,
1:17, 186, 191n48
1:29–33, 184n28, 192n54
12:9, 173n11
12:34, 173n8
12:34–37, 173n11
12:36–37, 173n8
18:11, 125
19:9, 173nn8–9
19:17, 173n8
chs. 23–26, 226n134
23:4, 341n53
24:6, 229
24:31, 229
- 2 Chronicles
13:3, 173
14:9, 173n8
19:8, 229
ch. 20, 203n78
23:2, 229
23:4–8, 226n135
34:12, 341n53

APOCRYPHA

- 1 Esdras
 2:17, 191n51
 2:24, 191n51
 2:27, 191n51
 1:1, 186
 Judith, 186
- 1 Maccabees, 92n13, 138, 145–48, 152–
 53n235, 154n238, 155–57, 393
 1:1, 133–34n156, 138, 144, 146n210,
 148
 1:10, 155n243
 2:29, 163
 ch. 3, 247–48n23, 273n86
- 3:45, 163
 3:56, 247
 4:24, 292n132
 5:1–68, 126
 6:2, 155n243
 8:5, 134n156, 138, 144, 146n210, 148
 8:18, 155n243
 9:6, 243n7, 267n72
 9:23, 159n247
- Sirach
 51:12, 213n103

NEW TESTAMENT

- Matthew
 2:2, 141

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

- 1 Enoch*, 119, 141n190, 210n98
 chs. 85–90 (*Animal Apocalypse*),
 141n190, 209, 210n97, 211, 213,
 238, 396
- Book of Giants*, 199
- Book of Noah*, 186
- Jubilees*, 127, 138–39, 145–46, 152–53,
 157, 182n26, 184–86, 188n38, 189,
 191–201, 395
 chs. 8–9, 186
 8:12–16, 188
 8:17–21, 198n65
 8:22, 188
 8:25–28, 188
 8:30, 198n65
 9:1, 198n65
 9:1–13, 188–89
 9:2–6, 193, 195
 9:15, 198
- 10:35–36, 197
 14:18, 196
 17:7–19, 198n65
 20:12–13, 200
 24:28, 139
 24:28–29, 134nn156–57, 138, 144–45
 chs 37–38, 125n109, 126
 37:10, 134nn156–57, 138, 144–47
 37:14–15, 139
- Prayer of Enosh*, 27
- Psalms of Solomon*, 142, 211, 393, 396
 Ps. 17, 211
 17:2, 141, 238
- Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*,
 140, 142n191
T. Judah, 24:1–6 140
T. Levi, 18:3 140

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

- CD (*Damascus Document*), 27, 34,
 53n32, 142n191, 154n239, 162–65,
 288n126, 327, 333–34, 357–63, 400
 1:23, 360
 3:14, 364n116
 7:6, 362
 7:6–7, 361
 7:18–21, 140
 7:20–21, 360
 8:11, 155n243
 8:13, 357
 10:2, 279n107
 10:4–8, 361
 10:5–10, 329n9
 12:19, 53n32
 12:23, 362
 13:7, 362
 13:10, 362
 13:20, 362
 14:3, 362
 14:5–7, 329n9
 14:9, 362
 14:10, 361
 14:12, 53n32
 15:4, 375n30
 15:5, 364n117
 15:6, 279n107
 15:8, 279n107
 16:1, 364n117, 375n30
 19:2, 362
 19:11–13, 24n40
 19:14, 155n243
 20:2, 354
- 1QIsa^a (*Isaiah^a*), 11n4, 55n38
- 1QIsa^b (*Isaiah^b*), 11n4
- 1QpHab (*Peshar Habakkuk*), 11n4,
 56n39, 134–37, 138n176, 386, 388,
 393, 401
 5:4, 335
 5:4–5, 202
 5:12, 357
 7:12, 96n24
 9:4–5, 168n285
 10:10, 357
- 11:22, 356
 12:7–9, 168n285
- 1QpPs (*Peshar Psalms*) 138n173
 frgs. 9–10:1, 241n3
- 1QapGen ar (*Genesis Apocryphon*),
 11n4, 44n8, 184–86nn35, 36, 38,
 188n38, 189, 191–201n75, 395
 cols. 16–17, 186
 16:9–11, 188
 16:14–20, 188
 col. 17, 188
 17:6–7, 193
 17:10, 193
 17:10–14, 195
 17:12, 194n59
 17:12–14, 193
- 1QDM (*Words of Moses*), 358
 frg. 1 i:2, 357
 frg. 1 i:7–8, 24n40
- 1QS (*Rule of the Community*), 11n4,
 24n40, 34, 45n13, 70n60, 250–51,
 287n124, 327, 332–34, 336–37,
 359n101, 361–62
 5:1, 54, 356
 5:1–2, 24n40
 5:8–9, 24n40
 5:20, 354
 6:1–8, 362n108
 6:8, 54
 6:25, 361
 9:23, 202, 250, 335
 10:19, 250
 10:19–20, 202, 335
- 1QSa (*Rule of the Congregation*), 7,
 118, 327n11, 336–37, 340, 354, 365,
 400
 1:1, 54
 1:6, 54, 357
 1:6–7, 24n40
 1:9, 279n107, 354
 1:12, 329
 1:12–13, 357

- 1:14–15, 329
 1:16–17, 357
 1:19, 329
 1:19–20, 357
 1:22, 118
 1:23, 345n64
 1:23–25, 216, 235–36, 357
 1:25–27, 235
 1:26, 235, 337–38
 1:28, 357
 2:1, 235
 2:4–8, 331
 2:5, 357
 2:7, 357
 2:8, 354
 2:12–13, 225n131
 2:16, 357
 2:21, 354, 359
- 1QSb (*Rule of the Benedictions*), 204,
 287n124, 327–28, 331n16, 333n23,
 358, 384, 400
 3:3, 357
 5:20, 357
 5:24–29, 287n124
 5:27–28, 140
- 1Q29 (*Apocryphon of Moses^{b?}*)
 frgs. 3–4:3, 364n118
- 1QM (*War Scroll*)
 col. 1, 2, 6, 24–25, 35, 77, 86–88, 90–
 91nn8, 11, 93, 94n18, 95n21, 97–
 99, 101–2n45, 112, 126, 130, 132,
 136, 158, 169–70, 172, 174–75,
 177–78, 180, 183, 196, 201–5,
 207n88, 208, 211, 213–14, 216,
 222, 236–38, 240–44, 246, 250,
 252n31, 255, 274, 276, 277, 283,
 292, 295–96, 301–2, 305, 312,
 316n191, 317n192, 323–24, 326,
 336–39, 343, 352, 365–70, 372–73,
 375, 376–77n33, 379–88, 391–92,
 394–98, 401
 cols. 1–2, 292, 352, 366, 373, 383,
 401
 cols. 1–3, 25
 cols. 1–4, 370
- cols. 1–9, 246n18, 277, 368, 375n26,
 377n33, 381–85, 401
 1:1, 100, 125, 170, 208, 242, 277
 1:1–2, 94, 124, 126, 131, 201, 276
 1:1–3, 94n18, 99
 1:1–7, 94n18, 95–96, 386
 1:1–15, 91n9, 98
 1:2, 94, 103, 111–13, 122, 125n114,
 164, 208, 212, 246, 393
 1:2–3, 246
 1:3, 95, 110, 127, 129, 161n254, 162,
 168, 208, 378n37, 394
 1:3–6, 88, 159
 1:4, 94–95, 99–100, 132, 167, 242,
 339
 1:4–5, 95, 99, 122, 248
 1:4–7, 99–100
 1:4–2:14, 26
 1:5, 91, 94, 123–24, 246n18
 1:5–6, 168n286, 295
 1:5–7, 170, 242, 295
 1:6, 95, 97, 129, 239, 295, 388n61
 1:6–7, 99
 1:7, 67, 77, 91n8
 1:7–9:9, 307n162
 1:8, 67, 98, 100, 170, 203, 239, 302,
 332, 339
 1:8–9, 336, 339, 386, 387n60
 1:8–11, 94n18
 1:8–15, 95
 1:9, 97, 183, 243, 387
 1:9–12, 386, 394
 1:9–15, 386
 1:10, 97, 183, 243, 280n110, 387
 1:10–11, 244
 1:11, 97, 183, 243, 250
 1:11–12, 94n18, 101, 202, 208
 1:12, 96–98, 178, 183, 238, 242–44,
 248, 250, 290, 296, 394
 1:12–13, 98
 1:12–15, 94n18, 386
 1:13, 242, 248, 302, 312, 315–17, 387
 1:13–14, 96, 399
 1:13–15, 386
 1:14, 208, 211, 244
 1:14–15, 97, 317
 1:15, 67, 77
 1:15–16, 244
 1:16–E, 97n28

- 1:E, 77
 1:E-2:3, 23
 col. 2, 6, 30n68, 35, 37, 55, 66n50,
 77, 86-7, 115, 124, 127, 161n254,
 168, 170-78, 180, 182-83, 196,
 201-5, 207-8, 213, 215-16, 222,
 227n144, 228, 229n150, 230-38,
 240, 242, 244, 246-48, 250, 255,
 271n79, 277n97, 293, 301, 318,
 323-24, 326, 336-37, 349n74, 365,
 367, 368n1, 371, 388, 391-92, 394-
 96, 399
 cols. 2-5, 363
 cols. 2-9, 2, 245, 246n18, 287n124,
 365, 368-69, 387n60
 cols. 2-13, 30nn67-68
 cols. 2-14, 337, 365
 2:1, 217n114, 224, 228-29, 231, 233,
 357
 2:1-2, 35, 38n91, 60n44, 217, 221-
 22, 230
 2:1-3, 23, 66, 205
 2:1-6, 174, 215-16, 233-34
 2:1-10, 77
 2:2, 127n125, 221, 230, 234
 2:2-3, 217, 222, 226n133, 230, 342,
 348
 2:3, 216n111, 229-30, 234, 357, 364
 2:3-4, 217, 230
 2:4, 206, 230
 2:5, 173n12, 205, 219-20
 2:6, 170, 174-78, 180-83, 205-6,
 220, 329, 394
 2:6-8, 177, 249
 2:6-10, 171
 2:6-14, 182, 211
 2:6-E, 174
 2:7, 170, 176, 204, 216n111, 249,
 275, 296, 329, 338, 348, 357, 364
 2:7-8, 171, 177, 248, 280n108
 2:8, 176, 181, 182n26, 235, 296, 329,
 337-38
 2:8-9, 171, 176
 2:9, 54, 171-72, 174-75, 177, 180,
 182-83, 205, 357, 394
 2:9-10, 38n91, 172, 181, 394
 2:9-14, 180
 2:10, 54, 77, 171, 176-78, 180-81,
 182n26, 183, 192, 239, 250, 394
 2:10-13, 184, 190
 2:10-14, 171, 181, 189, 202, 338
 2:10-15, 388
 2:11, 192, 194, 196
 2:12, 192, 242
 2:13-4:E, 349
 2:14, 388n61
 2:15, 77
 2:16, 280n108
 2:16-3:11, 344
 2:16-7:7, 245, 344
 2:E, 77
 2:E-3:11, 259n52, 305, 348
 col. 3, 44, 54, 87, 207, 306, 308, 312
 cols. 3-6, 370
 cols. 3-7, 326
 cols. 3-9, 247, 249-51, 254-55, 292,
 299, 301-2, 304-5, 323-25, 337,
 367, 368n1, 376, 396, 398
 cols 3-14, 245, 254n43, 261, 314,
 320, 322-23, 397
 cols. 3-19, 398
 3:1, 308, 312
 3:1-2, 306
 3:1-10, 77
 3:2, 306, 308, 357
 3:2-5, 306
 3:3, 309
 3:4, 216n111, 247, 348, 357
 3:6, 250, 308
 3:6-11, 306
 3:7, 312
 3:7-8, 308
 3:8, 244n12, 306, 308-9, 377n33
 3:9, 54, 250
 3:10, 54, 77, 308
 3:10-11, 207, 283, 306
 3:11, 246, 357
 3:12, 69, 78
 3:13, 124, 245, 246n18, 280, 357
 3:13-4:E, 245, 344, 350
 3:14, 245-46, 344, 347, 364
 3:14-4:5, 330
 3:15, 246
 3:16, 330n13, 347
 3:17, 330n13
 3:E-4:5, 345
 col. 4, 53, 57
 4:1-2, 286n122

- 4:2, 287n124, 295
 4:8, 53–54
 4:9, 54, 78, 357–58
 4:10, 246, 364
 4:12, 250
 4:15, 245, 280, 357
 4:15–5:2, 330
 4:17, 54, 78
 col. 5, 57n41, 246, 313
 cols. 5–9, 373, 375
 cols. 5–17, 373
 5:1, 112, 246, 280, 344n62, 347, 357,
 370n7
 5:1–2, 344n62, 364
 5:2, 78, 246
 5:3, 78
 5:3–6:6, 313, 349
 5:3–6:E, 351
 5:7–10, 351
 5:14, 78
 5:15, 78, 351
 5:16, 292n134, 322
 5:16–17, 20
 col. 6, 57, 313n179, 325
 6:1–4, 313
 6:2–3, 351
 6:4–6, 313
 6:6, 250
 6:8–17, 87, 351
 6:8–18, 253
 6:8–E, 349
 6:10–11, 253
 6:11, 246
 6:14, 329
 6:18, 78
 6:E–7:7, 259n52
 col. 7, 57n42, 87, 215n109, 247–49,
 269n76, 312–314, 317n 193, 322,
 349, 396
 cols. 7–9, 251–54, 308, 311–14,
 315n190, 317, 322, 326, 368n1,
 369, 385, 399
 cols. 7–14, 283n118
 7:1, 266, 329
 7:1–7, 349
 7:1–E, 79
 7:2, 176n20
 7:3, 173n12, 248, 329
 7:3–4, 246, 248, 283
 7:3–5, 329
 7:3–7, 20
 7:4, 248
 7:4–5, 249n25
 7:5, 250
 7:6, 249, 329
 7:6–7, 71
 7:7–9, 23
 7:7–9:9, 23
 7:7–9:E, 346n68
 7:9, 322
 7:9–12, 345n64
 7:9–9:9, 385
 7:9–9:E, 245, 251, 345
 7:9–14:E, 318
 7:10–11, 71, 234n163
 7:10–12, 345, 349
 7:12, 264n63, 267, 270–73, 304,
 319–21, 399
 7:12–18, 349
 7:13, 305–6, 308, 312
 7:13–15, 348
 7:13–9:9, 259n52
 7:14, 266, 342, 348
 7:14–9:E, 308
 7:15, 312–13
 7:15–9:7, 314n185
 7:15–9:9, 305
 7:16, 266, 314, 342, 348
 7:16–17, 343
 7:17, 71, 307
 col. 8, 252n32, 307, 313–14, 317n193
 cols. 8–9, 325
 8:1, 325
 8:1–3, 314n186
 8:2, 307–8, 313n180
 8:2–17, 313
 8:3, 307, 312–13
 8:4, 253, 307n164
 8:5, 308
 8:6, 310n171
 8:7, 309
 8:8, 252n34
 8:9, 309, 343, 348
 8:9–11, 348
 8:10–11, 325
 8:11, 252n34, 314
 8:11–12, 309
 8:12, 309

- 8:12–13, 313
 8:13, 308, 313n180
 8:14, 313, 315n188
 8:14–17, 307n167
 8:14–E, 314n186
 8:16–17, 313
 8:17, 313
 8:18, 254n40
 col 9, 79, 259, 260n53, 297, 300, 303,
 306, 314n186, 319, 369–70
 9:1, 314
 9:1–2, 309, 313
 9:2, 293
 9:3, 307, 311n176, 312
 9:3–6, 292
 9:3–7, 313
 9:4, 307n164
 9:5, 253
 9:5–9, 38n91
 9:6, 307, 311n176
 9:7, 253
 9:7–8, 353
 9:7–9, 346
 9:9, 250
 9:10, 24n40, 173
 9:10–E, 349, 351
 9:15–16, 244n13, 351
 9:17, 253, 306
 9:E, 79
 9:E–10:8, 259, 274
 9:E–11:12, 258, 270, 273, 296, 303,
 321, 371n8, 372, 390n63, 396
 9:E–12:5, 249n26, 258, 278, 301
 9:E–12:E, 297, 302n152, 321n205
 9:E–14:E, 283
 9:E–14:E, 245, 259n53
 col 10 57, 79, 247n21, 260n53, 266,
 321
 cols. 10–12, 271, 300–1, 303–4,
 305n154, 321
 cols. 10–14, 2, 61n47, 255, 258–61,
 264, 266, 271, 278, 283–84, 287,
 290, 294n138, 297–99, 300n149,
 301–4, 320–22, 324, 326, 368,
 369n3, 370, 380, 382, 384, 389,
 390n63, 396, 398, 401
 cols. 10–19, 326n215, 370, 379n39,
 382, 383n49, 384–85, 389n62, 390,
 401–2
 10:1–2, 259
 10:1–6, 260n53
 10:1–14:E, 346
 10:2, 254n40, 260, 272, 298, 319–20,
 399
 10:2–4, 259, 273
 10:2–5, 298n147
 10:2–6, 265–66, 268–70
 10:3–5, 264n61, 320, 346
 10:5, 298, 348
 10:5–6, 259, 261–62, 264n61, 265–
 66, 268–69
 10:6–8, 259, 273
 10:8–E, 278
 10:8–11:12, 259, 274
 10:9–10, 24, 372
 col 11, 154n239, 255, 259n53
 11:1–12:5, 278
 11:4, 371n8
 11:6–7, 140, 274
 11:8–9, 274
 11:9, 250, 296
 11:11, 129, 241, 274, 397
 11:11–12, 130
 11:13, 275, 397
 11:13–12:5, 258, 275, 296, 321, 397
 11:13–12:E, 303
 11:15–16, 176, 275
 11:16, 276
 col. 12, 38n91, 61, 65, 224, 255, 259–
 60n53, 279–80, 281n113, 282, 284–
 85, 289, 302, 319, 370, 376, 397
 cols. 12–13, 375–76
 12:1, 375, 379n39
 12:5, 359n102
 12:6, 79, 278n102
 12:7, 277, 309
 12:7–16, 79–80, 253n39, 277,
 278n102, 281, 289, 298–99,
 300n149, 321, 390n63, 397
 12:7–E, 258, 278, 282
 12:8–9, 279
 12:8–16, 38n91, 61, 64, 81
 12:9, 176n20, 281
 12:12, 279n106
 12:12–15, 281
 12:13, 112, 279–81
 12:13–16, 278
 12:16, 278n10 2

- 12:17–13:6, 288n126
 12:17–E, 321
 12:E–13:2, 284, 288n126, 289, 293,
 300n149, 397
 12:E–13:3, 288n126, 300n149
 12:E–14:1, 258, 290, 301
 12:E–14:E, 284
 col. 13, 12n10, 285–90, 292n134,
 300–1, 303, 372, 376
 cols. 13–14, 259n53, 283n118, 284,
 290, 295, 297, 299–300, 323, 397–
 98
 13:1, 224, 225n131, 284, 297n146,
 318, 323, 343, 348
 13:1–2, 284–85, 290, 297n144
 13:1–3, 298
 13:2, 382n46
 13:2–3, 284, 286, 289n129, 300n149,
 390n65
 13:2–6, 286–87, 289, 303, 319
 13:2–14:1, 297, 297n144
 13:3–6, 397
 13:4–6, 286, 289n129
 13:4–14:1, 300n149
 13:5, 294n138
 13:7, 287
 13:7–17, 286–87, 299, 303, 372,
 390n64, 397
 13:7–14:1, 287, 303, 397
 13:8, 295, 296n140
 13:8–9, 375, 379n39
 13:9–12, 24, 67, 288n127, 372
 13:10, 79
 13:11, 372
 13:12–13, 289
 13:16, 294n138
 13:17, 79
 13:18, 79
 13:18–14:1, 286, 299, 303, 390n64
 col. 14, 12, 79–80, 291–96, 300, 304,
 306, 322, 377, 381, 401
 cols. 14–17, 20
 14:2, 292–93, 298
 14:2–3, 292
 14:2–4, 290–91, 294, 297n144,
 297n146, 300, 302, 382n46, 397–98
 14:2–15, 79
 14:2–E, 258, 298, 301
 14:3, 292
 14:4, 71, 382n46
 14:4–8, 374
 14:4–15, 294, 374
 14:4–18, 294n137
 14:4–E, 294, 297n144, 398
 14:5, 294, 296
 14:6, 294, 296
 14:8, 294n139, 295
 14:9, 295
 14:10, 296
 14:12, 294n139
 14:16–E, 294, 297, 374
 14:17, 294
 14:18, 79
 14:19, 79
 14:E, 79
 14:E–15:5, 297n143
 14:E–16:1, 278, 301
 col. 15, 30n67, 80, 96n27, 199,
 260n53, 261, 272–73, 321–22, 396
 cols. 15–17, 300, 390n63
 cols. 15–18, 312, 314
 cols. 15–19, 2, 87, 241–45, 251–55,
 258, 266n65, 276–78, 281–82,
 283n118, 284, 289, 294–95, 297–
 305, 311–12, 314, 315n188, 316–
 17n191–92, 318–20, 323, 325–26,
 347, 367–70, 372, 376n33, 377–78,
 381, 382n46, 384, 385n55, 386–88,
 390nn63, 66, 396–99, 401
 15:1, 242–43, 276, 295–96, 397
 15:2, 131, 241, 276, 295
 15:2–3, 242
 15:3, 130, 244, 250
 15:3–17:E, 301
 15:4, 224, 225n131, 254n40, 267,
 272, 343, 348
 15:4–5, 273, 276, 318–19, 321n205
 15:4–6, 270
 15:4–7, 271, 298, 303
 15:4–16:1, 266–67, 273
 15:5, 297n143, 298, 321, 389
 15:5–6, 315n188, 318
 15:5–7, 297n143
 15:6, 272, 319
 15:6–7, 323
 15:6–16:1, 80, 273
 15:6, 71, 80, 267, 318
 15:6–16:1, 296

- 15:7, 318, 382n46
 15:7–E, 346, 348
 15:7–16:1, 266n65, 297n143, 298,
 301, 316, 318n198, 320–21
 15:8, 320
 15:8–9, 321
 15:9, 243
 15:10–11, 276
 15:11, 243n11
 15:12, 243, 377
 15:12–16:1, 271n80
 15:13, 276, 295
 15:15, 250
 col. 16, 87, 252n32, 278, 314, 317n92
 cols. 16–17, 242, 385n56, 386
 cols. 16–18, 314, 315nn188, 190, 316,
 325
 16:1, 97, 264n63, 276, 295
 16:2–10, 385
 16:2–17:9, 278n102
 16:2–17:E, 278
 16:2–18:5, 307n162
 16:3, 53n30, 308
 16:3–9, 316
 16:3–13, 314n187
 16:3–14, 374
 16:3–15, 314n184
 16:3–18:4, 305
 16:3–18:5, 314n185
 16:4, 311
 16:4–5, 309
 16:5, 310n171
 16:6, 252n32, 309, 325n213
 16:7, 343, 348
 16:7–8, 309, 348
 16:8, 252n32, 325n212
 16:9, 45, 69, 71, 309
 16:10, 69, 80
 16:11, 53n30, 294n138, 301, 317
 16:11–12, 272n83
 16:11–13, 311n176
 16:11–14, 297n143
 16:11–17:1, 296
 16:11–17:11, 272n83
 16:11–17:E, 301
 16:12, 307, 307n164, 311, 314n187,
 316, 377n35
 16:13, 254n40, 272n82, 298, 307
 16:13–14, 318
 16:14–17:9, 318n196
 16:15, 382n46
 16:15–E, 346
 16:15–17:3, 266n65, 371n8
 16:15–17:9, 279, 297n143, 298, 301,
 314n185, 316, 320
 16:15–E, 348
 16:16, 317n192
 col. 17, 80, 314n187, 316n192, 317
 cols. 17–19, 87
 17:1–2, 123
 17:1–9, 314n185
 17:2, 119, 371n8
 17:4–9, 266n65
 17:5, 243
 17:6, 296
 17:6–7, 244
 17:10, 272n83, 314n187
 17:10–11, 310n171
 17:10–14, 374
 17:10–15, 316, 385
 17:11, 309
 17:12, 325n213
 17:12–13, 309
 17:13, 343, 348
 17:13–14, 348n73
 17:14, 348n73
 17:14–15, 309
 17:15, 348n73
 17:16, 314, 316–17
 17:16–E, 317
 17:17, 317
 17:E, 80
 17:E–18:5, 288n126, 292
 17:E–18:6, 278, 289–90, 300n149,
 397
 17:E–18:E, 301
 17:E–19:E, 278, 284
 col. 18, 12, 13n14, 15, 80, 242,
 283n118, 285–90, 303, 314n187
 cols. 18–19, 243n8, 283, 289, 297,
 299–300, 397
 18:1, 287–88, 293, 316n191
 18:1–3, 244, 317
 18:1–5, 315n188, 317
 18:1–6, 297n143
 18:2, 129
 18:2–3, 242
 18:3, 287, 316

- 18:3–4, 315
 18:4, 293, 311
 18:5, 243, 293, 343, 348
 18:5–6, 284, 298
 18:5–8, 318
 18:6, 284, 297n146, 382n46
 18:6–8, 284, 286–87, 288n128, 289–
 90, 297n143, 300n149, 318n197,
 390n65
 18:6–19:8, 258, 289, 298
 18:8, 80
 18:8–10, 309
 18:10–11, 243n8
 18:10–E, 288, 290, 303
 18:10–19:8, 287
 18:11, 243, 295–96
 18:12, 243, 288–90, 293
 18:13, 80
 18:E, 80
 18:E–19:8, 253, 278, 284n119, 289,
 298–99, 300n149
 col. 19, 12, 15, 23, 38n91, 61, 80, 88,
 278–80, 281n113, 282, 283n118,
 289, 291–94, 296, 300, 302,
 306n161, 322, 370, 372, 382n46,
 397
 19:1, 281n113
 19:1–8, 38n91, 61, 64, 81, 390n63
 19:1–14, 22, 61
 19:3–4, 289
 19:5, 61n46, 112, 282n117
 19:6, 61n46
 19:8, 65
 19:9, 243n8, 278, 292–93
 19:9–10, 288n126
 19:9–11, 293, 297n146, 300
 19:9–13, 291, 294, 297n143, 302,
 382n46, 397–98
 19:9–1,4 65
 19:9–E, 298, 301
 19:10, 129, 276–77, 292, 295, 397
 19:11, 130, 272n82, 318, 322
 19:11–12, 298
 19:12, 280n109, 348
 19:14–E, 297n143
- 1Q34 (*Festival Prayers^d*), 118
 1Q34bis (*Festival Prayers^b*), 118
- 1QH^a (*Hodayot^a, Thanksgiving Scroll*),
 11n4, 29–30n67, 34, 274, 336–37
 6:4, 335
 6:8, 296n140
- 2Q22 (*Apocryphon of David?*), 105
- 4Q57 (*Isaiah^c*)
 frg. 9 ii:17–18
- 4Q158 (*Reworked Pentateuch^d*),
 frg. 4:3, 364n111
- 4Q159 (*Ordinances^d*)
 frg. 5, 118, 120
 frg. 5:2, 118–20
- 4Q161 (*Peshar Isaiah^d*), 134n159, 136,
 138n173, 160–63, 358, 400
 col. 2, 161n254
 col. 3, 161n254
 frgs. 1, 3–4 iii:7–8, 335
 frg. 3:35, 276n96
 frgs. 4–6:13 161n254
 frg. 5:6, 159n248
 frgs. 5–6:2, 159–60, 162, 358n95
 frgs. 5–6:3, 357
 frgs. 5–6:5–13, 160
 frgs. 5–6:10, 161n254
 frgs. 5–6:11, 161n254
- 4Q162 (*Peshar Isaiah^b*)
 frg. ii:6–7, 168
 frg. ii:10, 168
- 4Q163 (*pap Peshar Isaiah^c*)
 frg. 23 ii:10–11, 168n285
- 4Q164 (*Peshar Isaiah^d*)
 frg. 1:1, 364n118
 frg. 1:3, 358, 359n102
 frg. 1:7, 364
- 4Q169 (*Peshar Nahum*), 134n159, 135–
 388n173, 155n243, 359n102, 393
 frgs. 1–2:8, 359n102, 360n103
 frgs. 3–4 i:2–3, 155n243
 frg. 3–4 i:3, 132
 frgs. 3–4 iii:3, 364n118

- 4Q171 (*Peshar Psalms^d*)
 frgs. 1–2 ii:5, 358
 frgs. 1+3–4 iii:5, 358
 frgs. 1–10 ii:5, 359n102
 frgs. 1–10 ii:9, 358
 frgs. 1–10 iii:5, 359n102
 frgs. 1–10 iii:10, 358
 frgs. 1–10 iv:19, 359
- 4Q174 (*Florilegium*), 208n92
 frgs. 6–7:1, 95n20
- 4Q175 (*Testimonia*), 45n13
 lines 12–13, 140, 142n191
- 4Q177 (*Cantena A*), 207–10, 237, 396
 lines 10–11, 208
 frgs. 12–13 i:10, 168–69n208
- 4Q180 (*Ages of Creation A*)
 frg. 1:4, 53n32
- 4Q181 (*Ages of Creation B*)
 1:2, 354
- 4Q201 (*Enoch^a ar*), 44n8
- 4Q204 (*Enoch^c ar*), 44n9
- 4Q221 (*Jubilees^f*)
 frg. 6:4, 114n79
- 4Q247 (*Peshar on the Apocalypse of Weeks*), 119–20, 134n159, 136, 138n173
 frg. 1:5, 118–20
 frg. 1:6, 241n3
 frg. 1:7, 132n147
- 4Q248 (*Historical Composition B*), 155n243
- 4Q249a (*pap cryptA Serekh ha-Edah^d*), 354n87
 frg. 1:2, 354n87
- 4Q249c (*pap cryptA Serekh ha-Edah^c*)
 line 4, 364n113
- 4Q249g (*pap cryptA Serekh ha-Edah^g*), 209n94
- 4Q254 (*Commentary on Genesis C*)
 frgs. 5–6:3, 364n111
- 4Q265 (*Miscellaneous Rules*), 362n109
- 4Q266 (*Damascus Document^d*),
 frg. 5 i:18, 364n116
 frg. 5 ii:14, 54
 frg. 8 i:9, 357
 frg. 8 iii:4, 357
 frg. 9 ii:5, 53n32
 frg. 10 i:3–4, 357
 frg. 10 i:5, 53n32
- 4Q267 (*Damascus Document^b*)
 frg. 5 iii:6, 357
 frg. 9 iv:10, 357
- 4Q270 (*Damascus Document^e*)
 frg. 6 iv:15, 54
 frg. 6 iv:15–16, 357
 frg. 6 iv:18, 357
 frg. 7 i:14, 357
- 4Q276 (*Tohorot B^a*), 23n37
- 4Q285 (*Sefer haMilhamah*), 27–29, 29n63, 33, 39, 41, 134n159, 136–38n173, 160, 352, 370, 383n49, 392, 400
 1:9, 28
 frg. 1:1, 61n44
 frg. 1:4, 359n102
 frg. 3:4, 353
 frg. 4:2, 160, 364n118, 375n30, 383n49
 frg. 4:4, 353
 frg. 4:5, 242n3
 frg. 4:6, 160, 353
 frg. 4:7, 383n49
 frg. 4:8, 353
 frg. 4:10, 353
 frg. 7:4, 160, 353
 frg. 10:2, 353, 383n49

- 4Q299 (*Mysteries^a*), 357
frg. 76:3, 216n111, 235n167, 357
- 4Q321 (*Calendrical Document Mishmarot B*), 232–33
- 4Q332 (*Historical Text D*), 138n173
- 4Q365 (*Reworked Pentateuch^c*), 358
frg. 7 i:4, 357
frg. 23:10, 116n88, 117n90
frg. 26a–b:5, 354n87
frg. 31a–c:15, 357
frg. 35 ii:5, 364n111
frg. 36:4, 114n79
- 4Q368 (*Apocryphon Pentateuch A*)
frg. 5:2, 364n111
- 4Q371 frgs. 1–2, 4Q371 frg. 1, 4Q373a (*Prayer of Joseph*), 104, 105–7, 109–15, 120–21, 123, 393
- 4Q371 (*Narrative and Poetic Composition^a*), 103n51, 104–5, 109n69, 123n105
frg. 1, 104, 393
frgs. 1–2, 104
- 4Q372 (*Narrative and Poetic Composition^b*), 103n61, 104–5, 109n69, 123n105
frg. 1, 104
frg. 1:14, 103, 105
- 4Q373a (*Narrative and Poetic Composition^c*), 104, 105n61
- 4Q375 (*Apocryphon of Moses^a*), 358
frg. 1 i:8, 364n111
frg. 1 ii:6, 357
frg. 1 ii:9, 357
- 4Q376 (*Apocryphon of Moses^b*), 358
frg. 1 iii:1, 357
- 4Q377 (*Apocryphon Pentateuch B*), 358
frg. 1 i:7, 364n115
frg. 2 ii:9, 357
- 4Q379 (*Apocryphon of Joshud^b*)
frg. 1:5, 364n112
- 4Q385a, 4Q387–89 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*), 114, 118, 165, 167n279, 168
- 4Q385a (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^a*), 114, 120
frg. 16a–b:4, 155n243, 166
frg. 18, 115, 122
frg. 18 ii:6–7, 115
frg. 18 ii:7, 114
frg. 18 ii:8–10, 115
- 4Q387 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^b*), 114n81
frg. 3:4, 168
frg. 3:4–5, 166
frg. 3:5–6, 24n40,
frg. 3:6, 125n112
frg. 3:7–8, 24n40
frg. 3:7–9, 166
frg. 4, 167, 324n109
frg. 4 i:1, 364n112
frg. 4 i:2, 166
- 4Q387a (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^f*), 114n81
- 4Q388a (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^c*), 114n81, 118
- 4Q389 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^d*), 114n81
- 4Q390 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah E*), 108, 114n81, 165
frg. 1:2–5a, 108
- 4Q394–99 (*MMT*), 159n247
- 4Q394 (*MMT^a*)
frg. 8 iv:11, 364n111
- 4Q396 (*MMT^c*)
frgs. 1–2 iii:1, 364n111
- 4Q397 (*MMT^d*)
frg. 3:5, 364n111

- 4Q400 (*Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice^a*), 358
frg. 1 i:4, 357, 358n99
- 4Q403 (*Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice^e*)
frg. 1 ii:24, 358
- 4Q405 (*Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice^f*)
frg. 23 i:3, 359
- 4Q408 (*Apocryphon of Moses^g?*)
frg. 2:2, 364n115
frgs 3+3a:4, 364n115
- 4Q418 (*Instructions^b*), 45n11
- 4Q427 (*Hodayot^d*)
frg. 5:3, 358
frg. 7 i:14, 359
frg. 7 ii:9, 359
frg. 8 i:10, 358
- 4Q431 (*Hodayot^d*), 29n67, 30
frg. 1:9, 358n98
- 4Q434 (*Barkhi Nafshi^h*), 45n11
- 4Q457b (*Eschatological Hymn*)
1:5, 358
- 4Q471 (*War Scroll-like Text B*), 29–31, 33n73, 38, 41, 60, 68, 215, 222–32, 234–35, 371–72, 379n39, 380–81, 391, 395, 401
frg. 1, 30, 30n68, 222, 371
frg. 1:2, 225
frg. 1:2–3, 224
frg. 1:3, 223, 225, 231
frg. 1:3–4, 60n44
frg. 1:3–5, 38n91
frg. 1:4, 225
frg. 1:5, 225–26, 228, 230
frg. 1:6, 108n65, 225, 231
frg. 1:8, 231
frg. 1:8–9, 38n91
frgs. 1–2, 33
frgs. 1–3, 29
frg. 2, 30
frg. 3, 30
- 4Q471a (*Polemical Text*), 29
frg. 6, 29
- 4Q471b (*Self Glorification Hymn*), 29n67, 379n39, 380n39
frgs. 7–10, 29, 30n67
- 4Q471c (*Prayer Concerning God and Israel*), 29
frgs. 4–5, 29
- 4Q491–97 (*Serekh haMilhamah*), 40–42, 357
- 4Q491 (*Serekh haMilhamah^a*), 17, 20, 22, 25n48, 33–34, 36–39, 41, 54, 60, 69–70, 80, 206, 215, 254n41, 309, 315n190, 373–74, 378, 379n39, 380–83, 385n56, 391, 400–1
frg. 1:1–5, 377n33
frgs. 1–3, 70nn60–61, 79, 373–74
frgs. 1–3:1, 70n60, 379n39
frgs. 1–3:4, 70n60
frgs. 1–3:5, 357
frgs. 1–3:6, 54, 70n60
frgs. 1–3:6–10, 215
frgs. 1–3:7, 70
frgs. 1–3:8, 173
frgs. 1–3:12, 377n35
frgs. 1–3:14, 70n60
frgs. 1–3:16, 70n60
frgs. 1–3:18, 70
frgs. 1–3:19, 70
frgs. 5–7, 379n39
frgs. 8–9, 382n46
frgs. 8–9:1–2, 382n46
frgs. 8–10, 79–80, 294n137, 374, 382n46
frgs. 8–10 i, 378, 380–81, 401
frgs. 8–10 i:1, 70–71, 79
frgs. 8–10 ii:8–12, 377
frgs. 8–10 ii:10, 377
frgs. 8–10 ii:11, 377
frgs. 8–10 ii:13, 377
frgs. 8–10 ii:15–17, 377
frg. 10, 382n46
frg. 10 i, 382n46
frg. 10 ii, 307n162, 382n46, 385

- frg. 10 ii:12, 307
 frg. 11 i, 33
 frg. 11 ii, 305n158, 307n162, 382n46,
 385
 frg. 11 ii:1, 377
 frg. 11 ii:5, 325n213
 frg. 11 ii:5–8, 377
 frg. 11 ii:6, 309, 315n190
 frg. 11 ii:8, 69
 frg. 11 ii:8–10, 377
 frg. 11 ii:10, 377n35
 frg. 11 ii:11, 377
 frg. 11 ii:12–18, 377
 frg. 11 ii:16, 377
 frg. 11 ii:19, 315n190, 377
 frg. 11 ii:19–20, 310n171
 frg. 11 ii:20, 309
 frg. 11 ii:21, 309, 325n213
 frg. 11 ii:21–22, 309
 frg. 11 ii:23, 309
 frgs. 11–12, 29n67, 379n39
 frg. 12, 33
 frg. 13, 305n158, 307n162, 311n176,
 315n190, 382n46, 385n56
 frg. 13:1–3, 377
 frg. 13:3–5, 311n176, 377
 frg. 13:4, 310n171
 frg. 13:5, 325n213
 frg. 13:6, 309
 frg. 13:6–7, 309
 frgs. 14–15, 80, 385n56
 frg. 15:4, 70, 71n62
 frg. 15:5–12, 377
 frg. 15:6, 377
 frg. 16, 207, 378, 379n39, 382n47
 frg. 16:2, 357
 frg. 16:4, 364n118
 frg. 17, 378, 379n39
 frg. 17:4, 379n39
 frg. 17:5, 379n39
 frg. 18, 385n56
 frg. 19, 378, 379n39
 frg. 22, 385n56
 frg. 23, 378, 379n39
 frg. 23:4, 379n39
 frg. 31, 70n60
 frg. 32, 70n60
 4Q491A, 20, 22, 374, 377–78, 381–82
 4Q491B, 20, 22, 29–30n67, 374–78,
 379–80n39, 381, 382n47
 4Q491C (*Self-Glorification Hymn*^b), 20,
 22, 29–30n67, 375n26
 4Q492 (*Serekh haMilhamah*^b), 22,
 25n48, 26n50, 33–34, 37–39, 41,
 60–61, 64–65, 68, 81, 280n112,
 282nn116–17, 292–93, 372, 380,
 382n46, 391–92, 401
 frg. 1, 38n91, 79, 282, 382n46, 397
 frg. 1:1–8, 61, 279n105
 frg. 1:1–13, 61
 frg. 1:5, 61n46, 282n117
 frg. 1:6, 61n46
 frg. 1:8, 243n8
 frg. 1:8–13, 65
 frg. 1:12, 382n46
 frgs. 2–3, 64
 4Q493 (*Serekh haMilhamah*^c), 23,
 25n48, 31, 33–34, 36, 37n87, 38,
 41, 60, 305n158, 306n160,
 307n162, 309–11, 346n68, 369–70,
 372, 380–81, 385, 391, 399, 401
 lines 2–3, 309
 line 3, 310n171
 line 5, 369
 lines 11–12, 310
 line 12, 307n165, 310
 line 13, 306n160, 369
 line 14, 369
 4Q494 (*Serekh haMilhamah*^d), 23,
 25n48, 26n50, 31n71, 33–35, 37,
 39–41, 60, 65–66, 68, 77, 215, 221–
 22, 225, 227, 231, 378–82, 391,
 395, 401
 lines 1–2, 24
 lines 2–6, 66
 lines 3–6, 221
 lines 4–6, 38n91, 60n44
 line 5, 66
 4Q495 (*Serekh haMilhamah*^e), 24,
 25n48, 26n50, 33–34, 37, 39, 41,
 60, 65, 67–68, 79, 372, 380–81,
 391, 401

- frg. 1, 372
 frg. 2, 372
- 4Q496 (*pap Serekh haMilhamah^f*), 24–
 27, 3, 33–34, 38, 41, 60, 67–70, 90,
 98, 136, 215, 221, 370, 371n8, 372,
 376n33, 380–81, 392, 400–1
 frgs. 1–7, 26, 37, 60
 frgs. 2+1, 77
 frgs. 2+1:8, 67, 77
 frg. 3, 90n8
 frg. 3:4, 96
 frg. 3:6, 91n8
 frg. 3:7, 67, 77
 frg. 4:2, 174n14
 frgs. 4–5, 38n91
 frgs. 5–7, 221
 frg. 7, 221, 235
 frg. 8, 26, 77, 305n158
 frg. 8:4, 77
 frgs. 8–10, 77
 frgs. 8–12, 26
 frg. 10, 45n13
 frg. 10:2, 69, 78, 357
 frg. 10:4, 124n106
 frgs. 10–12, 26
 frg. 11, 70
 frg. 13, 26, 37, 60
 frg. 15, 38n91, 370
 frgs. 15–17, 26
 frg. 16, 26
 frgs. 17–222, 26
 frg. 32, 379n39
 frg. 32:4, 371n8
 frg. 35, 26
 frg. 97, 38n91
- 4Q497 (*Serekh haMilhamah^g*), 26–27,
 31, 33n74, 69
- 4Q499 (*Prayer of Enosh*), 26–27
- 4Q505 (*pap Words of the Luminaries^b*),
 25n43
- 4Q506 (*Words of the Luminaries^c*), 25
- 4Q507–509 (*Festival Prayers*), 118
- 4Q509 (*pap Festival Prayers^c*), 24n 43,
 25, 120
 frg. 183:7, 118
- 4Q521 (*Messianic Apocalypse*),
 142n191, 154n239
 frg. 2 iii:5, 364n118
 frg. 2 iii:6, 140
- 4Q522 (*Prophecy of Joshua*)
 frgs. 22–25:3, 364n111
- 4Q523 (*Jonathan*)
 frg. 1–2:5, 276n96
- 4Q524 (*Temple Scroll*), 116
- 4Q525 (*Beatitudes*)
 frg. 10:7, 364n118
- 4Q554 (*New Jerusalem^a ar*), 134n159,
 138n173
 frg. 3 iii:16, 124n108
 frg. 3 iii:4, 124n108
- 5Q17 (Unclassified), 357
 frg. 1:2 357
- 11Q14 (*Sefer haMilhamah*), 27–28,
 29n63, 33, 39–41, 134, 352, 370,
 383n49, 392, 400
 frg. 1 ii, 353
 frg. 1 ii:15, 383n49
- 11Q18 (*New Jerusalem ar*)
 frg. 27:1, 364n118
- 11QT (*Temple Scroll^e*), 30n68, 44n8
 114n79, 115–22, 219n119,
 222n126, 224n130, 231n155, 342,
 358, 364n111
 15:5, 231n155
 21:1, 116
 22:4, 116
 23:9–24:13, 117
 23:10, 116
 24:10, 116
 24:11, 116
 24:12 116n89

- 39:12, 116
 39:16, 116n89
 40:14, 116n89
 40:15, 116n89
 42:14, 357
 44:4, 116n89
 44:5, 116n89
 44:7, 116
 44:11, 116
 44:14, 116n88
- 44:15, 116
 60:12, 364n115
 63:3, 116
- 11Q20 (*Temple Scroll^b*), 115, 120
 1:14, 231n155
 5:19, 357
 6:13, 116
 6:13–15, 117

RABBINIC LITERATURE

- Mishnah, 117, 248, 261n55
m. Ta'an. 4:4–5, 117
m. Soṭah 8:1, 319n200
m. Soṭah 8:6, 264n62
m. Soṭah 8:7, 247
- Babylonian Talmud
b. Soṭah 42a, 261n55, 263n60
- Palestinian Talmud
y. Pesah 4:1 30b, 226n137
y. Ta'an. 4:2 64d,
y. Ta'an. 4:2 68a, 226n134
y. Ta'an. 4:2 68d, 141, 226n137
- Bereshit Rabba*, 199
Book of Noah, 186
 Maimonides, 46
Code, Hilkhot Sefer Torah 8:1, 46n16
Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael, 199
Yalkut Shimoni, 199
Sifre 191, 263n60
Tos. Soṭah 7:18, 263n60

CLASSICAL AUTHORS

- Josephus
Ant. 1:122–147, 188
 1:128, 128, 134, 138–39, 143–44,
 147, 150, 155n240
 1:144, 186, 189n43, 194
 1:145, 192n5312:119 155n243
 12:327–353, 126
 13:301, 141n188
 20:216–18, 234n163
War 2:160–61, 362
 2:425, 114
 6:312–13, 141, 143, 155n240
- Suetonius
Vespasianus 4 141
- Tacitus
Hist. 5:13 141
- Varro
De Lingua Latina 4:14 352

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M.G. 9, 17nn23, 26, 20, 22,
 23nn36–37, 24nn39–41, 25nn44,
 48, 26–28n62, 30n68, 31n71,
 33nn72, 74, 66n51, 68n55, 91n8,
 135n164, 172n3, 178n24,
 222nn123, 125–26, 224n130,
 346n68, 353n80, 355n90, 356n92,
 364n113, 372n14, 374, 375n27,
 381n44, 401
- Aharoni, Y. 134n157, 138n177
- Albek, H. 226n139
- Albright, W.F. 31n70, 134n155, 149,
 150n226
- Alexander, P.S. 1n4, 28, 29n64, 33n73,
 91n11, 102, 128n131, 133, 141,
 145–48n215, 150, 153, 154n238,
 155, 157, 160, 184n31, 185n31,
 188n39, 193n58, 196, 213n103,
 242n3, 353nn81–83
- Allegro, J.M. 16n20, 118n98, 159n248,
 207n89, 360n102
- Allen, L.C. 130n141, 172n3, 203n80
- Amoussine (=Amusin), J.D. 112n75,
 134n159, 160, 161n254, 358n96
- Andersen, F.I. 130n141, 203n80
- Ashley, T.R. 134n155, 144n198,
 148n216, 150n226
- Asmussen, J.P. 96n26
- Atkinson, K. 141n185, 142n192,
 211n100, 212nn101–2
- Baillet, M. 1n4, 16n18, 17, 20, 22,
 23nn36–37, 24nn39, 41, 43, 25–27,
 31n70, 33n73, 61n45, 66–67n54,
 69n56, 70nn58, 60, 90n8, 105n59,
 221–22n122, 227, 228n144, 310,
 373n17, 375n29, 376n31, 378,
 390n68
- Baker, D.W. 128nn129–30, 135n164
- Barag, D. 104n57
- Bardtke, H. 262n58
- Bar-Kochva, B. 145n206, 160n250
- Barthélemy, D. 15nn15–16, 118n96,
 204n82, 241n3, 327n1, 328n6,
 342n57, 353n84, 364n118
- Bauckham, R. 160nn251–53
- Baumgarten, J.M. 327n4, 362n106,
 363n109
- Baumgartner, W. 131n143, 144n199,
 173nn6–7, 219n119
- Beale, G.K. 91nn9, 11, 93n14, 98n32,
 99nn37–38, 101, 103n53
- Becker, J. 300n149, 369n4
- Ben Dov, J. 182n26, 232n159
- Bernstein, M. 104nn54–57, 105nn60–
 61, 108n65, 115n84, 159n247
- Berrin, S.L. 134n159, 359n102
- Birnbaum, S.A. 31n70
- Block, D.I. 151n231
- Boccaccini, P. 108n66
- Brooke, G.J. 117n93, 121n103,
 128n131, 129n134, 164n262, 361
- Broshi, M. 119nn101–2, 132n147,
 364n118
- Brownlee, W.H. 129n138, 136n168,
 145, 146n210
- Budd, P.J. 143n197
- Carmignac, J. 1, 4, 10n3, 12n8, 13n11,
 47, 54n33, 78nn66–67, 91n10,
 93n14, 100, 110n72, 121n103, 125,
 126n115, 128n131, 129n135,
 161n254, 163n260, 172n5, 174,
 175n15, 176n21, 178n24, 191n48,
 201n74, 203n78, 204n82, 217n114,
 219n120, 229n148, 230n152,
 255n45, 262n57, 324n210, 328,
 341n54, 342n57, 343n60, 345n64,
 347n71, 374n22, 391
- Charles, R.H. 47n19, 134n156, 138,
 155n243
- Charlesworth, J.H. 2n5, 24n43, 25n43,
 118nn94–95, 119n100, 135n162,

- 142n191, 210n98, 242n3, 279n107,
327n1, 328n6
- Collins, J.J. 92n12, 129n132, 133n149,
140n184, 141n190, 149n217,
150n227, 165n267, 176n21, 328n5,
334nn24, 27, 356n91, 362nn107–8,
365n120
- Cross, F.M. 5n23, 31nn70–71, 142n191
- Davies, P.R. 1–3n9, 103, 110n72,
111n74, 168n284, 172n4, 175,
178n24, 203n78, 213n104,
214n105, 219nn117, 120, 221n121,
234–35, 245, 247n19, 248n24, 251,
252nn34–36, 255nn44–45, 274n89,
276n95, 277, 279n106, 282n114,
287n124, 288n126, 291n130,
292nn132–33, 297n142, 305,
307n167, 311, 312n177, 318,
327n4, 334n27, 367n1, 369n4,
371n7, 386, 387n59, 390n66, 391
- de Jonge, M. 142n191
- de Menasce, J.P. 96n26
- de Vaux, R. 15n15, 16nn18–19, 105n59
- Demsky, A. 342n58
- di Lella, A.A. 91n11, 92n12, 148n216,
149n221, 150nn224–25, 227,
213n103
- Dimant, D. 108nn66–67, 109n70,
114nn80–81, 115, 125n112,
164nn263–64, 165–68n283,
214n105
- Doudna, G.L. 39n93, 359n102
- Driver, G.R. 96n26
- Duhaime, J. 2–3, 4n14, 5, 8–9n27,
17nn22–23, 25, 20n30, 22nn33–34,
23nn36–37, 24nn39, 41, 25, 26n51,
27n56, 28n57, 30nn67–68, 33nn73,
75, 36n83, 38n89, 53n31, 54n34,
102n46, 128n131, 172n5, 174n13,
206n86, 207, 215n109, 236n173,
241n2, 245n14, 254n40, 288n127,
316n191, 324n210, 343n60,
344n61, 345, 346nn67–69,
347nn70–71, 351n75, 352, 369nn2,
4, 374nn21, 23, 384n52
- Dupont-Sommer, A. 15n14, 89, 94n19,
103, 112n75, 123, 125n114,
129n134, 132n148, 161n254,
176n21, 217n114, 291n130,
347n71, 359n102, 384n52, 394
- Eshel, E. 13nn11, 14, 20, 22nn31,
29n65, 29nn66–67, 30n68, 31n71,
33n73, 142n191, 149n220,
160n249, 186n38, 193n58,
219n120, 222–23n127, 225n132,
226, 227n140, 228–31, 234,
282n116, 371, 372n13
- Eshel, H. 13n11, 29n65, 30n68, 31n71,
33n73, 40n95, 86n2, 90n7,
102nn46–47, 103–4, 107–10,
111n73, 113, 123, 128n130,
129n133, 130n140, 135n161, 136–
37n172, 149n220, 155n243,
156n245, 159n247, 160nn249, 252,
163n257, 182n26, 207n88,
219n120, 222–23n127, 225n132,
226, 227n140, 228–31, 233n160,
234, 282n116, 258n96, 371,
372n13, 386, 393, 401
- Fabry, H.-J. 95n22, 354nn85–86
- Falk, D.K. 118nn94–95
- Feldman, L.H. 188n39, 192n53
- Finkielsztejn, G. 104n57
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 184n30, 194nn59–60
- Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. 255n45
- Flusser, D. 3, 4n14, 90–91n11, 93–
94n19, 95n23, 97–98, 101, 102n47,
112n75, 129n133, 130–31n144,
132n145, 168, 172n4, 178n24, 205–
6, 237, 244, 335, 338, 339n47, 392
- Frye, R.N. 131n143
- García Martínez, F. 1n4, 15n14, 22n34,
27, 28n60, 29n67, 30n67, 33n73,
109n71, 115n85, 116n86, 134n159,
164n262, 176n21, 335n33,
364n118, 374n21, 375n26
- Gaster, T.H. 135n164, 324n210,
384n52
- Gazor-Ginzberg, A.M. 150n225
- Gärtner, B.E. 214n105
- Ginsberg, H.L. 145, 150, 156–57,
343n59
- Gmirkin, R. 94n18, 125n109, 126,
127nn120–24, 168n286, 351n75

- Goldingay, J.E. 149n217, 151n228
 Goldstein, J.A. 92n13, 145n206,
 146n211, 147n213, 154n238,
 155n241, 159n247
 Graf, D.F. 200n71
 Greenberg, M. 108n68
 Greenfield, J.S. 142n191
 Grintz, Y.M. 128n131, 129n132,
 131n143, 136

 Harrington, C.E. 194n59
 Harrington, D.J. 102n46, 324n210
 Hartman, L.F. 91n11, 92n12, 148n216,
 149n221, 150nn224–25, 227
 Hayden, R.E. 196n63
 Hempel, C. 142n191, 162n255, 327n4,
 328n5, 334n24, 356n91, 361n105,
 363nn109–10
 Holst, S. 10n3
 Horgan, M.P. 159n248, 208n93, 242n3,
 358n95, 359n102, 364n114
 Hölscher, G. 184n31
 Hunzinger, C.-H. 16–17n23, 374n22

 Ibba, G. 4n14, 5, 94n18, 168n286,
 172n5, 219n120
 Isaac, E. 210n98

 Jellicoe, S. 149n219
 Jepsen, E. 91n11
 Jeremias, J. 234n163
 Jobes, K.H. 149n219
 Jongeling, B. 4, 5n19, 88n4, 126n116,
 172n5, 175, 178n24, 217n113,
 219n120, 230nn151–52, 262nn56,
 58, 345n64

 Kanael, B. 141n189
 Kapfer, H.E. 111n74, 327n4, 334n27
 Knauf, E.A. 199n70
 Knibb, M.A. 109n71, 118n96, 129n134,
 164–65, 230n152, 328n5
 Knohl, I. 232n159, 233n161
 Koehler, L. 131n143, 144n199,
 173nn6–7, 219n119
 Korpel, M.C.A. 43nn3–4, 6, 50,
 51nn28–29
 Kugel, J. 340n49
 Kugler, R.A. 122n103, 340n49

 Kuhn, K.G. 228n147

 Lange, A. 109n70
 LaSor, W.S. 191n51, 194n59
 Levine, B.A. 139n179, 143nn195, 197,
 144nn201–2, 150n222, 154n238
 Levy, D. 354n85
 Licht, J. 3, 4n14, 8, 95n22, 118n96,
 168, 202n76, 204n82, 214,
 215n107, 225n131, 227n141,
 230n152, 235, 251n30, 327, 328n6,
 329n9, 330n12, 331, 332n18, 333–
 37n42, 338nn45–46, 339, 341nn53–
 54, 342n55, 355nn88–89, 359
 Lim, T.H. 128n130, 135n162, 136
 Lundbom, J.R. 167n276

 Machiela, D.A. 185n32, 186n36,
 194n59, 199nn67–68
 Magen, Y. 104n57, 119n101, 364n118
 Magness, J. 163n257
 Maier, J. 111n74, 214n105
 Martin, M. 9, 17n23, 20, 28n62, 44n9,
 46–47n19, 135n164, 143, 151n231,
 401
 Martola, N. 254n40, 319–20n203
 Mertens, A. 91n10, 99nn33, 36
 Meshorer, Y. 141nn187–88
 Metso, S. 327n4, 334n27, 356n91,
 361n105, 362n108
 Michaud, H. 10n3
 Milgrom, J. 117, 232n159, 354n85
 Milik, J.T. 15nn15–17, 16n18, 24n41,
 28, 44n9, 45n9, 105n59, 118n96,
 119n101, 184n29, 204n82, 209n96,
 241n3, 327n1, 328n6, 353n79,
 364n118
 Millard, A.R. 196n64
 Montgomery, J.A. 92n12, 148n216,
 149n221
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 163n256
 Müller, W.W. 200n72

 Najman, H. 164n263, 165n267, 214
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 145n204, 209n97,
 211
 Nitzan, B. 28n60, 118n95, 134nn159–
 60, 135n165, 255n44, 274, 338n46
 Noth, M. 143

- O'Brien, J.M. 340n48
 Oesch, J.M. 43nn3–4, 6, 47n19
 Olley, J.W. 43
 Olson, D.T. 24n43, 25nn43, 45,
 118nn94–95
 Oswalt, J. 133n153
- Parry, D.W. 15n14, 45n13, 53n31,
 54n34, 122n103, 159n248, 208n92,
 330n11, 361n105
 Perrot, C. 47n19, 48n22
 Pfann, S.J. 1n4, 29nn65–66, 31n70,
 119n101, 209n94, 354n87
 Pitard, W.T. 189n41
 Puech, E. 116n87, 142n191, 364n118
 Purvis, J.D. 149n220
- Qimron, E. 17n26, 20, 104n54, 108n65,
 115n85, 118n94, 338n46, 390
- Rabin, C. 1n1, 3n11, 96n26, 127n126,
 217n114, 232n157, 301n150,
 321n204, 384n52, 390
 Rappaport, U. 3n12, 155nn241–42,
 185n31
 Redditt, P.L. 91n11
 Regev, E. 356n91, 361n105
 Roberts, B.J. 324n210
 Rosenthal, J.M. 160n251
 Rost, L. 12n8
 Roth, C. 129n134, 135n163, 141n189,
 157
 Rouillard, H. 139n178
 Rowley, H.H. 128n131, 129n132,
 134n160
- Sanders, E.P. 296n140, 333n23, 336–
 37n43, 364, 365n119
 Schäfer, P. 141n186
 Schiffman, L.H. 7n25, 13n11, 109n70,
 116n86, 118nn96–97, 119n100,
 128n130, 165n267, 214n105,
 227nn141–42, 235n170, 236n172,
 287n124, 327, 328nn5–6, 329n9,
 330nn10, 12, 331n15, 332–33, 337–
 38n46, 341n53, 342nn56–57,
 355n88, 362nn106, 108
 Schmidt, F. 184n31, 185n31, 188n39,
 189n40
- Schuller, E. 29n67, 103n51, 104nn54–
 57, 105nn60–61, 107, 108n65,
 109n71, 115n84
 Schultz, B. 128n128
 Schürer, E. 226nn134, 136, 232n156,
 234n163, 235n165
 Schwartz, D.R. 90n7, 112n75, 214n105,
 351n75
 Scott, J.M. 141n186, 185n31, 186n37,
 198, 199n69
 Segal, M. 126n117, 145n204
 Segal, M.H. 127n126, 129n132
 Segert, S. 128n130
 Shatzman, I. 351n75
 Siegel, J.P. 48n22
 Simons, J. 185n33
 Singer, I. 134n155
 Skehan, P.W. 151n230, 213n103
 Sperber, D. 226n138
 Stallman, R.C. 113n77, 116n88,
 117n93, 340
 Stegemann, H. 109n70, 136, 137n169,
 156n245, 328n5, 358n96
 Stern, M. 3n12, 131n144, 227n143,
 232n156, 234nn162–63
 Steudel, A. 140n180, 207nn89–90,
 208n91, 331n17
 Stone, M.E. 142n191
 Stökl Ben Ezra, D. 39, 40nn94–95
 Strugnell, J. 118n98, 159n248, 207n89,
 208n93, 364n118
 Stuckenbruck, L. 142n191, 279n107,
 327n1, 328n6
 Sukenik, E.L. 10nn1–2, 11, 12nn8–10,
 13, 15, 24n41, 31, 42n2, 96n26,
 100, 129n136, 230n151
 Swete, H.B. 149n219
- Talmon, S. 95n22, 232nn157, 159,
 233n161
 Tantlevsky, I.R. 128n130
 Teicher, J.L. 374n22
 Thiering, B.L. 116n88
 Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 1n4, 15n14, 22n34,
 27, 28n60, 33n73, 103n51, 104n54,
 115n85, 362n108, 364n118
 Torrey, C.C. 155n243
 Tov, E. 13n11, 15n14, 33n73, 43nn4, 6,
 45, 46n16, 48nn22–23, 49–52,

- 53n31, 54n34, 55, 56n39, 60n43,
61, 64–65n49, 69–70n60, 72n63,
77n65, 102n46, 149n220, 150n223,
159n248, 208n92, 328n5, 330n11,
362n108, 390n67
Trever, J.C. 10n2
Treves, M. 129n132
- Ulrich, E. 28n56, 43n6, 48n23, 50n26,
55, 102n46, 122n103, 151n230,
361n105
- van der Ploeg, J. 15n14, 46n15, 47,
71n62, 89n5, 91n10, 98n31, 100,
125, 129n135, 164n261, 175n17,
176nn20–21, 178n24, 221n121,
255n45, 291n130, 305nn154–55,
308n168, 321n204, 325n211
- van der Woude In4, 27, 28n60, 33n73,
109n71, 115n85, 161n254,
162n254, 364n118
- VanderKam, J.C. 13n11, 49n24,
102n46, 111n74, 116n86, 126,
128n130, 141n190, 145n204,
146n209, 158n247, 184n29,
185n31, 193n57, 210n97, 214n105,
327n4, 362n106
- Vargon, S. 130n141, 203n80
- Vermes, G. In4, 28, 29n64, 33n73,
89n5, 125n114, 172n3, 226n134,
242n3, 305n154, 353nn80–82
- von der Osten-Sacken, P. 2–3n8, 91n10,
99nn34–35, 38, 129n132, 255n45,
259n49, 369n4
- Wacholder, B.Z. 30n68, 145n207,
185n31
- Webster, B. 33n73
- Weinert, F.D. 118n99
- Wenham, G.J. 185n33
- Wenthe, D.O. 91n11
- Werman, C. 95n22, 108n66, 117n90,
121n103, 165–68n282, 185nn31–
32, 186n35, 338n46, 340, 341n52
- Wildberger, H. 133n152, 151n230
- William, W.K. 31n70, 96n26, 129n138,
134n155, 141n186, 144, 149n218,
191n51, 194n59
- Winter, P. 184n31, 232n157
- Wise, M. 135n164, 172n3, 178n24,
353n80
- Xeravits, G.G. 140nn182–84, 141n185,
219n119
- Yadin, Y. 1, 3nn11, 13, 4, 10nn2–3,
15n14, 31n70, 44n9, 46, 50, 52, 81,
88, 91n10, 96nn25–26, 100,
103n49, 112n75, 115n85, 116n88,
117, 125, 126n115, 127, 128n130,
129n134, 131n144, 133, 146,
161n254, 163n259, 171n2, 172,
174, 175n17, 177, 178n24, 190–91,
192n55, 194n60, 196n63, 200n73,
202n77, 205–6, 216–17n114, 219,
221n121, 226n133, 232n157,
235n166, 245n14, 247–50n28,
251n29, 254nn40, 43, 255n45,
258n46, 259n51, 262, 263n59, 266–
67n71, 268n74, 272nn83–84,
274n88, 276n94, 288n126,
293n136, 301n150, 303n153, 305,
309n169, 315n189, 316n191, 319,
321n204, 329nn8–9, 335, 345,
351n75, 391
- Yardeni, A. 31n70, 390n68
- Yshai, R. 3n10, 4n15, 5, 13n11,
17nn23, 26, 22n34, 23nn36–37,
24nn39, 41, 25n44, 34–37n87,
219n119, 255n45, 278n102,
279nn105–6, 282n115, 283n118,
306n159, 307n163, 310n170,
312n178, 346n68, 374n24, 375n26,
377n33, 381n42, 382n46, 384n52,
385, 392
- Zhu-En Wee, J. 253n39, 255n45,
282n116, 287n125, 384n52, 390
- Zimmerli, W. 151n231

STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH

38. Elgvin, T. *Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction*. ISBN 90 04 11424 6
(in preparation)
39. Brin, G. *The Concept of Time in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2001.
ISBN 90 04 12314 8
40. Murphy, C.M. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*. 2001.
ISBN 90 0411934 5
41. Pinnick, A. *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995-2000)*. 2001.
ISBN 90 04 12366 0
42. Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. *All the Glory of Adam*. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea
Scrolls. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12326 1
43. Fincke, A. *The Samuel Scroll from Qumran*. 4QSam^a restored and compared to the
Septuagint and 4QSam^c. 2001. ISBN 90 04 123709
44. Tigchelaar, E.J.C. *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*. Reading and
Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction. 2001.
ISBN 90 04 11678 8
45. Grossman, M.L. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document*. A Methodological Study.
2002. ISBN 90 04 122524
46. Davila, J.R. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Chris-
tianity*. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001. 2003.
ISBN 90 04 12678 3
47. Xeravits, G.G. *King, Priest, Prophet*. Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran
Library. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12892 1
48. Chazon, E.G. (ed.) (with the collaboration of R. Clements and A. Pinnick). *Liturgical
Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Fifth
International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls
and Associated Literature, 19-23 January, 2000. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12162 5
49. Dahmen, U. *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum*. Rekonstruktion, Text-
bestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QP^s aus Qumran. 2003.
ISBN 90 04 13226 0
50. Goff, M.J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13591 X
51. Collins, J.J., G.E. Sterling & R.A. Clements. *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in
Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the
Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22
may, 2001. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13670 3
52. Newsom, C.A. *The Self as Symbolic Space*. Constructing Identity and Community at
Qumran. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13803 X
53. Berrin, S.L. *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran*. An Exegetical Study of 4Q169. 2004.
ISBN 90 04 12484 5
54. Tov, E. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. 2004.
ISBN 90 04 14001 8
55. Puech, E. *Le Rouleau de Cuivre de Qumrân*. In production. ISBN 90 04 14030 1
56. Wacholder, B.Z. *The New Damascus Document*. The Midrash on the Eschatological
Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary. 2006.
ISBN 90 04 14108 1
57. Galor, K., J.-B. Humbert & J. Zangenberg (eds.). *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls:
Archaeological Interpretations and Debates*. Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown
University, November 17-19, 2002. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14504 4
58. Chazon, E.G., D. Dimant & R.A. Clements (eds.). *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and
Related Texts at Qumran*. Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the

- Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14703 9
59. Hughes, J.A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14739 X
 60. Arnold, R.C.D. *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15030 7
 61. García Martínez, F., A. Steudel & E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.). *From 4QMMT to Resurrection. Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15252 0
 62. Fraade, S.D., A. Shemesh & R.A. Clements (eds.). *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15335 7
 63. García Martínez, F. Edited by E.J.C. Tigchelaar. *Qumranica Minora I. Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15569 4
 64. García Martínez, F. Edited by E.J.C. Tigchelaar. *Qumranica Minora II. Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15683 6
 65. Heger, P. *Cult as the Catalyst for Division*. Cult Disputes as the Motive for Schism in the Pre-70 Pluralistic Environment. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15166 4
 66. Hultgren, S. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community*. Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15465 5
 67. Popović, M. *Reading the Human Body*. Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15717 4
 68. Jassen, A.P. *Mediating the Divine*. Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15842 1
 69. Oudshoorn, J.G. *The Relationship between Roman and Local Law in the Babatha and Salome Komaise Archives*. General Analysis and Three Case Studies on Law of Succession, Guardianship and Marriage. 2007. ISBN 90 04 14974 0
 70. García Martínez, F. & M. Popović (eds.). *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16414 7
 71. Clements, R.A. & N. Sharon. *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (2000-2006)*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16437 6
 72. Werrett, I.C. *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15623 2
 73. Joosten, J. & J.-S. Rey (eds.). *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period*. Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16404 8
 74. Mason, E.F. 'You Are a Priest Forever'. Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 14987 8
 75. Schiffman, L.H. Edited by F. García Martínez. *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord*. Studies on the Temple Scroll. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 12255 0
 76. Schultz, B. *Conquering the World*. The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 16820 6
 77. Schofield, A. *From Qumran to the Yahad*. A New Paradigm of Textual Development for *The Community Rule*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17007 0
 78. Ben-Dov, J. *Head of All Years*. Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in their Ancient Context. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 17088 9
 80. Klostergaard Petersen, A., T. Elgvin, C. Wassen, H. von Weissenberg, M. Winninge (eds.) & M. Ehrensverd (ass. ed.). *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17163 3
 81. Rey, J.-S. *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17268 5
 82. von Weissenberg, H. *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function and the Meaning of the Epilogue*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17379 8