

War Traditions from the Qumran Caves

*Re-thinking Textual Stability
and Fluidity in the
War Text Manuscripts*

HANNA VANONEN

BRILL

War Traditions from the Qumran Caves

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

George J. Brooke

Associate Editors

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

Jonathan Ben-Dov

Alison Schofield

VOLUME 139

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/stdj

War Traditions from the Qumran Caves

*Re-thinking Textual Stability and Fluidity
in the War Text Manuscripts*

By

Hanna Vanonen



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON



This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC 4.0 license, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided no alterations are made and the original author(s) and source are credited. Further information and the complete license text can be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

The terms of the CC license apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources (indicated by a reference) such as diagrams, illustrations, photos and text samples may require further permission from the respective copyright holder.

This title is published in Open Access with the support of the University of Helsinki Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Vanonen, Hanna, author.

Title: War traditions from the Qumran caves : re-thinking textual stability and fluidity in the war text manuscripts / Hanna Vanonen.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2022. | Series: Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah, 0169–9962 ; volume 139 | Revision of author's thesis. | Includes bibliographical references. | Summary: "In this volume, Hanna Vanonen offers a fresh view to the Milhamah and Sefer ha-Milhamah manuscripts by producing a thorough close-reading analysis of them, paying attention not only to their contents but also to manuscripts as material artifacts. Vanonen demonstrates that studying the stability and instability of the War traditions does more justice to the complex material than a traditional chronological literary-critical model. In addition, Vanonen argues that at least liturgical use and study purposes may have created needs for producing different manuscripts that were simultaneously important"— Provided by publisher.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022013999 (print) | LCCN 2022014000 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004510531 (hardback ; acid-free paper) | ISBN 9789004512061 (e-book)

Subjects: LCSH: Dead Sea scrolls—History and criticism. | War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness. | Good and evil. | Judaism—History—Post-exilic period, 586 B.C.–210 A.D. | Qumran Site (West Bank)—Antiquities.

Classification: LCC BM488.W3 V36 2022 (print) | LCC BM488.W3 (ebook) | DDC 296.1/55—dc23/eng/20220518

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022013999>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022014000>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 978-90-04-51053-1 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-51206-1 (e-book)

Copyright 2022 by Hanna Vanonen. Published by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Hotei, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau, V&R unipress and Wageningen Academic. Koninklijke Brill NV reserves the right to protect this publication against unauthorized use.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Dedicated to the memory of my father



Contents

Acknowledgments XI

List of Tables XII

Introduction 1

- 1 Framing the Question 1
- 2 Framing the Material 4
- 3 Previous Studies on the War Texts 6
 - 3.1 *Editions of 4QM* 14
- 4 Methodological Considerations 18
- 5 Research Questions and Outline of the Study 25

PART I

Analysis

- 1 1Q33 Alias 1QM 31
 - 1 Shape and Size 31
 - 2 Layout and Script 35
 - 3 Title, Content and Paragraph Division 40
 - 4 Summary of 1QM 47

- 2 4Q491a (4QM^{a/a} + 4Q491^{a/c}) and 4Q492 (4QM^b): War Texts That Overlap with Other War Texts 49
 - 1 4Q491a (4QM^{a/a} + 4Q491^{a/c}) 49
 - 1.1 *4Q491 – One or Several Manuscripts?* 50
 - 1.2 *4Q491a as a Material Artifact* 56
 - 1.3 *Fragments 8–10 i (B-371148)* 63
 - 1.4 *Fragment 10 ii (B-367012; B-367013)* 82
 - 1.5 *Fragment 11 i + fragment 12 (B-371355; B-370893)* 90
 - 1.6 *Fragment 11 ii (B-371355; B-370893)* 104
 - 1.7 *Fragment 13 (B-363818; B-363819)* 118
 - 1.8 *Fragment 15 (B-363816; B-363817)* 119
 - 1.9 *Other Fragments* 123
 - 1.10 *Summary of 4Q491a* 123
 - 2 4Q492 (4QM^b) 126
 - 2.1 *Contents* 128
 - 3 Summary of 4Q491a and 4Q492 145

- 3 4Q491b (4QM^{a/b}) and 4Q493 (4QM^c): Unestablished War Visions 146**
- 1 4Q491b (4QM^{a/b}) 146
- 1.1 *Fragments 1–3 (B-371148; B-366997; B-366995)* 148
- 1.2 *Fragment 4 (B-283964)* 162
- 1.3 *Fragments 5 + 6 (B-283964)* 162
- 1.4 *Fragment 7 (B-367010; B-367011)* 163
- 1.5 *Fragments 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, and 23* 164
- 1.6 *Summary of 4Q491b* 165
- 2 4Q493 (4QM^c) 166
- 2.1 *Trumpets* 170
- 2.2 *Priests* 175
- 2.3 *Purity* 176
- 2.4 *Summary of 4Q493* 177
- 3 *Summary of 4Q491b and 4Q493* 178
- 4 4Q494 (4QM^d) and 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B): Texts that Overlap with 1QM 2? 181**
- 1 4Q494 (4QM^d) 181
- 2 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B) 188
- 2.1 *Fragment 1 (B-358443; B-358442)* 188
- 2.2 *Fragments 2 (B-358445; B-358444) and 3 (B-358447; B-358446)* 193
- 3 *Summary of 4Q494 and 4Q471* 196
- 5 4Q495 (4QM^e): Remnants of a War Text? 197**
- 6 4Q496 (4QpapM^f) and 4Q497 (4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A): Opisthographic War Text Manuscripts 203**
- 1 4Q496 (4QpapM^f) 204
- 1.1 *Fragment 3 (B-285252)* 206
- 1.2 *Fragments 1 + 2 (B-285252; B-285247)* 208
- 1.3 *Summary of 4Q496* 211
- 2 4Q497 (4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A) 212
- 3 *The Opisthographic Nature of 4Q496 and 4Q497* 215
- 7 4Q285 and 11Q14: Sefer ha-Milhamah Texts 222**
- 1 4Q285 and 11Q14 as Material Artifacts 223
- 2 Mutual Relationship between 4Q285 and 11Q14 229
- 3 Content and Textual Relationship to M Manuscripts 233

- 3.1 *Fragments 1–3 and 5* 233
- 3.2 *Fragment 4* 235
- 3.3 *Fragments 6 and 9–10* 239
- 3.4 *Fragments 7–8* 241
- 3.5 *Summary of the Content of Fragments 1–10* 242

PART 2

Discussion

- 8 **Naming and Categorizing the War Texts** 249
 - 1 Ancient Titles 250
 - 2 Modern Titles 251
 - 3 Further Reflection 254

- 9 **Transmitting the Subgenres in the M Tradition** 260
 - 1 Battle Instructions 261
 - 1.1 *Weapons and Trumpets* 262
 - 1.2 *Enemies and Losses* 268
 - 1.3 *Priests and Laymen* 271
 - 1.4 *Towards Stability* 272
 - 2 Encouragement Speeches and the Hymnic Material 274
 - 3 Chief Priest Tradition and the Lateness of 1QM 13 282
 - 4 1QM in the Light of the 4QM Manuscripts 289

- 10 **Section Markers in M Tradition** 296

- Summary and Conclusions** 301

- Bibliography** 313
- Index of Ancient Sources** 326
- Index of Modern Authors** 336

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my warmest thanks to the following people for all their help while I was writing this book: Prof. Raija Sollamo and Prof. Jutta Jokiranta, who have supported me since the time I worked on my master's thesis, Prof. Annette Steudel and Prof. Daniel Falk who agreed to be the preliminary examiners for my dissertation of which this book is a revised version, Prof. Charlotte Hempel, Dr. Kipp Davis and Dr. Peter Portzig who provided encouraging comments and valuable suggestions while I was writing my dissertation, Dr. Katri Antin, Dr. Tuukka Kauhanen, Dr. Mika S. Pajunen, and Dr. Elisa Uusimäki who have answered my constant questions and requests for comments while I was revising this manuscript, Dr. Robert Whiting and Alice Lehtinen who helped me with the English of this book (any remaining mistakes are due to my own negligence), and Prof. George Brooke and the anonymous STDJ reviewer for accepting my manuscript in this series and providing many comments and suggestions in order to make it better. There are also several research projects and foundations that have provided financial support for my work: I extend my gratitude to the Finnish Concordia Fund, the Niilo Helander Foundation, the Church Research Institute in Finland, and the Oscar Öflund Foundation for granting me scholarships, and to four research projects in which I have had the privilege of working while preparing this book, namely *Conflicting identities – Social and Religious Identities in Light of the Qumran Material from the Judaean Desert* funded by the Academy of Finland and directed by Prof. Sollamo, *Social Changes in Late Second Temple Judaism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* funded by the University of Helsinki and directed by Prof. Jokiranta, *The Centre of Excellence in Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions* funded by the Academy of Finland and directed by Prof. Martti Nissinen and Prof. Anneli Aejmelaesus, and *The Septuagint and Its Ancient Versions*, funded by the Academy of Finland and directed by Dr. Tuukka Kauhanen. The editions of 1QM and 4Q491–97 was used in this book with kind permission of Mohr Siebeck Tübingen. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my husband Juuso Vanonen who has constantly supported me and encouraged me to finish this work.

Tables

1	The number of existing fragments of the War Text manuscripts	21
2	The placement of additional fragments of 1QM	33
3	Outline of 1QM; <i>serekhs</i> and <i>vacats</i>	42
4	The contents of 4Q491 according to Baillet's arrangement of fragments	60
5	The contents of 4Q491 according to Davis's arrangement of fragments	61
6	The texts of 4Q491 8–10 i and 1QM 14:4–18	68
7	Differences between 4Q491 fragments 8–10 line 5 and 1QM 14:7	77
8	Similarities between 1QM 14:8b–9a and 1QM 14:4b/line 2b of 4Q491	77
9	The texts of 4Q491 10 ii and 1QM 16:8b–17:9	86
10	The texts of 4Q491 10 ii and 1QM 15:4–7	89
11	The texts of 4Q491 12 + 11 i and 4Q427 7 i	98
12	The texts of 4Q491 11 ii and 1QM 16:3–17:15	107
13	Four cases where, according to Duhaime, the author of 1QM has expanded the text of 4Q491	113
14	The texts of 4Q491 13 and 1QM 16:3–8a and 1QM 17:10–13	120
15	Lexical similarities between 4Q491 fragment 15 line 5 and 1QM 15:7	122
16	The contents of 4Q491 fragments 18, 22, 24–28, 31–33, 35	123
17	1QM 14–17 and its parallels in 4Q491a	124
18	The text of 4Q492 1 1–5a, 1QM 19:1–5a and 1QM 12:8b–13a	131
19	The structure of 1QM 12:8b–9a	132
20	The structure of 1QM 12:10b–12a	133
21	Parallelism in 1QM 12:12b–13a	135
22	The texts of 4Q492, lines 5b–8a; 1QM 19:5b–8 and 1QM 12:13b–16	136
23	The text of 4Q492 1 8b–13, 1QM 19:9b–14 and 1QM 14:2–4a	140
24	Lexical similarities between 1QM 13:7–9a and 1QM 14:8b–15	142
25	The text of 4Q491 1–3 and 1QM 3:4b, 5:16, 7:9b–12	154
26	The texts of 4Q491 fragments 5+6 and 1QM 12:1	163
27	The texts of 4Q491 fragment 7 and 1QM 13:8–9	163
28	The texts of 4Q493 1–14, 4Q491 1–3 13b–15a, 1QM 3:1–2a, 1QM 7:12b–13a and 1QM 16:3–4a, 18:3b–5a	172
29	The texts of 4Q493 6b–8c, 1QM 8:8b–13b and 1QM 16:6b–9	174
30	The texts of 4Q493, lines 4b–6a and 1QM 9:7b–9	176
31	The text of 4Q494 and 1QM 2:1–3a	183
32	Words common in 4Q471 1 and 1QM 2	191
33	The texts of 4Q495 2 and 1QM 13:9b–12a	201
34	The texts of 4Q495 1 6b–8c and 1QM 10:9b–10a	202

- 35 Arrangement and dating of 4Q496, 4Q505, 4Q506 and 4Q509 according to Baillet 204
- 36 The texts of 4Q496 fragment 3 and 1QM 1:4b–9a 207
- 37 The texts of 4Q496 fragments 1+2 and 1QM 1:11–17 210
- 38 The texts of 4Q497 fragment 1 and 1QM 14:7b–8a 215
- 39 DJD transcriptions and transformations of 4Q285 8 and 11Q 14 1 ii 227
- 40 DJD transcriptions and translations of 4Q285 fragment 7 and 11Q14 fragment 1, column 1 230
- 41 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 fragments 1–3, 5 and M manuscripts 235
- 42 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 4 and M manuscripts 238
- 43 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 fragments 6, 9–10 and M manuscripts 240
- 44 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 7–8 and M manuscripts 243
- 45 Battle instructions in the M manuscripts 263
- 46 Encouragement speeches in M manuscript 276
- 47 The similarities between the passages that (very probably) mention the chief priest or the appointed priest 286
- 48 The textual parallels between 1QM and 4QM manuscripts 290
- 49 Themes in 4Q491 fragments 1–3, lines 6–11 and 1QM 7:3b–7. The arrows demonstrate where the similar themes are discussed 299

Introduction

1 Framing the Question

Battle between two opposing sides has always caught people's imaginations. Contradiction is generally much more interesting than harmony, and although it can be unattractive to make a choice between black and white, it is generally even more difficult to try to see all the shades of gray and take them into account when making decisions. Due to its ongoing complexity, the world we live in is so difficult to grasp that people long for simplicity. Therefore, visions that make a clear distinction between two sides – and furthermore, make these two sides battle against each other – are appealing.

This study originates from the desire to understand the polarized and perhaps even violence-provoking thinking in some ancient Jewish manuscript finds: how it developed, how and for what purposes it was used and what kind of consequences it had. The Dead Sea Scrolls offer a great amount of interesting material in terms of these questions:¹ Texts like 1 Enoch and Jubilees, which were already known before the revolutionary discoveries made in the Qumran area in the 1940s and 1950s,² reflect dualistic thinking and, in many later texts, it is even more explicit; the Treatise on the Two Spirits, the famous section in the Community Rule (1QS), is perhaps the most well-known example but the battle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness described in the War Scroll (1QM) and other War Texts does not lag far behind. Especially the manuscript 1QM and the ten other manuscripts considered to be related to it (4Q285, 4Q471, 4Q491–4Q497, 11Q14) not only describe the polarization and

1 On the Dead Sea Scrolls and polarized thinking, see, e.g., Raija Sollamo, “War and Violence in the Ideology of the Qumran Community,” in *Verbum et Calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen*, ed. H. Juusola, J. Laulainen, and H. Palva, StOr 99 (Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004), 341–52; Hanna Vanonen, “Vastakkainasettelun aika: Valon ja Pimeyden lapset Qumranin Sotakäärössä” (The Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness in the War Scroll from Qumran), *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 3 (2013): 259–69 (in Finnish).

2 Of course, before the Qumran discoveries, the polarized thinking was already known from the Hebrew Bible as well. Just to mention a few examples: The Book of Psalms starts with the description of two different ways (Ps 1) and the contraposition between the wicked and the righteous is discussed, e.g., in Ps 37. Some of the prophetic books describe two angels that represent opposing sides (Zech 3 and Dan 10) and the contraposition between light and darkness is known in, e.g., The Book of Isaiah (5:20). In Jewish-Christian literature, the terminology related to light and darkness is used even more frequently: see, e.g., Luke 16:8, John 12:36, 1 Thess 5:5, Eph 5:8.

conflict but also represent partly different and sometimes seemingly contradictory views of the war in multiple manuscripts. All this attracted my interest, and the War Text material from Qumran, namely eleven Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts that have been interpreted as dealing with war and warfare, were chosen to be the object of this study.

Concentrating on polarization, conflict and differences, however, is not the only and not always the most useful way to approach this material. For example, the claim of polarization reflected in the content of the War Texts turned out to be something to be criticized: strictly speaking, the terms “Sons of Light” and/or “Sons of Darkness” are only represented in one fourth of the War Text manuscripts and in 1QM, for instance, they are featured only in a few chosen columns. The question arose whether the strong polarization between light and darkness – which certainly is not the most transmitted theme among the preserved themes in the War Texts – really is a key element in understanding the Scroll.³ It appears that in the history of research, the case is similar to what it is in everyday life, namely that polemical discourse is often unrestrained and nuances are neglected. At the same time, questions related to the domination of somehow polarized thinking began to surface regarding the study of ancient manuscripts in general. In recent years, scholars across disciplinary boundaries have been so intrigued by differences and conflicts that other viewpoints have often been neglected.⁴

The interest in differences involves not only the polarization expressed in the content of the texts but it also influences how scholars view their material in general. In Dead Sea Scrolls studies, scholars are very much interested in the differences between the manuscripts – more so than the similarities between them – although finding two ancient manuscripts to be different is much more to be expected than finding them to be identical. Concurrently, however, differences between the manuscripts are still often seen as something that must be explained as a struggle towards stability, not as an intended state of affairs – although the textual evidence clearly reflects more variation than identity. In other words, attention is paid to differences but the presupposition is to find a (coherent) development towards standardization. All this leads one to ask whether the phrasing of the question needs refining.

3 Initially, I explored this question (in Finnish) in Vanonen, “Vastakkainasettelun aika,” 259–69.

4 Recently, for example, the researchers of the Academy of Finland’s Centre of Excellence *Reason and Religious Recognition* have reacted against this emphasis by paying attention specifically to similarity, recognition and tolerance instead of differences and conflict. See <http://blogs.helsinki.fi/reasonandreligiousrecognition/about-the-centre/research-plan-in-sum/>.

In the course of this project, it soon became clear that there is a constant need to scrutinize manuscripts at the level of basic research. At the beginning of my project, scholarly understanding of the manuscripts as material artifacts was still incomplete. Furthermore, the existing editions of the War Texts proved to reflect the above-mentioned presupposition of the similarity between the manuscripts despite their differences: 1QM as a best preserved manuscript had often guided the reading of the other manuscripts which were reconstructed to resemble it. Producing a material and textual analysis of the War Text fragments found in Caves 4 and 11 in their own right was thus the first aim for this study. Related to this, grouping manuscripts and/or compositions they were thought to reflect into categories needed to be questioned: not all manuscripts labeled as M manuscripts according to 1QM are (exact) parallels to 1QM,⁵ and not all manuscripts labeled as War Texts undoubtedly discuss war specifically. Therefore, clarifying the categorization of the material and understanding the mutual relationships of the individual manuscripts were additional goals. The questions of labeling and grouping texts are acute in Dead Sea Scrolls studies in general,⁶ as are the questions concerning editing and practices related to it.⁷ The study aims to free itself from the presupposition that in the case of multiple manuscripts – i.e. manuscripts that are considered to be representatives of the same literary work – the best preserved one would serve as the starting point and a special case. The War Text manuscripts found in Caves 4 and 11 as well as the Cave 4 manuscripts of, for example, the Community Rule, the Hodayot, the Temple Scroll, the Songs of the Sage, and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C⁸ have highlighted the textual variety that seems

5 Here, I do not agree with the view that 1QM is or that it should be in some way normative. What I aim to do here is to bring up the question on the criteria for grouping the manuscripts. Manuscripts were labelled as M manuscripts according to 1QM but not all the manuscripts that were labelled as M are exact parallels to 1QM. Thus, the criteria according to which a text can be labelled as M seem to be unclear.

6 Cf., e.g., Hindy Najman and Eibert Tigchelaar, "A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature and Text Designation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ*, 26 (2014): 305–26; Årstein Justnes, "On Being a 'Librarian': Labels, Categories, and Classifications," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, ed. S. White Crawford and C. Wassen, STDJ 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 15–29.

7 Eibert Tigchelaar, "Proposals for the Critical Editing of Scrolls Compositions," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of SBL 2012, available through www.academia.edu; idem, "Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Illustrated by a Study of 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman)," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*, ed. M.L. Grossman (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 26–47.

8 In all these cases, many at least partly parallel manuscripts are preserved and scholars have labeled them as "copies" of one work. Thus, a work like Community Rule exists mainly on a

to be characteristic of the scribal culture at Qumran. In order to understand the work of the scribes, all the preserved material is to be scrutinized as a whole. Therefore, in this study, 1QM is discussed among all the other War Text manuscripts, as one representative of the War Text material.

While the War Text manuscripts are first analyzed individually, the fundamental questions of this study are related to the ensemble of manuscripts: what does the study of the manuscripts independently contribute to our understanding of the lively and variable scribal culture in the orbit of Qumran? Understanding variation and stability in ancient scribal culture on the basis of a limited amount of material is the question that occupies scholars' minds more broadly.⁹ While the main focus of this study is on textual questions – that is, understanding each manuscript in its own right, the similarities and differences between manuscripts, and textual transmission – the study is also motivated by the original interest in polarization in the War Texts. It will be my goal that the reader will in the end have a more solid basis for asking whether the War literature of Qumran was violence-provoking or not, what kind of role the dualistic language played in this literature, and to what extent and in what forms polarization is present in different manuscripts.

2 Framing the Material

The study of the Dead Sea Scrolls has demonstrated clearly that in order to cope with the hundreds of ancient manuscripts found just at this site, one needs categories by which to organize the material. Furthermore, the categories are artificial and vague and sometimes they can hinder rather than help by cementing scholarly understanding of the relationships between the texts. “War Texts” is definitely one of those vague categories. The term is especially

theoretical level and what we actually have is a collection of fragmentary manuscripts that is interpreted as representing this hypothetical work.

9 Cf., e.g., Jutta Jokiranta, “What is ‘Serekh ha-Yahad (S)’? Thinking about Ancient Manuscripts as Information Processing,” in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*, ed. J. Baden, H. Najman, and E. Tigchelaar, JSJSup (Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 2016), 61–35; idem and Hanna Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of the S and M Documents,” in *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. M.S. Pajunen and H. Tervanotko, Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 108 (Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015), 11–60. As Jokiranta and Vanonen note, some new models that can help us discuss the variation in ancient manuscripts have been presented in recent years, cf., e.g., Eva Mroczek, “Thinking Digitally about the Dead Sea Scrolls: Book History before and beyond the Book,” *Book History* 14 (2011): 241–69.

known from the publication series *Companion to the Qumran Scrolls*, which has aimed to introduce relevant Qumran texts especially to non-specialists. In the sixth volume of this series, Jean Duhaime introduces the “War Texts” that, according to him, is

the name given to a small group of Dead Sea Scrolls which depict the preparation for, and the various phases of, the eschatological battle (Hebrew *milhamah*) between two opposite camps, the ‘Sons of Light’ and the ‘Sons of Darkness’.¹⁰

According to Duhaime, manuscripts 1QM, 4Q285, 4Q471, 4Q491 (or 4Q491a, b, c),¹¹ 4Q492–4Q497 and 11Q14 are subsumed under this category definition. However, as the textual analysis of the manuscripts of this study will show, this characterization is not representative of the complete corpus. First, as already noted, the crucial terms “Sons of Light” and/or “Sons of Darkness” are preserved with certainty only in manuscripts 1QM, 4Q491a and 4Q496 (which is only one-quarter of the War Text manuscripts), and in most of the manuscripts neither the word “light” (אור) nor the word “darkness” (חושך) has been preserved (cf. 4Q285, 4Q491b, 4Q492, 4Q493, 4Q494, 4Q495, 11Q14). Second, in the largest and best preserved manuscript 1QM, the terms “Sons of Light” and/or “Sons of Darkness” occur fairly seldom, and it is questionable how well the battle between these two parties actually defines the key content of the complete Scroll.¹² Third, even the idea of war is difficult to find in all manuscripts categorized as War Texts: in the case of manuscripts 4Q285 and 11Q14, the links to the war remain weak and the word *milhamah* never occurs in the preserved fragments.¹³

Duhaime naturally follows the early scholars and the editors of the Cave 4 and Cave 11 manuscripts.¹⁴ The work of these pioneering researchers was greatly influenced by the order of discovery and publication of the material. If, for example, Cave 4 had been found and published before Cave 1, the scholarly

10 Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Fragments*, *Companion to the Qumran Scrolls* 6 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 4.

11 Concerning 4Q491 and the theories of dividing its fragments as belonging to two or three manuscripts, see Section 1.1. of Chapter 2.

12 See columns 1, 3, 13, 14, 16 which is only one-quarter of the 1QM columns. See also Vanonen, “Vastakkainasettelun aika,” 259–69.

13 For further discussion on this, see Chapter 7.

14 The purpose of the publication series *Companion to the Qumran Scrolls* is to give an overview of different groups of manuscripts (in addition to the War Texts, e.g., the purity texts, the exegetical texts, the Damascus texts) on the basis of earlier editions, not to create completely new categories.

discourse might have been very different. However, the fact is that Cave 1 was found first and thus, it is not unexpected that all the manuscripts Duhaime considers as War Texts were named after 1QM: 4Q491–4Q496 are labeled with the siglum M (4QM^{a-f}) denoting *milḥamah* as does the M in the code 1QM. In addition, 4Q471 and 4Q497 are labeled with the name War Scroll-like Text which clearly indicates some kind of similarity or relationship with 1QM/1QWar Scroll. The title for 4Q285 and 11Q14, *Sefer ha-Milḥamah*, points to the similarities the editors saw between 4Q285 (/11Q14) and 1QM (thus “*milḥamah*”) and to the differences between these two texts (thus “*sefer*”).¹⁵ Therefore, it is at the moment more appropriate to say that “War Texts” is the *name for a small group of Dead Sea Scrolls that have, at least at some stage of their study, been linked with the manuscript 1QM and/or the idea of the eschatological war presented there and consequently labeled after 1QM*. In this study, the term “War Texts” is used in that sense. However, the category and the labels given to manuscripts are critically evaluated and their significance and effects are discussed. The questions of naming and categorizing also have a wider impact on the field of Dead Sea Scrolls studies: in this field, scholars have recently grown more and more aware of how the designations and titles given to texts have influenced – or probably will influence – scholars’ ways of reading, interpreting and categorizing texts now and in the future.¹⁶ In this study, the War Texts of Qumran are engaged in this discussion.

3 Previous Studies on the War Texts

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls was revolutionary for the scholarly understanding of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible. However, the dominant views during the time of the discovery of the scrolls were not directly called into question. Rather, scholars fitted new evidence to old theories and understood it as complementary to the material that was already known.¹⁷ Only in

15 See Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: 4QSerakh Ha-Yahad*, DJD 26 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 231; and note also Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 312.

16 See e.g., Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 305–25 (about earlier discussion on this topic, see esp. 306 n. 2); Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 11–14, 18–27, 51. See also Mika S. Pajunen, *The Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381*, JSJSup 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 15–23, 374–77, who discusses the question of labeling psalms as “apocryphal” or not.

17 Cf. Emanuel Tov, *The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed., revised and expanded (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012), 157.

the course of time has the whole collection of material been reassessed and scholars have started to examine the discovered evidence in its own right.¹⁸ A similar trajectory can be seen in the study of the texts that scholars got to know only through the Dead Sea discoveries: When manuscripts of several previously unknown compositions were found in Cave 1, redaction criticism was soon applied to explain the incoherence and discrepancies in them.¹⁹ When Cave 4 fragments revealed the pluriformity of the texts, the initial attempts aimed at reconstructing them with the help of the first-found and better preserved Cave 1 manuscripts.²⁰ A coherent chronological model of the textual history of a given composition continued to be the goal to strive for.²¹ The new evidence was understood as supplementing, not as challenging the old views. What evidently played a role too was the long and meandering publication

-
- 18 Cf. Jokiranta and Vanonen, "Multiple Copies of Rule Texts," 13: "Categorizing 'biblical' scrolls into previously known 'textual families' (proto-Samaritan, proto-Masoretic, and proto-Septuagint) or into representatives of local varieties (Palestinian, Babylonian, Egyptian) has proved to be insufficient in explaining the full variety of manuscript evidence, and the situation cannot be improved by adding categories to the previous ones." Here, Jokiranta and Vanonen refer to theories and discussion in Tov, *Textual Criticism*, and Eugene C. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999). They continue by stating that "textual pluriformity seems to have been the norm rather than an exception" and refer here to "the recent judgment by Florentino García Martínez," "Rethinking the Bible: Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research and beyond," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. M. Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 19–36 (24–28), and "the discussion on how this pluriformity is and could be seen in the present Hebrew Bible editorial projects by Eibert Tigchelaar," "Editing the Hebrew Bible: An Overview of Some Problems," in *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present*, ed. J.S. Kloppenborg and J.H. Newman, RBS (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 41–68.
- 19 As regards 1QS, for example, several studies discussing its redaction history were published between the 1950s and the 1980s. See a summary of these by Sarianna Metso in *The Serekh Texts*, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9 / LSTS 62 (London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007), 15–17. In the case of 1QM, the early theories of the redaction of 1QM were presented by, e.g., Johannes P.M. van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre traduit et annoté avec une introduction*, STDJ 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1959), Chaim Rabin, "הגנוזות: ספר זכרון: המבנה הספרותי של מגילת מלחמת בני אור ובני חושך," in *מחקרים במגילות לאלעזר ליפא סוקניק*, ed. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (Jerusalem: Hekal haSefer, 1961) (in Hebrew), and Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*, SUNT 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969). See further discussion below.
- 20 This can be seen, for example, in Maurice Baillet's edition of the Cave 4 War Text fragments in which many manuscripts have been reconstructed according to 1QM (cf., e.g., the arrangement of fragments 1–16 of 4Q491). See Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*, DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 12–72.
- 21 A recent example is the model created by Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*, STDJ 76 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); see further below.

process of the Cave 4 manuscripts.²² Only recently, has a closer examination of all the material been undertaken without automatically considering the smaller fragments as complementary to the best-preserved text or as “textual evidence” of the one composition which was chronologically developed from one form to another.

The history of the study of the War Texts reflects in many ways these general trajectories.²³ 1QM was among the seven scrolls that were first found in Cave 1.²⁴ Professor Eleazar Sukenik bought it together with the Hodayot (1QH^a) from the antique dealer Faidi Salahin.²⁵ He named the text “The War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness” which was not only his summary of the first line of the Scroll but also his understanding of the key content of the whole text.²⁶ He also published the preliminary edition of 1QM and some photographs of the Scroll, among them the image of the Scroll when it was unopened.²⁷ After Sukenik’s death (1953), his son Yigael Yadin continued the work with the Scroll.²⁸ Yadin’s book, *מגילות מלחמת בני אור בבני חושך* (in Hebrew), published in 1955, was the first important study on 1QM. It was later translated into English (The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, 1962) and it became basic work for all interested in the Scroll.²⁹ Yadin thoroughly discusses key themes of the Scroll and provides the Hebrew text and its translation with the explanatory footnotes appended. Yadin considered the Scroll a work produced by the Qumran sect and argued

22 The publication of all Dead Sea Scroll manuscripts continued over 54 years, from 1955 to 2009: see the series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, DJD 1–40 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955–2009).

23 A review of the research history of 1QM and Cave 4 M texts is also offered by, e.g., Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 45–53.

24 The other six were 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, 1QS, 1QpHab, 1QapGen, and 1QH^a. About the discovery of the scrolls, see, e.g., James C. VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), 3–19.

25 About Sukenik’s scholarly career in general, see Neil Asher Silberman, “Sukenik, Eleazar L.,” *EDSS* 2:902–3.

26 Cf. Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth I* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948), and Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 3.

27 Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth I*; cf. also Emanuel Tov, “Israeli Scholarship on the Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, ed. D. Dimant, STDJ 99 (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill, 2012), 299.

28 About Yadin’s scholarly career, see Neil Asher Silberman, “Yadin, Yigael,” *EDSS* 2:999–1000.

29 Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1962).

that it was a “detailed set of regulations and plans in accordance with which they were to act on the day of destiny.”³⁰

Although Yadin’s book was influential long after its publication and has remained the *editio princeps* of the text, other researchers became interested in 1QM in the 1950s. Johannes van der Ploeg and André Dupont-Sommer both translated the text into French and published their translations in journals.³¹ Slightly later, van der Ploeg published a monograph on the text with a revised translation.³² At that stage, questions concerning repetitions and internal discrepancies of the scroll had aroused interest,³³ and in his book van der Ploeg presented a list of reasons why he did not believe in the coherence of 1QM.³⁴ He concluded that there had been a primitive version of 1QM which was then enlarged by a redactor.³⁵ For many questions, van der Ploeg pinned his hopes on the Cave 4 fragments, which he already knew to exist but were not yet published.³⁶ At the same time, in the 1950s, Claus-Hunno Hunzinger

30 Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 4.

31 Johannes P.M. van der Ploeg, “La règle de la guerre: traductions et notes,” *VT* 5 (1955): 373–420; André Dupont-Sommer “«Règlement de la guerre des fils de lumière»: Traduction et notes,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 148 (1955): 141–80. On early Francophone studies of 1QM, see also Jean Carmignac, “Concordance hébraïque de la Règle de la Guerre,” *RevQ* 1 (1958): 7–49. Carmignac considered 1QM to be a single unity and he identified its author as the Teacher of Righteousness.

32 Van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*. On van der Ploeg as a scholar, see Eibert Tigchelaar, “Research of Qumran Scrolls in the Netherlands,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 488–491. According to Tigchelaar, van der Ploeg was a philologist before anything and he preferred to study words rather than theological themes or concepts. Although being hesitant to believe in absolutely certain interpretations in the study of ancient texts in general, he introduced his own views, of which the composite character of 1QM was one.

33 On the discrepancies and repetitions, cf., e.g., Duhaime (*The War Texts*, 46) who especially mentions the repetition of the same hymn in columns 12 and 19 and the discrepancies between columns 1, 15–19 and 2 (whether it is a matter of a one-day war against the Kittim or a 40-year war against all the nations).

34 Van der Ploeg argues, for example, that the descriptions of trumpets and the sequence of the war include discrepancies; see van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 13–22. In the beginning of his book, van der Ploeg also demonstrates that there was already a rich discussion on 1QM going on, for example, on the dating of the scroll and whether it was influenced by Roman war tactics.

35 According to van der Ploeg, the primary author formulated the introduction (in column 1), the instructions for setting up the camp (in column 15), the prayer given by the chief priest (in columns 15 and 10–12), the urge to encourage (in columns 15–16), the description of the three battles and the divine intervention (in columns 16–18), and the thanksgiving hymn (in columns 18–19). See van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 19–20.

36 Cf., e.g., the question of dating, van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 11. Cave 4 was found during the excavations in the ruins of Qumran in the winter of 1951–1952. However, its

had offered the first glimpse of the Cave 4 War Text fragments and introduced his idea that the Cave 4 War Text manuscripts could provide evidence of different redactional stages or different recensions with regard to the Cave 1 manuscript.³⁷ The edition of the ensemble of 4QM manuscripts had been entrusted to Hunzinger but he left the task quite quickly and was later replaced by Maurice Baillet. The completion of the publication eluded scholars until the 1980s but changing the editor was not the only reason for its delay; the material proved to be demanding in many ways³⁸ and determining the correct order of the fragments is a continuing challenge.³⁹

While the publication of the Cave 4 fragments was delayed, the study of 1QM continued. The coherence of the text was denied and scholars tried to formulate theories of textual evolution.⁴⁰ In the 1960s, Chaim Rabin, the other of the two translators of Yadin's book, presented his understanding of the composition of 1QM.⁴¹ According to him, 1QM was constructed of three components: the Book of the War (1:1–9:6), the Book of God's time (9:17–14:15), and the Book of Victory (from 14:16 to the end), of which the last mentioned was written last

discoverers were not scholars but Bedouin who were still exploring the area actively. In order to benefit from their discovery, the Bedouin sold many of the fragments and only after that, did scholars even become aware of the Cave, let alone be able to study it. Although not all the fragments were scattered to the world by the Bedouin, it took a long time to make them available to the scholarly community. Furthermore, editing these often very unstable and difficult fragments was a challenging task and thus many decades elapsed before they were finally available to all interested researchers. Cave 4 contained about 15,000 fragments. Cf., e.g., VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 16–18.

- 37 Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran," *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51. Note that Hunzinger also mentions 4Q492 and 4Q493 in his article (see p. 131). However, the further discussion of these manuscripts did not start before Baillet's DJD edition in 1982 (Baillet, DJD 7). For a review of the significance of Hunzinger's article, see Jörg Frey, "Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 539–40.
- 38 See Baillet's foreword for DJD 7 (pp. xi–xiv). Wise notes that Baillet had over 2200 fragments to analyze for DJD 7 so the amount of work Baillet faced was huge. Cf. Michael O. Wise, "מי כמוני באלים": A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:25–26:10," *DSD* 7 (2000): 173–219 (173).
- 39 See, e.g., Kipp Davis, "'There and Back Again': Reconstruction and Reconciliation in the War Texts of 4QMilhama^a (4Q246^{a-c})," in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Kipp Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 125–46.
- 40 In addition to van der Ploeg, Dupont-Sommer ("Règlement de la guerre des fils de lumière," 141–80) also doubted the coherent nature of the scroll. Duhaime notes that Yadin, although constantly speaking of "the author" of 1QM, already also believed that there were various "sources" behind the present scroll. Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 46.
- 41 Rabin, "המבנה הספרותי של מגילת מלחמת בני אור ובני חושך," 31–47.

in order to expand the two preceding ones (these were, according to him, actually mentioned in the third part, in 15:4–6).⁴² This division into three (roughly in columns 1–9, 10–14, and 15–19) has later also been a typical way of outlining of the scroll's content, although opinions on whether these three parts also reflect redactional stages have varied. In the German-speaking world the most important researcher interested in 1QM in the 1960s was Peter von der Osten-Sacken. His study *Gott und Belial* actually dealt with the traditions of dualism in the Qumran texts, and, for him, 1QM 1 was one of the earliest expressions of dualism.⁴³ According to von der Osten-Sacken, column 1 was the source on which the whole 1QM text had been constructed. This is opposite to many later views according to which 1QM 1 is actually one of the latest parts of the scroll.⁴⁴

The most important study in the 1970s—and long after – was Philip R. Davies' *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*.⁴⁵ This study was devoted exclusively to the composition of 1QM. According to Davies, there were two main sections of the scroll: the text in columns 2–9 derives from the Hasmonean period and the final redaction of the text in columns 15–19 – the result of a long process – points to a Roman date. This later section contains dualistic elements that are absent from columns 2–9 (that are rather characterized by a “nationalistic” tone). In addition, columns 10–14 included a collection of hymns and prayers; column 14 is also an earlier recension of columns 15–19. Davies' theory became influential. However, he was not able to take all M material into account. As Bastiaan Jongeling notes in his review of Davies' book, “the author, as well as other scholars, has to work with hypotheses.”⁴⁶

In 1982, the waiting came to an end as Maurice Baillet published the Cave 4 M manuscripts in the seventh volume of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. This volume also included several liturgical texts and other texts, many of which were challenging papyrus fragments. In his preface to the volume, Baillet described his unwillingness to take the responsibility for all these fragments and the demanding nature of the task.⁴⁷ Of the fragments under his responsibility, Baillet labeled six manuscripts with the name *La règle de la guerre* and with the sign M (4Q491–4Q496) and one manuscript with the name *Texte ayant quelque rapport avec la Règle de la guerre* [?], i.e., a text

42 See also Duhaime's summary of Rabin's article: Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 46–47.

43 See von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 28–115.

44 See, e.g., Philip R. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*, BibOr 32 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), 21.

45 See note 44.

46 Bastiaan Jongeling, review of *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran. Its Structure and History* by Philip R. Davies, *JSJ* 8 (1977): 197–8.

47 Baillet, *DJD* 7: xi–xiv.

having something to do with the War Scroll (4Q497). In his introductions to each manuscript, he concentrated on describing the material and the script. In some cases, he stated his opinion on the manuscript's relation to 1QM: in the case of 4Q491, he saw it probable that the manuscript was an earlier recension of what was then copied in 1QM, and with regard to 4Q493, he suggests it too represents a recension different from 1QM.⁴⁸ He also brought forward the possibility that different manuscripts were inscribed for different purposes: 4Q491 could be for the purposes of personal meditation.⁴⁹ Herein, he was ahead of his time; different uses of manuscripts is something that is more and more discussed in present-day studies.⁵⁰ All in all, within the limits of the edition, Baillet did not present any uniting theory of the relationships between the M manuscripts. However, he clearly had the idea that the M manuscripts were strictly dependent on each other and he used 1QM as much as possible to complete the text of the more fragmentary manuscripts.

The concept used by Baillet, "recension," had shown up in other studies of 1QM as well (cf., e.g., Davies' book and its reviews). Jean Duhaime established the term by using it in his introductory work for the War Texts when demonstrating the Cave 4 manuscripts' relationship to 1QM. He introduced five "text types" to group the material: 1QM, similar recensions (i.e., similar to 1QM), other recensions, Sefer ha-Millhamah, and "Self-Glorification Hymn."⁵¹ Two of these text types are defined according to their contentual relation to 1QM: manuscripts 4Q492, 4Q494, 4Q495 and 4Q496 are copies of a recension similar to 1QM, while manuscripts 4Q471, 4Q491, 4Q493 and 4Q497 are copies of other

48 Baillet, DJD 7: 12, 50.

49 Baillet, DJD 7:12. The idea of manuscripts being private or personal copies is further discussed in this study in Chapter 6, Section 3.

50 The question about the purposes of use is related to the growing interest in material aspects of manuscripts. For example, George Brooke argues on the basis of the observations on the "paratextual indicators" of the manuscript, that the *Pesher Habakkuk* was "a text produced for use rather than for beauty" (cf., e.g., the unusual number of columns per sheet) and that the "text was used orally" (cf., e.g., the use of the tetragrammaton, marginal markings). See Brooke, "Physicality, Paratextuality and Pesher Habakkuk," in *On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures*, ed. Sydney H. Aufrère, Philip S. Alexander, and Zlatko Pleše, OLA 232 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 175–93 (191). Jutta Jokiranta argues as well that "material aspects of Pesher Habakkuk give several hints of the text being meant to be performed." See Jokiranta, "Quoting, Writing, and Reading: Authority in Pesher Habakkuk from Qumran," in *Between Canonical and Apocryphal Texts: Processes of Reception, Rewriting and Interpretation in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. J. Frey, C. Clivaz, and T. Nicklas, WUNT 419 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 185–211.

51 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 41. The quotation marks around the Self-Glorification Hymn were put in by Duhaime.

recensions.⁵² 1QM is called a “copy” as well.⁵³ “Other” recensions are closely connected to 1QM whereas Duhaime sees the other two text types as “copies of a separate work”: Sefer ha-Milḥamah is represented by manuscripts 4Q285 and 11Q14, and the “Self-Glorification Hymn” is embodied by 4Q491c, 4Q471b (= 4Q431), 1QH^a 26:6–17 and 4Q427.⁵⁴ In both cases, Duhaime again speaks about “copies” of compositions.⁵⁵ Following Duhaime, many recent scholars have continued to operate with this terminology: Brian Schultz (2009) outlines a largely similar model of similar and different recensions and classifies 4Q285 and 11Q14 as representing a “different composition altogether, albeit very much related to the eschatological war described in M.”⁵⁶ Rony Yishay (2006), although ending up arguing that it is impossible to say whether the Cave 4 M manuscripts represent recensions different from 1QM or, for example, reworking of the same sources,⁵⁷ seems to accept this terminological toolkit (including “recensions” and “editions”) in outline.⁵⁸ What should also be noted is that, instead of concentrating solely on the material evidence of the manuscripts, Yishay is more interested in seeing theoretical sources, “literary models” that are used and reworked in them.⁵⁹

52 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 20–31, 41.

53 Cf., e.g., Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 40: “... 1QM remains the most comprehensive copy of a War Text....”

54 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 31–41.

55 Cf., e.g., Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 33: “Copies of this poetic composition (i.e., the “Self-Glorification Hymn”) were identified among fragments of three different manuscripts of Hymns....”

56 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 37–39.

57 Rony Yishay, *ספרות המלחמה בקומראן* / “The Literature of War at Qumran: Manuscripts 4Q491–4Q496 (edition and commentary) and their comparison to War Scroll (1QM)” (PhD diss., University of Haifa, 2006) (in Hebrew). Yishay writes (see English abstract): “It cannot be determined whether they (= 4QM mss) contain different recensions, editions or only slight reworking of the basic sources.”

58 It is not completely clear whether Yishay sees any difference between “recension” and “edition.” Concerning 4Q493, she concludes that it and 1QM “present two editions of similar materials which serve different purposes and perspectives.” She further argues that 4Q493 and 1QM are dependent on a “common literary tradition” and that they are “two independent reworkings of sources.” See Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 253 and English abstract. Regarding 4Q494, she notes that lines 4–6 overlap with 1QM 2:1–2 while lines 1–3 are not in any way connected to 1QM. Yishay concludes that a “precise estimation” of the relationship between 4Q494 and 1QM is not possible (because 4Q494 is mostly damaged), but she uses the words “different recension” or “edition” of 4Q494. See Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 270 and English abstract.

59 Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” e.g., 326.

Of the recent studies on the War Texts, Schultz's monograph is the most exhaustive.⁶⁰ Schultz's main aim is to understand 1QM in its present form:⁶¹ he argues that columns 1–9 form the primitive part of the Scroll from the Hellenistic period and columns 10–19 were added later, inspired by the Roman conquest of Judea. He also discusses the other War Text material but his model for explaining the texts is strongly 1QM-oriented and consequently his study leaves space especially for further studies concerning the Cave 4 material in particular.⁶²

A special part of the research history of the War Texts is the editions made of them. In the case of M manuscripts, the number of editions is large and the question of arranging the Cave 4 fragments is still acute. Therefore, I shall take a separate look at the editions of the Cave 4 War Texts and the discussion on editing principles in the field of Qumran studies.

3.1 *Editions of 4QM*⁶³

What demonstrates the challenges in editing and classifying the War Text manuscripts is the great number of existing editions.⁶⁴ In the DJD edition of the 4QM texts from 1982, Baillet aimed at joining fragments together whenever possible – and he often made the joins with the help of 1QM.⁶⁵ Furthermore, Baillet tended to reconstruct each manuscript as fully as possible, i.e., to guess what was inscribed in the lacunas in or between the fragments, usually on the

60 Yishay's dissertation is also focused solely on the War Texts but its significance for wider scholarship is diminished by the fact that it is unpublished and thus not easily accessible.

61 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 5.

62 As Charlotte Hempel puts it: "It is a pity that the evidence from Cave 4 is incorporated only rather briefly and often in conversation with the author's reading of 1QM." Cf. Hempel, review of *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* by Brian Schultz, *JSOT* 34 (2010): 206–7.

63 This analysis (with some differences) was published in an article called "Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of the S and M Documents" by Jutta Jokiranta and me; see *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries*, 34–37. Although the article was a joint project, I wrote the original version of the section discussing editions of 4QM independently.

64 The editions of the so-called Sefer ha-Milhamah texts (4Q285, 11Q14) and the Self-Glorification Hymn texts (4Q491c, 4Q471b (= 4Q431), 1QH^a 26:6–17, 4Q427) are also numerous and they could be enumerated as part of the War Text editions. These editions are further discussed in Chapters 2 and 7.

65 Cf., e.g., connecting fragments 5 and 6 (see Baillet, DJD 7:20). The certainty of this connection was later called into question; cf., e.g., Martin Abegg, "The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4" (PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1993), 51.

basis of 1QM.⁶⁶ This made it easy to give emphasis to the links between 1QM and the Cave 4 War Texts – which probably was a conscious aim and also a kind of research result of the DJD volume.

Martin Abegg (1993) was the first to challenge Baillet's views.⁶⁷ Abegg preferred to treat the fragments separately and did not accept all Baillet's joins.⁶⁸ However, in his readings of the fragments, Abegg mainly followed Baillet and made large reconstructions based on 1QM, mostly similar to Baillet. Abegg's interest was focused primarily on the links between 1QM and 4QM manuscripts, as is shown by the inclusion of an edition of 1QM in which coincident passages with the Cave 4 War Texts are marked at the end of his dissertation.

Jean Duhaime's edition (1995)⁶⁹ differed from the two previous ones by refraining from large reconstructions.⁷⁰ However, in the arrangement of the fragments and in his readings, Duhaime followed mainly Baillet.⁷¹ Later, in his introductory monograph on the War Texts, Duhaime introduces Abegg's theory of dividing the much-discussed manuscript 4Q491 into three different manuscripts, 4Q491a, 4Q491b and 4Q491c, and considers it to be plausible.⁷²

The most recent editions of 4QM manuscripts demonstrate well the two very different approaches to manuscript editing. Rony Yishay (2006) is a cautious editor: her main aim is to provide the reader a reliable reading of the visible

66 George Brooke notes that in Baillet's edition "it is often difficult to see what text is actually extant," see Brooke, review of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol. 2, Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* by James H. Charlesworth and Joseph M. Baumgarten (eds.), *JTS* 48 (1997): 576–9 (577).

67 Abegg ("The War Scroll," 211) states that his edition is indebted to Sukenik's, Carmignac's and Yadin's earlier works.

68 Cf., e.g., 4Q491 fragments 14 and 15 and the theory of 4Q491a,b,c. See further discussion in Chapter 2.1.

69 Jean Duhaime, "War Scroll," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol. 2, Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth and J.M. Baumgarten, PTS DSSP (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), 80–141. Duhaime's work was edited by James H. Charlesworth and Brent A. Strawn, who wrote part of the comments in the footnotes. The comments concern mostly the similarities between the 4QM texts and 1QM.

70 As George Brooke notes, Duhaime's edition "enables one to see easily more or less what the original fragment looks like." See Brooke, review of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts* by James H. Charlesworth and Joseph M. Baumgarten, 576–9.

71 As do Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, who published their *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (1997–1998) almost concurrently with Duhaime. The revised paperback edition was published in 2000. For the 4QM texts, see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition. Vol. 2, 4Q274–11Q31* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

72 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 24–30. On arguments and discussion of this theory, see Chapter 2, Section 1.1.

text, and she avoids large reconstructions.⁷³ As regards 4Q491, the most controversial of the 4QM texts, Yishay does not follow either Baillet's order or Abegg's division: she creates her own arrangement of the fragments, and further separates individual fragments from each other. She shows an interest in treating each fragment as it is, even though her separations can be criticized. However, she does not abandon Baillet's idea of the fragments of 4Q491 belonging to one manuscript – she only states that the fragments “do not yield a coherent running text.”⁷⁴ Elisha Qimron (2010), on the other hand, aims at reading all the War Texts together and placing the text of the 4QM manuscripts as part of the running text of 1QM.⁷⁵ For example, 4Q493 is situated between columns 7 and 8 of 1QM.⁷⁶ When any textual form of 4QM manuscripts is identical with 1QM, the transcribed text is colored, whereas the text that is only found in 1QM is in black. This way of editing has a great impact on readings: in Qimron's edition, 1QM dictates the reading of 4QM manuscripts. This is one reason why it has met with critical response.⁷⁷ In any case, Qimron's edition shows that using a Cave 1 manuscript as a basis for editing the Cave 4 manuscripts is not a passing phenomenon. Even so, the critical question raised above – namely whether there are reasons to suppose that those parts of the Cave 1 text that have not been preserved in Cave 4 texts would still have existed there – is worth asking.

73 Ishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran.” In comparison with other editions, it is difficult that Yishay does not distinguish between certain, probable and possible letters but marks only identified or unidentified letters. If a letter is not clearly visible, she usually marks an unidentified letter. The work is an unpublished dissertation in Hebrew, so our access to it is limited.

74 See Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” English abstract.

75 Elisha Qimron כרך ראשון העבריים, *מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים*, / *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings, Vol. 1* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010) (in Hebrew).

76 Another example: Manuscript 4Q491 is shown to exist in columns 12, 14 and 16 of 1QM, and it is further situated between columns 6 and 7, 15 and 16, 16 and 17, and 18 and 19 of 1QM, and at the end of the scroll.

77 Eibert Tigchelaar (“Proposals for the Critical Editing”) notes that Qimron's editions are not intended to be critical editions at all but to present composite texts in an economical form. Overlaps are easily seen in this type of edition but the user cannot assess the distinct manuscript features and variants. Ariel Feldman, for his part, notes that there is a significant difference between Qimron's and Yadin's assessment of the number of lines of 1QM: according to Yadin, there were some 20 lines per column, whereas Qimron argues that the number of lines was some 30. In addition, Feldman takes note of Qimron's suggestion that – as Feldman puts it – “the 4QWar materials that have no parallel in 1QM may be accommodated in those additional lines.” Feldman does not directly accept that idea but writes: “It remains to be seen whether this proposal, as well as the entire concept of using a composite edition strategy for the texts that bear marks of inner literary development, will gain scholarly support.” See Feldman, review of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings, Vol. 1* by Elisha Qimron, *JSS* 58 (2013): 201–2 (202).

Although there are a number of editions of 4QM material, the manuscripts that are considered to represent the Community Rule (S manuscripts) – in Caves 1, 4 and 5 – have been studied much more, and working out the relationship between the 4QS manuscripts and 1QS has caused many clear controversies.⁷⁸ The principle that the DJD editors of 4QS material call a “maximalist approach” clearly has had an influence on editing the 4QM manuscripts as well.⁷⁹ The editors of the 4QS manuscripts, Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes, clearly state that 1QS is the “more or less complete manuscript of the document” and thus, it should constantly be checked to see if *lacunae* in Cave 4 fragments can be reconstructed accordingly.⁸⁰ Similarly, 1QM – the longest representative of the suggested M tradition – continues to have an impact on the editions of 4QM manuscripts. However, in the case of S, the evidence put forward for the priority of 1QS has been contested and, correspondingly, one should critically review the standing of 1QM in reconstructing and interpreting other M manuscripts. The maximalist principle is only justified if one thinks that the best-preserved manuscript is in some way special – beyond the fact that it is well preserved – and it must be asked, both in the case of S and in the case of M, whether there are any self-evident reasons to suggest this specialty.⁸¹

Of all the editions presented above, Duhaime’s edition is the most minimalistic, i.e., it does not start with the premise that 1QM is the special manuscript and that the reconstruction of 4QM material should be guided by it.⁸² Rather

78 Cf., e.g., the case of 4QS^b, also introduced in Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts,” 30–34, 38–43. Two completely controversial views of the relationship between 4QS^b and 1QS have been presented. To put it simply: On the one hand, e.g., Philip S. Alexander has argued that, on paleographic grounds, 1QS represents an older textual form than 4QS^b. On the other hand, e.g., Sarianna Metso has argued that the opposite is the case: as a shorter text, 4QS^b represents an older text than 1QS. See Alexander, “The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–56; Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, STDJ 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 68.

79 For a discussion on 4QS and 4QM material from the perspective of manuscript editing, see Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts,” 27–37, 52.

80 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:15. The editors also express reservations about Hartmut Stegemann’s method of material reconstruction (p. 16).

81 Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts,” 28–29; see also Jokiranta, “What is ‘Serekh ha-Yahad?’” 627–31.

82 Yishay’s edition is also mainly minimalistic – to the extent that it neglects to read letters that are the most difficult to identify. Thus, it gives its reader an impression of what can trustworthily be read on the fragments but does not give a coherent idea of the complete state of preservation.

than trying to demonstrate what the manuscripts or the possible work behind them could have contained, Duhaime aims to show what the original fragments look like. Therefore, in this study, Duhaime's edition is chosen to be used as a starting point for approaching the manuscripts. However, when studying the fragments, I also make use of the photos – both the old PAM photos and the new digitized photos – and on the basis of the photos – when needed – I make my own amendments to Duhaime's readings.⁸³

One can ask whether it would be more functional to draw up completely new editions of the manuscripts under discussion; since none of the earlier editions is usable enough as it is, would it not be more appropriate to create a new one? However, at this stage of Dead Sea Scrolls studies, the evaluation of existing editions and decoding their principles have proven profitable and can even be argued to be indispensable. Today, it stands to reason that the Qumran data is an important part of the material for both biblical scholars and neighboring fields of research. For these scholars, it is of special importance that Qumran specialists communicate the ways in which they approach their material and produce editions and studies for others to use. At present, there is little tendency to analyze one's own principles of editing, to make explicit the purpose or the intended audience of the edition or – as Eibert Tigchelaar has recently noted – to separate “different levels of textual entities, namely those of fragments, manuscripts, works, and textual groups.”⁸⁴ For this reason, the aim of this study is not to make one more new edition but to make use of one well tried with exploring it critically in order to help future scholars evaluate the ongoing editorial work.

4 Methodological Considerations

As noted in the research-historical overview above, the term “recension” has been essential in studying the M texts – so essential, that it is necessary to analyze briefly this concept. “Recension” was obviously transmitted to Dead Sea Scrolls studies from the study of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible where the Masoretic text (MT), the Septuagint (LXX) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) were long known as three “recensions” or “text types” of the

83 The photos are available in *The Leon Levi Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library*, <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/> and in Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, rev. ed. (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill, 2006).

84 Tigchelaar, “Proposals for the Critical Editing,” 4.

Torah.⁸⁵ Labeling these three as “recensions” indicated that they were each products of an independent textual development and they had gone through deliberate revision.⁸⁶ However, for many reasons, the usefulness of this kind of terminology on the whole has been called into question: The Qumran discoveries have substantially changed the view of the ancient textual situation: it was rather defined by multiformity than by three stable groups of textual “recensions.” What scholars have also been forced to take into account in the “post-Qumran” era is that the preserved textual evidence is always somehow coincidental: finding new textual evidence is no longer unthinkable.⁸⁷ For all this, Emanuel Tov, for example, has suggested that instead of using terms like “text type” and “recension,” one should just speak about “texts” and “clusters of texts,”⁸⁸ and that the term “recension” should at least in the study of the Hebrew Bible be replaced with a “term that is less committing, such as *group* or *family*.”⁸⁹

In recent years, the need for reassessing even the more basic concepts like “text” and “manuscript” has come up more broadly: For example, the meaning of the term “manuscript,” which seems to be one of the basic concepts, proves to be ambiguous. According to Eibert Tigchelaar, it is usually used in three different senses – and in all cases, it is a theoretical concept: First, it can denote a presupposed inscribed object which consists of discrete pieces of inscribed papyrus or skin – of which one or more have been preserved. In the second, and according to Tigchelaar, the more usual case, “manuscript” refers to “the sum and tentative assemblage of all the fragments and only fragments that are hypothesized to originate from one and the same original whole.” In this

85 Cf. Tov, *The Textual Criticism*, 155–6. The LXX *Vorlage* was called the “Egyptian/Alexandrian recension,” the MT the “Babylonian recension,” and the SP the “Samaritan recension.”

86 Tov, *The Textual Criticism*, 158.

87 Cf. Tov, *The Textual Criticism*, 159.

88 Tov, *The Textual Criticism*, 158–9.

89 In addition to the discussion on the applicability of concepts like “recension” and “text type” in the study of the Hebrew Bible, the discussion on how to define whether a manuscript represents a “rewritten” form of some earlier work has also been lively in recent years. As Jokiranta and Vanonen (“Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 13–14) note, this discussion raises “important questions of what makes a work distinguishable from other works, what amount of variation is allowed in order to justifiably speak of the same work, and how the ancient scribes themselves perceived what they were doing” – questions that are not far removed from the questions raised by “multiple” manuscripts found at Qumran, namely how one should understand the ancient textual variation. About the discussion on “rewritten” texts, see, e.g., Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008); Molly M. Zahn, “Rewritten Scripture,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 323–36.

case, the concept still refers primarily to the physical fragments and admits the hypothetical nature of the “original whole” – whose concrete form has not necessarily been further considered. Third, “manuscript” can have an even more theoretical meaning and denote the “tentative scholarly reconstruction of the original whole on the basis of the extant evidence.”⁹⁰ In his later paper, Tigchelaar further emphasized that only fragments are concrete; speaking of “manuscripts,” “works,” and “textual groups” already moves onto the theoretical level.⁹¹

Different ways of understanding “manuscript” are also evident in the study of the War Texts. Baillet’s edition represents the second of Tigchelaar’s three senses: Baillet assembles and arranges the fragments into groups according to their supposed originating from one original whole and calls these groups “manuscripts.” Recently, aiming at reconstructing the original wholes on the basis of the extant evidence (Tigchelaar’s third sense) has been in prospect,⁹² and as demonstrated in this study as well, the need for this kind of work is evident. However, in this study in general, the second use is dominant since the existing editions are used as a basis for the work. The theoretical nature of the concept is still understood and its use in this particular sense does not exclude the other ways of understanding it. Also, while using “manuscript” in a certain sense, the study aims to preserve a critical attitude towards this understanding and to raise questions concerning it for further research.

In the case of the War Texts, not only “manuscript” but also “fragment” is an ambiguous concept. For all scholars, “fragment” is a concrete, physical object but even it can consist of different pieces. Thus, in the case of many of the supposed manuscripts, the number of existing fragments depends on whether one accepts the joins made by the editor (or different joins by different editors) or not.⁹³ In many cases, the number of fragments is different from the

90 Cf. Eibert Tigchelaar, “Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing,” 26–27. Tigchelaar (pp. 27–28) also wants to make a clear distinction between the concepts “construction” (“the process of sorting out, assembling and arranging fragments into groups that are believed to stem from a single original manuscript”), “reconstruction” (“the application of an ensemble of methods in order to determine the original place of the fragments in the manuscript”) and “deconstruction” (“the critical and methodological questioning of the plausibility of the constructions and reconstructions of manuscripts by editors”).

91 Tigchelaar, “Proposals for the Critical Editing,” 4. The concept “manuscript” is further discussed in Section 5 of this introduction.

92 Cf. Davis, “There and Back Again,” 125–46.

93 Compare, e.g., Baillet’s edition of the 4QM texts to Abegg’s edition of the same texts and Schultz’s compilation of them (Baillet DJD 7:12–68; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 1–97; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 21).

number of pieces into which the manuscript was once scattered. Table 1 gives an approximate view of the number of existing fragments in the manuscripts discussed in this study.

TABLE 1 The number of existing fragments of the War Text manuscripts

Manuscript	Number of existing fragments
1QM	12
4Q491a	≥ 20
4Q491b	≥ 13
4Q492	3
4Q493	1
4Q494	1
4Q495	2
4Q496	≥ 122
4Q497	≥ 47
4Q471	3
4Q285	10
11Q14	2

This study seeks to take seriously the criticism of terms like “recension” and the need for clarifying concepts like “manuscript,” “text,” and “composition.” These questions have also been asked within a research branch called “new philology” which aims to understand not only the texts themselves but also how the material artifacts carrying those texts were produced and used. The new philology focuses on concrete manuscripts and studies them as they are, not, for example, as part of some collections into which the texts of the manuscripts were later incorporated. A manuscript is seen not only as a witness of the existence of some work in a given time period, but as an interesting research subject as such.⁹⁴ Each manuscript is understood to be one important snapshot of a tradition that is continuously evolving.⁹⁵ Although the new

94 Note that this is quite a different point of view from that of Duhaime according to whom “the different War Texts found at Qumran are particularly interesting *as witnesses to traditions* which have been used and reworked over and over in a priestly milieu during the first century BCE and the first years of the first century CE.” See Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 43 (italics mine).

95 See Hugo Lundhaug and Liv Ingeborg Lied, “Studying Snapshots: On Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology,” in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish*

philology is not a leading methodological approach used in this work, the study, partly influenced by this trend, also aims to understand the fragmentary Cave 4 manuscripts not only as “similar to” or “different from” 1QM but to see them in their own right.

The basic method of this research is material and textual analysis the fragments, i.e., analyzing each text in a systematic and detailed way, paying attention to the readings (what can be seen on the fragment), scribal markings and corrections, words and their frequency, the order of sentences and presentation of themes. In a broader sense, this analysis can be seen both as a methodological approach and an aim of the study: especially the War Text manuscripts from Cave 4 have been relatively little studied and there is still a clear need to present a basic material and textual analysis of them in one and the same book. After each analysis, comparisons can be made. In the case of the fragmentary manuscripts, one single manuscript does not usually offer much information. Comparison is needed in order to understand manuscripts in their own right. It is necessary in order to review the categories into which the texts are grouped: one must critically consider the arguments for understanding the texts as part of some established categories and representatives of certain groups and genres.

Comparison of the manuscripts naturally focuses on the textual basis. However, this study aims to take into account the material character of the texts as well and pay attention to the material similarities and differences between the texts. As regards the textual comparison, two different levels are separated: the similarity can be distinguished on the lexical level – in which case it is quite unequivocally perceivable – but also on the thematic level. The transmission not only involves wordings but also themes and ideas. Even a small lexical difference between two texts can sometimes reflect some larger ideological difference or change of thought. Therefore, the thematic level is important to keep in mind although it is not always as easy to grasp as close textual parallelisms. What should be noted is that thematic comparison is of course more subjective than comparing clear textual parallels – but in order to further scholarly discussion, some subjectivity is allowed and innovative thinking is needed.

The aim of comparing the manuscripts is to produce knowledge about the War Texts both in their own right and as a group or groups of texts: what can be known, what is similar, what was transmitted and why, what kind of differences there are in the material (that on the face of it share many elements),

and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology, ed. L.I. Lied and H. Lundhaug, TUGAL 175 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 1–19.

and what kind of changes, experiments, or variations in thinking the manuscripts reflect.⁹⁶ Instead of using the vague concept of “parallel” to describe the textual relations, the degree of similarity is evaluated with the help of three subcategories: First, “close parallel” means textual similarity on the level of wording. Second, “remote parallel” is used for the cases in which the texts of two manuscripts share elements on the thematic level but allow variation in word choices and in arrangement of the text. And third, the term “genre parallel” is utilized for cases in which the texts of two manuscripts are contentually different but share their genre and serve the same purpose in the manuscripts, for example, being speeches of the same character or being hymns breaking a text otherwise proceeding as narrative or instructions.⁹⁷

In addition to analyzing and comparing the texts, the study is influenced by the literary- and the redaction-critical approaches used in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls – but these approaches are seen through critical lenses:⁹⁸ The traditional redaction-critical approach presumed that the result of the

96 One of the scholars that is known for his use of the comparative approach is Jonathan Z. Smith. For him, the comparison is all about difference: Smith argues that “comparison requires the acceptance of difference as the grounds of its being interesting”; see Smith, *To take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual*, CSJH (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 14. However, in this study, the similarity is also something that is of interest and in fact, something that is of even more interest. As already stated in Section 1 of this introduction, if one takes two random manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is reasonable to suggest that the text in them differs. Therefore, what is noteworthy in the end is the cases where the manuscripts reflect – at least on some level – similarity. This leads scholars to the sources of the ancient textual transmission processes.

97 In the best-preserved manuscripts like 1QM and 4Q491a, similar kinds of battle descriptions recur throughout the text. Consequently, one may suggest, before making any comparisons, that the stage within which the battle description in the manuscript in question should be situated should be defined. Then, only the descriptions of the same stage should be compared. This starting point is still problematic for two reasons. First, the texts in these manuscripts do not necessarily describe one multi-stage war that logically proceeds from one stage to another; at least this cannot be the only model in the reader's mind when trying to find a fresh viewpoint on the texts. Second, if this kind of logically structured war could be distinguished from the texts, it is still difficult to determine which stage is at issue in the preserved fragments.

98 There has been critical discussion going on about the possibilities and limitations of the literary- and redaction-critical method both in the field of Dead Sea Scrolls studies and in the field of the study of the Hebrew Bible. On the last mentioned, cf., e.g., Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala and Bas ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*, RBS 75 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014). Müller, Pakkala and ter Haar Romeny argue that there is no reason to adopt an “overall methodological skepticism” towards these methods but they also admit that in many cases, reconstructing the “literary growth” of a text is difficult or even impossible. Furthermore, they state that “excessively optimistic notions about the methodology should be avoided,

study would be a coherent chronological model of the textual development. However, recently, scholars have emphasized more and more that this presupposition does not do justice to the textual reality of late Second Temple times: multiformity defines it more than direct flow towards stability or away from stability. Also, some scholars have suggested that textual development was not only chronological but also spatial and it could take place in different ways in different groups and social contexts.⁹⁹ Consequently, when explaining the differences and similarities between the manuscripts, this study aims to take into account not only the model of coherent chronological textual development but also different heuristic options in explaining the work of scribes and (possible) redactors of the War Texts – although still concentrating on the textual level.

What should still be noted is that war material is not the only textual cluster in which the material discussed in this study could be placed. Although the term *serekh* occurs in 1QM over twice as often as it is found in 1QS – and although in 1QM, *serekh* occurs more often in a titular usage – 1QM and other M texts are seldom included in the rule texts.¹⁰⁰ In this study, the research done on S is presumed to be an important parallel field to the study of M. Scholars have tried to grasp the variation in the manuscripts labeled with the code S and to understand the similarity and differences between them in new ways. Charlotte Hempel has suggested that studying the profile of the

and uncertainty about the reconstructions has to be accepted.” Cf. Müller, Pakkala and ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 221–2, 224.

99 Note that this suggestion was already part of the theory of three “recensions” of the Torah mentioned above. For this suggestion in Dead Sea Scrolls studies, see, e.g., Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009). What has also recently become a scholarly interest is the role of orality and oral traditions in the processes of textual transmission. On orality, cf., e.g., David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

100 Cf. Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 12–13. Concerning the titular usage of סרך: as Jutta Jokiranta notes, among the S texts “the expression *serekh ha-yahad* occurs only once in its complete form in a possible titular usage” (cf. 4Q255). “What is ‘Serekh ha-Yahad,’” 632. As regards the frequency of סרך in the rule texts in general, in explicit form it occurs eight times in 1QS, four times in 1QSa, 19 times in 1QM, and 10 times in CD. In 1QM, סרך is used to refer to the array of the final battle, but it occurs also in a titular use. When comparing this titular usage in the rule texts, it should be noted that the titles containing סרך are not identical in form: in 1QSa and 1QS, titles often begin with זה הסרך, whereas in 1QM, the pronoun זה is often absent (cf., however, 1QM 16:3 where a new section begins with the words יעשו הזה). See further distinctions by Charlotte Hempel, “סרך *særæk*,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten, Band II* (ed. H.-J. Fabry and U. Damen; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013), 1111–17.

different caves would help in understanding the function of different S manuscripts; she sees the manuscripts in Cave 4 as representing a learned selection of material, utilized for introducing experimental ideas.¹⁰¹ Jutta Jokiranta, for her part, has suggested a need to combine scholars' knowledge of possible textual history, reached on the basis of both theories of literary editing and existing manuscript material, and their understanding of an individual manuscript on its own, at a certain time and place, in order to understand what S actually is and how to perceive the manuscript variation within it.¹⁰² Both of these suggestions are relevant in the case of M and they are further exploited in this study.

5 Research Questions and Outline of the Study

As the research-historical overview above in this introduction demonstrates, 1QM has been briskly discussed since the first Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered, but the War Text material from Cave 4 – despite having been published in the 1980s – has not yet been analyzed exhaustively. There is a clear need to study the manuscripts found in Cave 4 and 11 at the manuscript and fragment level. What makes this need even more urgent is that in recent years scholarly understanding of editing and interpreting ancient manuscripts has developed and scholars have started to view textual multiformity – which is evident in the case of the M texts – as a quality that characterizes ancient scribal culture, not as an exception to the norm. Therefore, *producing a material and textual analysis of the War Text manuscripts found in Caves 4 and 11* treating them as important material in their own right, not just as additional witnesses to the study of 1QM, is the first fundamental task for this study. Part 1 is devoted to this task. As a short introduction in Chapter 1, 1QM is analyzed primarily from the physical perspective and its main content is presented in table format. This is a reader-friendly solution: in Chapter 1, it is demonstrated that 1QM is such important comparison material for the other War Texts that its introduction is needed before going to the more fragmentary manuscripts. However, in Chapter 1, 1QM is treated as one representative of the War Texts, not as a model through which all the other manuscripts are to be seen and interpreted.

101 See Charlotte Hempel, "The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4: The Community Rule Manuscripts as a Test Case," in *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, ed. M. Fidanzio (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 80–86. See also Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies*, TSAJ 154 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 303–13.

102 See Jokiranta, "What is 'Serekh ha-Yahad,'" 612–13.

Chapters 2–7 are the main parts of the study. In order to facilitate the reading and to anticipate the results of this study, the manuscripts are grouped into six chapters: The analysis starts from the manuscripts that, with regard to their content, have clear overlaps with other War Text material (4Q491a and 4Q492). Then, it proceeds by discussing the manuscripts that have preserved more distinctive war visions that appear unestablished when compared to the whole ensemble of the preserved War Texts (4Q491b and 4Q493). All these manuscripts discussed in Chapters 2–3 are fairly well preserved and readable in comparison to Cave 4 War Text manuscripts in general. In Chapter 4, the discussion turns to the more deteriorated and more difficult manuscripts, first to those that have been considered to overlap with 1QM 2 (4Q494 and 4Q471 in Chapter 4), then to the very poorly preserved 4Q495 (in Chapter 5) and finally to the opisthographic papyrus manuscripts 4Q496 and 4Q497 (in Chapter 6). At the end of the analysis part, Chapter 7 is devoted to the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* manuscripts 4Q285 and 11Q14.

In each chapter of the analysis part, the manuscript in question is first introduced from the physical perspective: the material, the number and the size of its fragments are discussed, and when needed, the joins made by earlier scholars are reviewed. Other material facts that can be determined – like the size of margins, the number of letters per line, the number of lines, the sizes of letters and the date of the material – are discussed. Second, the text of the manuscript is presented fragment by fragment.¹⁰³ The text is introduced according to Duhaime's edition and the cases that need amending (or that for some other reason require the reader's attention) are discussed in the notes. Third, the content of the text is analyzed and the important themes are defined. Finally, fourth, the relationship of the text to the other War Text manuscripts is discussed and the relevant manuscripts are read synoptically. The texts somehow parallel are now introduced in tables that serve as a fresh and graphic way of visualizing the similarity and variation in this material. When translations are given, they are based on Duhaime's but their layout is revised to be as functional as possible. All the fragments that have enough text to be analyzed are gone through in this way.

The categories into which the manuscripts are divided in the analysis part are not the only possible ones and the categories are not analogous. There may be other even more helpful taxonomies that can be made. However,

103 The study does not go through all the tiny pieces but only those fragments which include enough text to analyze. All fragments that contain text have been edited before and therefore, there is no need to introduce them all here. In order to answer the research questions of this study, larger fragments are enough.

this categorization aims to bring certain texts together in ways that avoid the names that have been applied to them so that ultimately it is possible to start to discuss the nomenclature of the texts with a clean slate. Also, the taxonomy slightly reflects the results of the study: for example, the study will demonstrate that 4Q491a and 4Q492 have clear overlaps with other War Text material while 4Q491b and 4Q493 include more inventive visions of the war.

Part 2 aims to accomplish the second task of this study, *clarifying the categorization of the War Texts*, i.e., asking whether the categories into which the War Text material has been classified are relevant, what kind of premises there are behind these categories and whether there are any reasons to correct or change the labels given to the texts. Some of this discussion is anticipated in Part 1. In Part 2, the naming and categorizing of the material are analyzed by taking into account the material as a whole. Although one of the main aims is to understand the manuscripts, including the most fragmentary ones, as independent representatives of the scribal culture, the other central questions of this study – and the questions that also make it relevant to the field of Dead Sea Scrolls studies in general – are related to the ensemble of manuscripts. In Chapter 9, the similarity between the War Text manuscripts is examined from the material, textual and thematic point of view, and, furthermore, the substance that is transmitted from one manuscript to another is highlighted. This kind of analysis aims to carry out the third task of the study, namely *understanding the similarity and variation between the War Text manuscripts and the mutual relationships between them* and consequently, to evaluate the function of these manuscripts, paying attention to their physical characteristics as well. The goal is to understand the significance of the similar traditions and the implications of the differences: what is preserved and what does this reveal about the transmission process and the use of the manuscripts. Also, the option that the profile of different caves could help understand the manuscripts is taken into consideration.

In the concluding chapter, the results of the study are summarized and their significance in the field of Dead Sea Scrolls studies in general is evaluated.

PART 1

Analysis



1Q33 Alias 1QM

Although 1QM is not the main focus of this study, it is still an essential part of the War Texts and deserves its own chapter under the part now about to begin. However, in the following brief analysis, the perspective is consciously limited: 1QM has been widely studied as a literary composition but it is relatively seldom approached as a material artifact.¹ Therefore, this chapter provides a brief overview of 1QM, emphasizing the material facts and aiming to see how they may help understand the character of this manuscript better.² At the same time, the analysis helps the reader with the following chapters discussing the War Text manuscripts from Caves 4 and 11, as 1QM is often used as comparative material, and some ideas are then further developed in Part 2. The discussion on 1QM reveals the challenges of studying even such a well-preserved manuscript – challenges that continue to grow as the material becomes more fragmented.

1 Shape and Size

There are four more or less complete sheets forming the nearly three-meter-long scroll 1QM (2.9 m × 16 cm), made of fine buff-colored skin:³ columns 1–4 belong to the first sheet, columns 5–10 to the second one, columns 11–15 to the third, and columns 16–18 to the fourth. On the right side of column 18, there are traces of sewing. In addition, there is one more sheet that was found near the

1 In 1QM, the battle descriptions recur throughout the text and most of the literary analyses of it suggest that the recurrent battle descriptions are to be explained as describing different stages of the war. However, it is equally possible that 1QM was not necessarily meant to introduce a coherent narrative of a multi-phased war – 1QM could as well have a character of compilation: collecting, arranging and reworking the material related to war without one logical (for modern western readers) and stable narrative in mind. In this study, the last-mentioned option is shown to be plausible.

2 This kind of interest has recently been roused with many manuscripts, cf., e.g., Brooke, “Physicality, Paratextuality and Peshar Habakkuk,” 175–93.

3 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 12; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 247. As George Brooke notes, the majority of the Qumran scrolls were inscribed on skin, cf. Brooke, “Physicality, Paratextuality and Peshar Habakkuk,” 177. As a material artifact, 1QM is not especially large or small; Tov uses it as an example of medium-sized scrolls, cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 70.

scroll. Yadin notes that this fifth sheet is only partly preserved but according to him there are traces of two columns left: one column is clearly preserved but of the other, following the better preserved one, only a single small fragment is left. For Yadin, it is clear that these preserved fragments belong to the same scroll as the other sheets of 1QM.⁴ Later on, Esther and Hanan Eshel called this suggestion into question. They argue that since the remains of column 19 were found “separated from the rest of the scroll,” it is more reasonable to assume that they belong to a different manuscript that represented a different “recension” than 1QM.⁵ According to Brian Schultz, however, the fragments of column 19 were found “rolled together with, or partially wrapped around the scroll.”⁶ Unfortunately, there are no photos that might clearly demonstrate where column 19 was when found.⁷ Taking into account the facts that there are traces of sewing on the right side of column 18, that the text in column 18 and the text in column 19 are written in a similar script,⁸ and that column 19 was obviously found at least in the vicinity of the scroll, there is no reason to doubt that column 19 belongs to 1QM.⁹

In addition to the relatively well-preserved sheets, there are several additional fragments suggested to belong to 1QM.¹⁰ Ten of these fragments (1–10 in Table 2) were disconnected parts of the scroll and Sukenik obtained them when he bought the scroll. Another two were discovered during the excavation of Cave 1 (1Q33 fragments 1–2 in Table 2).¹¹ These fragments were located in the two outer sheets of 1QM and the sheet preserving column 19:

4 Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 247–48.

5 Eshel and Eshel, “Recensions of the War Scroll,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, ed. L.H. Schiffman et al. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 351–63 (354). Rony Yishay goes along with Eshel and Eshel on this issue, cf. e.g., Yishay, “Column 19 of the ‘War Scroll’ (1QM) / מגילת המלחמה / טור יט במגילת המלחמה (MQ1),” in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls / מגילות יהודה מזקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה* 8–9 (2010): 175–92.

6 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 12.

7 There are some photos of the scroll in Sukenik’s *הגנוזות האוצר המגילות* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, 1954) – see, e.g., figures 9–11 – but they do not help resolve the problem conclusively.

8 Eshel and Eshel, “Recensions of the War Scroll,” 354.

9 The idea that column 19 belongs to 1QM is also supported by, e.g., Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13.

10 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13. These fragments can be seen in Sukenik’s *הגנוזות האוצר המגילות*, on plate 47. They are transcribed in Yadin’s book; see *The Scroll of the War*, 352–3.

11 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13.

TABLE 2 The placement of additional fragments of 1QM^a

Fragment	Placement in 1QM	The placement is made by
1	15:11–16	Sukenik, Yadin, Abegg, Duhaime
2	19:1–2	Sukenik, Yadin, Abegg, Duhaime
3	col. 20	Duhaime
4	17:6–7	Milik, Abegg, Duhaime ^b
5	18:12–14	Milik, Abegg, Duhaime
6	18:11–12	Milik, Abegg, Duhaime
7	col. 20	Duhaime
8	19:9–11	Yadin, Milik, Abegg, Duhaime
9	15:16–18	Sukenik, Yadin, Abegg
10	14:5	Milik, Abegg, Duhaime
1Q33 fragment 1	18	Yadin, Milik
1Q33 fragment 2	19	Yadin, Milik

a Cf. also Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 14.

b In line 17:7, Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 341, reads בשמחה ב[ית] ישראל while Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 242, and Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 132, read ברית ישראל after joining fragment 10 here.

The placement of fragment 1 is reliable since there is a direct join between the top of the fragment and column 15. The tops of the letters of line 11 are visible in column 15 and they fit together with נ and ם in the fragment. The join can be seen in Sukenik’s *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות* and Duhaime has transcribed column 15 by taking this join into consideration.¹² Another fragment that is placed in column 15 is fragment 9 and its join with column 15 is not as sure since there is no physical connection. The right margin was probably what led Sukenik to propose the placement.¹³

The placements of fragments 3 and 7 are the most uncertain since they are situated in the hypothetical column 20. By contrast, the placements of fragment 10 into column 14, fragment 4 into column 17, and fragments 2 and 8 into column 19 are highly probable: in these cases, both the shape of the fragment and the ink traces help in their placement. Fragments 5 and 6 can also plausibly be placed in column 18 but it must be noted that fragment 5 is very small

12 See Sukenik, *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות*, figure 30; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 128.

13 See Sukenik, *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות*, figure 30.

and the traces on it are unclear. In addition, what should be noted is that in order to join fragment 6 into this column one must first accept another join; namely, there are two more fragments relevant to this discussion, 1Q33 fragments 1 and 2. Barthélemy and Milik introduced these two in DJD 1 and argued that they probably represent part of 1QM:¹⁴ the spacing in these fragments is about 7 mm as it is in 1QM, and the size of the letters is 2 mm, the same as in 1QM.¹⁵ Barthélemy and Milik suggested that fragment 1 belongs to the edge of the scroll. On fragment 2, they do not say more than that it does not belong directly together with fragment 1. Yadin, for his part, argues that fragment 1 can be placed in column 18 and fragment 2 in column 19.¹⁶ Yadin also concludes that, since there are some letters visible on the left side of the fragment in fragment 2 and since this fragment belongs to column 19, there must have been at least one further column on the fifth sheet.¹⁷ This placement was later followed by Abegg and Duhaime. Again, both the shape of the fragments and the ink traces on them make the placement plausible, and, in addition, both fragments include *vacats* like lines 18:9 and 19:8, which is a further argument for the location. Thus, it is probable that 1Q33 fragment 1 is to be placed at the right edge of column 18, on the same level with lines 7–12, and 1Q33 fragment 2 at the left edge of fragment 19, next to fragment 8 discussed above, on the same level with column 19 lines 6–10.

Although the bottoms of the columns are fragmentary, 1QM is very well preserved and that probably indicates that the scroll was carefully handled. It was probably stored in a jar,¹⁸ and possibly it was not much used before storing. However, the fact that the scroll was not rolled back after usage¹⁹ may indicate that it was used just before storing it for the last time.

14 Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, DJD 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 135.

15 Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, 135.

16 Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 352–53.

17 Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 13 n. 4.

18 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 40; Weston Fields, *Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 25–29, esp. 29. Sidnie White Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2019), 118.

19 Annette Steudel, “Reading and Reconstructing Manuscripts,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. G.J. Brooke and C. Hempel, T&T Clark Companions (London: T&T Clark, 2016) 186–91 (188). Steudel notes that there are several scrolls from Cave 1 that are not rolled back after usage (in addition to 1QM, see e.g., 1QS). See also Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 12, esp. note 10 in which he describes the photos of 1QM which show the fourth sheet to be the outermost complete inscribed sheet in the scroll. Schultz refers here to Eleazar Sukenik’s works *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, trans. Daniel A. Fineman (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955) and *Megilloth Genuzoth I*. The last-mentioned

2 Layout and Script

In 1QM, 14–19 lines per column have been preserved but since the bottom of the scroll is largely damaged, the exact number of lines cannot be ascertained.²⁰ Scholars have suggested different numbers between 20 and 30 for the original number of lines, but Sukenik’s assumption that there are no more than 3–4 lines missing (which means 20–23 lines per column) is, however, largely accepted.²¹ The width of the columns varies considerably – from 10.5 cm to 16.0 cm²² – and depends in part on what size pieces of prepared skin were available to the scribe. This is the case with most Qumran scrolls.²³ On average, the column width is 15.0 cm.²⁴ As Tov notes, in comparison with the Qumran scrolls in general, 1QM has a medium-size writing block.²⁵

Between the columns, the margins are about 2 cm. The upper margins are a bit wider, about 3 cm.²⁶ The beginning of the scroll is easy to distinguish since there is a wider unruled margin on the right edge of the scroll, before the first column.²⁷ This margin is unstitched, which means that there was no handle sheet at the beginning of the scroll.²⁸

work includes a description and photographs of 1QM and a partial transcription of its columns 8, 14 and 15.

- 20 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 11–12. According to Schultz, there are 16–19 lines per column but according to Duhaime, the 14–19 lines of text “can be read.” However, later, when Schultz describes column 19, he writes that there are “14 incomplete lines of text” in it; see Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 12.
- 21 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 12. Emanuel Tov, when enumerating the parameters of 1QM, gives 20 as the number of lines or 23–25 if the text is reconstructed; see Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 127. In general, Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 84, notes that the “average number of lines per column in Qumran scrolls is probably twenty” but that “larger scrolls contained columns with from 25 to as many as 60 lines.”
- 22 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 12.
- 23 Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 82.
- 24 Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 83.
- 25 Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 86.
- 26 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 12.
- 27 The length of this margin is according to Duhaime and Schultz, 5 cm and according to Tov, at least 7.1 cm. Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 11–12; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 113.
- 28 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 108; contrary to Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, 35, according to whom there was an unscribed handle sheet at the beginning of the scroll. Tov denies this assumption by emphasizing that there are no stitch holes in the right margin of the first column of the scroll.

1QM was probably written by one scribe. The script is neatly done²⁹ and the words are clearly separated from each other with spacing.³⁰ The height of the letters is around 2 mm and the space between the lines is 7 mm on average. The number of letters or spaces per line varies considerably; depending on the width of the column, it can be from 60 to 90.³¹ There are some corrections every now and then but they are carefully made.³² Different correcting practices indicate that not all the corrections were made by the same scribe.³³ For example, in column 10, in the middle of line 9, there is an empty space between the words *ומיא* and *בעמכה*, although Yadin notes that there is “no fault in the skin.”³⁴ The space is marked with a stroke near the bottom of the line. According to Tov, the stroke reflects a canceled paragraph division: either the

29 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13–14. Duhaime refers to Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, 35, who describes the scribe of 1QM as “an expert scribe writing a beautiful and accurate hand.” Frank Moore Cross describes the hand of 1QM as delicate formal script, see Cross, “Paleography,” *EDSS* 2: 629–34. According to Lindsey A. Askin, 1QM reflects many scribal practices typical of “competent scribes with professional abilities”; cf. Askin “Scribal Production and Literacy at Qumran,” in *Material Aspects of Reading in Ancient and Medieval Cultures: Materiality, Presence and Performance*, ed. A. Krauß, J. Leipziger and F. Schücking-Jungblut, *Materiale Textkulturen*, 26 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020), 23–36 (31).

30 Tov notes that the great majority of the Judean Desert texts use either dots or other kind of small dividers (in texts written in paleo-Hebrew) or spacing (texts written in square script) between words. Thus, with its spacing, the script of 1QM represents a typical practice of separating words from each other. Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 131.

31 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13.

32 According to Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 127, the number of lines between corrections is on average 17.

33 At least the following three correction procedures can be distinguished in 1QM: 1) Parenthesis signs are used at the beginning of column 3, where the first three words are enclosed inside them and the identical text is written above. In addition, the text in parenthesis is marked with two small lines, one above and one below it. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 202, conjectures that the reason for these markings could be “the addition of a header or damage to the leather.” 2) In column 11, in the middle of line 8, the end of one word is marked with cancellation dots (both above and below the letters to be cancelled) and a correction is marked above the line. The scribe may have accidentally started to write the word again since the first cancelled letter is the same as the first letter of the word. Another option is that the scribe accidentally wrote a wrong word that was later corrected by him or by a later scribe. Another case where cancellation dots are used is in line 4:6, where one extra letter is marked to be cancelled. 3) There are a number of superscripted words or letters which sometimes correct the words in the actual line (5:3, 5:4, 6:5, 7:1, 15:1, 15:12, 18:10) and sometimes function as additions to the text below them (2:6, 4:16?, 12:12, 17:11). In some cases, the corrected letters are also erased (7:1, 15:1, 15:12). The superscripted corrections are random: one cannot say that there are especially many corrections near *vacats* or near the beginnings or the ends of *serekhs*.

34 Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 305.

original scribe or a later one wanted to cancel the lacuna that was first left in the text.³⁵ However, Tov does not speculate on why the lacuna was originally left there. Yadin, for his part, suggests that since this exceptional space is near the shift where the text, after describing God, moves on to describing Israel, the lacuna may indicate the scribe's intention to separate these two themes. The stroke may have been added later by another scribe.³⁶ Another option is that the scribe wanted to make a distinction between two different sources: the words just before and just after the blank space are also known in 2 Sam 7:23 and what comes before these words in lines 8–9 is similar to what is in Deut 3:24. However, if this is true, author seems to have been careless with his work; the most natural place for the lacuna would have been before וַיִּמְצָא and not after it. In this case, too, the stroke in the lacuna was probably added later in order to make the text continuous again. As regards the scroll in general, it is probable that the original scribe made some of the corrections himself and afterwards, one or more other scribes made more corrections.

The large bottom and top margins, fine calligraphy, and limited amount of scribal intervention led Emanuel Tov to define 1QM as one of the so-called *de luxe* manuscripts, together with many biblical scrolls and 1QIsa^b, 11QPs^a, 11QT^a, 11QT^b, MasEzek, and MasPs^a.³⁷ He does not explain the origin of this term but it seems that he acquired it from the study of the Oxyrhynchus papyri; he refers to William A. Johnson's unpublished dissertation "The Literary Papyrus Roll: Formats and Conventions" (1992).³⁸ More recently, Johnson writes about *de luxe* editions of the Oxyrhynchus papyri in his book *Bookrolls and Scribes in*

35 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 202.

36 Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 305. Van der Ploeg, for his part, supposes that the line indicates the lacuna is not intentional; see van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre*, 137.

37 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 126. For Tov, the main criterion for categorizing a manuscript as representing the *de luxe* category is the use of large bottom and top margins. Additional criteria are "a large writing block, fine calligraphy, the proto-rabbinic text form of Scripture, and only a limited amount of scribal intervention." Daniel Falk follows Tov by defining 1QM as "one of the very few non-scriptural *de luxe* scrolls from Qumran"; see Falk "Prayer, Liturgy, and War," in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. K. Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 275–94 (293). See also Devorah Dimant according to whom 1QM "certainly enjoyed special status in the Qumran community since it too is a copy executed with particular care, written on a large, well-prepared scroll, and hidden carefully in a jar in cave 1"; Dimant, "The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance" in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*, FAT 90 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 183.

38 William A. Johnson, "The Literary Papyrus Roll: Formats and Conventions. An Analysis of the Evidence from Oxyrhynchus" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1992).

Oxyrhynchus (2004).³⁹ For him, *de luxe* editions seem to refer to the scrolls that deviate – although not very clearly – from “those of an everyday production.”⁴⁰ Thus, the term *de luxe* has to do with scroll manufacturing. The most distinctive characteristic in *de luxe* editions is the “fine execution of the script.” In addition, in *de luxe* editions, there may be large upper and lower margins, short height for the column, and large script with tight line spacing.⁴¹ Johnson – and also Tov in his *Scribal Practices* – concentrates mostly on these technical details and the reasons for certain categorizations. By contrast, questions like why, for whom and/or for what purpose these *de luxe* editions were manufactured gets less attention. In the case of Qumran studies, Devorah Dimant has turned the conversation in this direction by suggesting that at least 1QS, 1QH^a and 1QM – which she notes are labeled as *de luxe* editions by Tov – have special status in the Qumran community.⁴²

Charlotte Hempel does not use the concept of *de luxe* but chooses the term “showroom quality” to describe the quality of manuscripts like 1QM, 1QS and 1QH^a.⁴³ She also does not explain why she makes this choice, but for her the main purpose of using the term seems to be to make a distinction between manuscripts that display “workaday quality,” mostly known in Cave 4.⁴⁴ Although she does not say it very explicitly, her idea seems to be that the manuscripts that can be categorized as showroom copies are somehow more finished and considered than those categorized as workaday copies. She notes that this also has to do with the preservation of the scrolls: showroom copies in Cave 1 were carefully stored in jars and wrapped in linen.⁴⁵ Here, she follows Harmut Stegemann who was one of the first to develop a categorization based on the material factors and the findspot of the manuscripts.⁴⁶

39 William A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Studies in Book and Print Culture (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).

40 Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes*, 156.

41 Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes*, 156.

42 Dimant, “The Composite Character,” 183.

43 Charlotte Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, TSAJ 154 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 335; Hempel, “The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4,” 85. Hempel argues that several manuscripts from Cave 4 represent “workaday quality” while in Cave 1, the manuscripts mostly represent a more refined form.

44 Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 335.

45 Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 335. For more about Hempel’s theory, see Section 2 of Chapter 9. White Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls*, 118, notes that it is not sure whether 1QM was in a jar and wrapped but its condition indicates that it at least was in a jar.

46 Harmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 80–85. The first of his four categories is “master

Whether one accepts this idea of *de luxe* or “showroom quality” or not, it is in any case clear that with regard to its physical characteristics, 1QM stands out from the rest of the War Texts: it is a well-preserved, large manuscript that is beautiful to look at. This leads one to think that the appearance of the scroll was of great importance. Of course, the fact that the scroll is well preserved makes it easy to draw conclusions about the beauty of 1QM. However, saying that 1QM is a beautiful manuscript does not rule other manuscripts out as beautiful as well. Being aware of many problems related to terminology like *de luxe* or showroom copy, I have chosen to utilize Hempel’s fresh explication of concepts. For me, the manuscripts that are of “showroom quality” are scrolls the appearance of which is meant to matter. They were most likely prepared with the idea that they would be beautiful as artifacts. With 1QM, the decision about its showroom quality is easy to make since the scroll is preserved very well. In the case of other War Text manuscripts, because of their fragmentariness one should be more careful when drawing such conclusions. It should also be remembered that there may have been more manuscripts of even better quality than 1QM that have not been preserved at all. However, by analyzing the material facts that can still be observed, I review below the other War Text manuscripts as well from this point of view, i.e., whether they were meant to be looked at – or whether their purpose was different, e.g., a draft version. As regards the terminology in general, there is a clear need for further discussion. The terms, especially *de luxe*, can easily evoke impressions of luxury or snobbery although these are not necessarily what the initiators of the terms meant to evoke. Therefore, scholars should explain the terminology in a more detailed way. In future studies, this should be taken into account, both when using the terms initiated by others and when introducing new ones.

manuscripts” which he defined to be “models for the preparation of further copies” (p. 80). These master manuscripts were carefully stored in Cave 1 where they were found well preserved. Although Stegemann does not use 1QM as an example of the master manuscripts, it undoubtedly belongs to this first category. The second category includes the manuscripts “for general use, especially for study” (p. 81). In this class, Stegemann places especially “biblical” manuscripts which, according to him, were the objects of “communal study.” These manuscripts were hidden in caves 1, 6 and 11. The manuscripts that were “for special studies” and “current interest,” for example the Greek manuscripts from Cave 7 (p. 81) form the third category. And finally, the fourth category consisted of “worn-out manuscripts” which were stored in Cave 4 (p. 81). Stegemann’s categorization seems to be based partly on his understanding of the profile of different caves, partly on material observations, and partly on the content of the manuscripts (and their purposes of use inferred from the content). Also, it is strongly related to his ideas of Qumran as an Essene settlement and the caves as a library.

3 Title, Content and Paragraph Division

Usually, in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, the title of the composition (if there was any) was inscribed at the beginning of the first column of the scroll without separating it from the running text so there was no special layout for the title.⁴⁷ In the case of 1QM, the title is unclear: the first completely preserved word in the line probably belongs to the title but before this word (המלחמה), there most likely was two or three words now lost. The first two letters in the line are partly visible and they should probably be read as ל and מ.⁴⁸ Thus, often suggested title המלחמה סרך למשכיל is a plausible option though not the only conceivable one.⁴⁹

The suggestion that there was a term סרך in the title is supported by the fact that this term is also used as a title for different organizational orders within the scroll⁵⁰ – and that overall, it occurs very often in 1QM.⁵¹ While

47 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 119. Tov notes that this practice is also known in most of biblical psalms and in Ugaritic texts. See also Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 309.

48 Cf. also Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 142. Although interpreting traces as belonging to ל presupposes that the top stroke of the letter is more inclined to the left than is usual in this manuscript, ל is a more probable option than the ך suggested by Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 257. If the letter was ך, it would not curve to the left at the bottom as is the case with the traces of this letter. Yadin reconstructs the whole title as סרך המלחמה וזה ספר.

49 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 119; Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, 111. Qimron’s reading stems from Józef T. Milik, “Recension: Osar ha-megilloth ha-genuzoth,” *RB* 62 (1955): 64–76, and Jean Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils des Ténèbres. Texte restauré, traduit et commenté* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1958); cf. Duhaime, *War Texts*, 53. Although belonging to the category of incipits, Yadin’s option also fits in with the category of the overall subject matter of the text and Qimron’s option with the category that connects the book to a specific figure. Cf. Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 309. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 257.

50 See also Chad Stauber, “Prophetic Scribalism: A Semantic, Textual and Hypertextual Study of the Serek Texts” (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2013), 79–81, who describes the use of root סרך in M manuscripts according to a fourfold semantic range: 1) spatial disposition (when the term denotes to laying out or organizing in space), 2) hierarchical disposition (arranging in a specific order, ranking), 3) martial disposition (army, battalion), and 4) procedural disposition (in the lists of instructions that must be done in a particular order).

51 The term סרך has been considered as belonging to the distinctive vocabulary of the Qumran community, see Philip S. Alexander, “Rules,” *EDSS* 2:799. This term is also discussed by Charlotte Hempel, “סרך *særæk*,” *EDSS* 2:1111–17; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Memory and Manuscript’: Books, Scrolls, and the Tradition of the Qumran Texts,” in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 9–11 January, 2005, ed.

סרך does not occur in the Hebrew Bible at all, in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls it is quite commonly used, for example, 10 times in CD, eight times in 1QS, four times in 1QSa – and 19 times in 1QM.⁵² In most cases, to put it in Philip Alexander's words, it “denotes, abstractly, the order or rules according to which a group of people is to be organized and to conduct its affairs.”⁵³

As Alexander argues, there are six different parts in 1QM that can be defined as סרכים. One of these is at the end of the scroll and consists of lines 16:3 to the end of the text. The other five (which all start with סרך in construct form while line 16:3 reads יעשו הזה כול הסרך הזה יעשו) are in columns 3–9: Lines 2:16–3:11 form the rule of the trumpets, in lines 3:13–4:8 one finds the rule of the banners of the whole congregation, and the other rule of banners is in lines 4:9–14. The rule for arranging the divisions is found in lines 5:3–9:9 and from line 9:10 starts the rule for changing the order. Obviously, in 1QM, סרך is something that the author⁵⁴ uses to give a structure to his text, and consequently, in this study, סרכים are used as the primary tool in order to outline the content of the scroll. Also, it is probable that the author uses the term סרך to direct his readers to consider it as a rule or a collection of rules.⁵⁵ This is noteworthy since in modern scholarship, the eschatological character of the scroll seems to have characterized it more than these multiple references to the text as being a rule or a compilation of rules. The composition is largely known as the War Scroll while the War Rule is not so much used – although it would be a legitimate title as well.⁵⁶

Table 3 demonstrates how the content of 1QM takes shape through the סרכים. The sections in which a new *serekh* begins are marked with gray.

E.G. Chazon and B. Halpern-Amaru, *STDJ 88* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 133–50, on pp. 141–43; and Stauber (about the root סרך), “Prophetic Scribalism,” 24–83.

52 See 1QM 13:1, 15:4–5, 16:3, 18:6. It should be noted that here we discuss only those occurrences which are clearly visible, and we do not take account here of the fact that the word סרך is often reconstructed at the beginning of 1QM.

53 Alexander, “Rules,” 799.

54 While being conscious of the possibility that there may be many authors and/or redactors/reworkers/compilers/scribes behind the text, in order to facilitate reading I usually use the singular term “author” when referring to the person or persons behind the text of this manuscript. This principle is also applied later in this study and also involves other manuscripts.

55 Note also that in 1QM another *serekh* text עתו פר סרך [ס], unknown from anywhere else, is referred to (see 1QM 15:5).

56 See further discussion on this in Part 2 (Chapter 8).

TABLE 3 Outline of 1QM; *serekhs* and *vacats*

Description of the Section	1QM
<i>Sons of Light against Sons of Darkness and Kittim</i>	1:1–6
<i>Day of disaster and hope in God</i>	1:7–15
<i>Victory over enemy</i>	1:16–1:E
<i>Temple service during the war*</i>	1:E–2:14 ^{*a}
The rule (reconstructed) for the trumpets*	2:16–3:11 [*]
The rule for the banners of the whole congregation	3:13–
<i>Banners of the formations</i>	3:13–4:5
<i>Banners in the battle</i>	4:6–4:8
The rule for the banners of the congregation	4:9–
<i>Banners when setting out the battle</i>	4:9–4:14
<i>Lengths of the banners</i>	4:15–4:17
<i>Names in the banners</i>	4:18–5:2
The rule for arranging the divisions	5:3–
<i>Weapons*</i>	5:3–5:14 ^{*b}
<i>Progress of the war*</i>	5:16–6:6 [*]
<i>Cavalry*</i>	6:8–6:17 [*]
<i>Purity rules*</i>	6:19(?)–7:7 [*]
<i>Tasks of the priests and progress of the war</i>	7:9–9:9 ^c

All sections that are preceded by a *vacat*, small or large, are entered in their own rows. The sections in which a new *serekh* begins are marked with gray. Those sections that end with a large *vacat* (with an empty line or an empty line and a blank space at the end of the preceding line) are marked with an asterisk (*).

- a According to Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 54, there is also a *vacat* in line 2:9, which is the shortest line in the column after line 14 where a section clearly ends. He argues for this by noting that it would be possible to add the first word of column 10 to the end of column 9 and still the length of line 9 would have remained at what the length of line 10 is now. In addition, according to Schultz, a new topic is introduced in line 10, which calls for a new paragraph. What should be noted is that this new topic, מלחמת המחלקות “war of divisions” is important for Schultz’ theory of understanding 1QM as describing a two-phased war (see, e.g., *Conquering the World*, 394–5). Because of the uncertainty of this *vacat*, it is not marked in the table. Schultz also discusses the possibility that there might be a *vacat* in line 3:9. In this case, however, he ends up considering it more improbable. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 54–55.
- b In this case and the following two as well, it is also possible that the *vacat* was not meant to be long but since the text comes to an end very near the end of the line, there was no choice but to leave the following line empty.
- c The small indent at the beginning of line 8:13 may result from damage to the leather at this point.

TABLE 3 Outline of 1QM; *serekhs* and *vacats* (cont.)

Description of the Section	1QM
The rule for changing the order	9:10–
<i>Towers</i>	9:10 – E
<i>Hymn: Overview on salvation history</i>	9:E–11:12
<i>Hymn: Heavenly forces*</i>	11:13–12:5*
<i>Hymn: War cry</i>	12:7–16
<i>Rubric and blessings</i>	12:17–13:3
<i>Curses</i>	13:4–13:6 ^d
<i>Thanksgiving hymn*</i>	13:7–16* ^e
<i>Hymn?</i>	13:18–14:1
<i>Rubric and thanksgiving hymn</i>	14:2–15
<i>Hymn: War cry</i>	14:16–15:3
<i>Rubric and encouragement speech*</i>	15:4–16:1*
Rule that shall be carried out	16:3–
<i>Battle instructions (phase 1)*</i>	16:3–9*
<i>Battle instructions (phase 2)</i>	16:11–14
<i>Rubric and encouragement speech (part 1)</i>	16:15–17:3
<i>Encouragement speech (part 2)</i>	17:4–17:9
<i>Battle instructions (phase 3, rubric) and thanksgiving hymn*</i>	17:10–18:8*
<i>Thanksgiving hymn and war cry</i>	18:10–19:8 ^f
<i>Rubric (for the thanksgiving hymn?)</i>	19:9–

d The small indent at the beginning of line 13:5 may result from damage to the leather at this point. Cf. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 321.

e It is not absolutely clear whether this *vacat* was the whole line in length or whether there were some letters at the beginning of the line.

f It is impossible to determine whether there was a *vacat* somewhere at the end of column 18 or at the beginning of column 19. In the preceding rule, the war cries start after a *vacat* (see 12:6–7, 14:15–16).

The table above is drawn up not only according to the סרכים but also according to the *vacats*. All sections that are preceded by a *vacat*, small or large, are entered in their own rows. In addition, those sections that end with a large *vacat* (with an empty line or an empty line and a blank space at the end of the preceding line) are marked with an asterisk (*). As the table shows, in all six cases, a new *serekh* section starts after a *vacat* – in three cases after an empty line, and in the other three, after an empty space at the end of the line. The first rule, the rule for the trumpets (2:16–3:11) is separated from its context by complete empty

lines plus an empty space at the end of the preceding line. This section is the only one that is surrounded by large *vacats* on both sides. There are no other completely empty lines in columns 1–4 (the first sheet). The rules in these columns (assuming that the section in 1:1–2:14 is not a rule but some kind of introduction) are generally short and they are divided by a maximum of two *vacats*. The rule for the trumpets is also an exceptional rule in respect to *vacats* since the whole rule is a single textual unity.

The fourth rule, the rule for arranging the divisions, encompassing columns 5–8 (5:3–9:9), includes the largest number of empty lines of all the rules. Every subsection is here separated from the preceding one with an empty line. In the case of the sections discussing weapons (5:3–5:14), progress of the war (5:16–6:6), and cavalry (6:8–6:17), it is, however, also possible that the author had no choice between a long and short *vacat*: since the text of each section ends near the end of the line, it was not possible to leave any empty space at the end of the line. The rule itself is separated from the preceding and following rules with smaller *vacats*, empty spaces at the end of the lines.

In the rule for changing the order (9:10–16:1), the empty lines are used within the hymnic sections. Line 12:6 clearly separates the war cry from the hymn of heavenly forces. As regards line 13:17, the length of the *vacat* is impossible to determine with certainty because the line is not fully preserved. However, whether there is an empty line in question or not, the *vacat* separates two hymns. The smaller *vacats* seem to function similarly: they separate different hymns. Lines 12:17–13:6, which include blessings and curses, suggest that the *vacats* can also be used inside a section that was considered to be some kind of unity: in lines 13:1–2, in the rubric,⁵⁷ the priests, the Levites and the elders are suggested to both bless and curse, which indicates that the rubric is meant to encompass both the blessings that follow it directly and the curses that are

57 The term rubric denotes here the short introductory element leading to the hymn. Falk uses this same term and says that rubrics indicate “occasions of use, for example days of the week, days of a month, Sabbath, festivals, and purification rituals”; see Daniel Falk, “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Study of Ancient Jewish Liturgy,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. J.J. Collins and T.H. Lim (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 1, 12. In the study of 1QM, at least Davies has used this term. About the beginning of column 13, he writes: “There is a rubric introducing the column, which indicates that the following liturgy is part of a blessing and curse ritual.” He also sees many similarities between this rubric and the rubrics between columns 15–19. According to him, they all begin with a list of participants in the liturgy and in all cases (if column 13 is reconstructed), the participants are led by the chief priest. The words common to all are עומדים and שם and the formula ויענו ואמרו. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 104.

separated from the blessings and the rubric with a *vacat*.⁵⁸ At the end of the rule, an empty line (16:2) separates it from the following rule.

In the last rule (16:2–19:E) too, an empty line 17:10 appears in the middle of a hymnic section. At the beginning of the rule, another empty line divides the battle description in two, perhaps separating two phases of the war from each other as is suggested in the table.

All this demonstrates as regards the content of the scroll, it is not implausible to interpret *vacats* as we as modern Western readers often tend to interpret them, namely as contentual division markers, denoting beginnings and ends of contentual sections.⁵⁹ This interpretation is defended by the fact that there is a *vacat* before every new *serekh* section and, for example, inside the rule for arranging the divisions (5:3–9:9), the empty lines separate contentual units like the description of weapons (5:3–5:14) and the description of cavalry (6:8–6:17). However, there are at least three other options to explain the use of *vacats* as well – and it should be kept in mind that these are not mutually exclusive: first, the blank spaces may carry some kind of performative force,⁶⁰ second, they may point to the sources used or the scribal reworkings made in the text,⁶¹ and third, the use of the sense division markings may have been

58 Here, the *vacat* at the end of a line functions as a space in the middle of the line is often considered to do: Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 145, refers to Jonathan P. Siegel, “The Scribes of Qumran: Studies in the Early History of Jewish Scribal Customs, with Special Reference to the Qumran Biblical Scrolls and to the Tannaitic Traditions of Massekhet Soferim,” (PhD diss., Brandeis University, 1971), according to whom a space in the middle of the line denotes a section that is thematically related to the preceding section, and to Charles Perrot, “Petuhot et setumot. Étude sur les alinéas du Pentateuque,” *RB* 76 (1969): 50–91, according to whom a space in the middle of the line is a break within a paragraph.

59 Cf. the case of Peshar Habakkuk: as Brooke notes, many of the *vacats* in 1QpHab “corresponds with the breaks in the sense, particularly as the move is made from the text of Habakkuk to the peshar proper.” Cf. Brooke, “Physicality, Paratextuality and Peshar Habakkuk,” 175–93, esp. 186.

60 In the case of 1QM, this has been suggested by Rebekah Haigh, who argues that “some of the seemingly odd sense divisions in the War Scroll may also be a natural product of a performative history.” She gives 1QM 12:6–16 as an example: “the *vacat* falls before and after the 1QM hymn yet elsewhere divides that same hymn (4Q492 frag. 1).” Cf. Haigh, “Oral Aspects: A Performative Approach to 1QM,” *DSD* 26,2 (2019): 189–219 (197).

61 Brooke (“Physicality, Paratextuality and Peshar Habakkuk,” 186–7) argues that some of the *vacats* in 1QpHab (that are exceptions to the general scribal practice of the scroll) probably reflect different sources used and reworkings made in the text. Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 71, who discusses M manuscripts, argues that some of the differences in the sense divisions between 1QM and the other M manuscripts can be explained by suggesting that “some of the sense divisions were intended to mark a change in sources, rather than a shift in content.” However, Schultz also argues that in 1QM, the *vacats* mainly result

unsystematic and incoherent.⁶² To start with the last mentioned option, Tov justly reminds us (not regarding particularly the War Texts but the Dead Sea Scrolls in general) that “the idea of consistently subdividing a larger unit into smaller ones may well be a Western concept.” For Tov, the safer way to think about this is that scribes supposedly “often directed their attention to the type of relation between the unit they had just copied and that they were about to copy, without forming an opinion on the adjacent units.” He also notes that while there might be some kind of logic behind the paragraph division, the scribes’ work in this matter was probably largely “impressionistic.”⁶³ In addition to Tov’s suggestions, explaining the *vacats* as reflecting (only) contentual paragraph division is weakened by the fact that of the 11 preserved empty lines of 1QM, only about one-quarter precede a new rule section while half of the rules are preceded by a smaller, half-line *vacat* and thus, the larger *vacats* do not go hand in hand with the *serekh* sections. This may indicate that the completely empty lines do not necessarily have to do with the contentual division of the text.⁶⁴

The first option, namely that the *vacats* may have to do with performing the text is notable and probably not enough studied yet. However, while it is clear that the ancient texts were not necessarily primarily meant to be read but to be heard,⁶⁵ what we can know about the performance of the text is very limited. For the main questions of this study, the most interesting option is the second one, namely that it is possible that the paragraph division may have pointed to the sources used or the scribal reworkings made in the text. It is unlikely that all the *vacats* would have functioned in marking the sources or reworkings but the suggestion could perhaps explain the large *vacats* which include both the empty space at the end of the line and the empty line following a *vacat*.⁶⁶ The cases that are indisputably large *vacats* of this kind are in lines 3:11–12 where the rule for the trumpets ends and the rule for the banners of the whole congregation starts,⁶⁷ in lines 7:7–8 where the section describing the purity rules ends and a more narrative-like depiction of the progress of the war

from the scribe’s aim to divide the text into contentual units and the different sizes of *vacats* reflect two levels of contentual divisions (see, e.g., p. 392).

62 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 144.

63 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 144.

64 Note also that in 4Q491 fragments 1–3, the *serekh* is not preceded by a *vacat* (cf. line 6).

65 Cf Haigh, “Oral Aspects,” 191–94.

66 Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 145–6) refers to these large *vacats* as major divisions.

67 Note that there are two similar titles concerning banners following one another in columns 3–4, and the question arises whether one or the other of these could be a duplicate. The fact that there is a long *vacat* just before the first one of these may indicate that some kind of reworking was made in the case of the rules for the banners.

starts, and in lines 12:5–6 and 18:8–9 where one hymn gives way to another. In the first-mentioned case it is also noteworthy that the rule for the trumpets includes language referring to a strong contraposition between one's own army and that of the enemies: the enemies are called "those who hate righteousness," "those who hate God," "the Sons of Darkness," and "the slain of unfaithfulness" (cf. inscriptions in lines 3:5–6, 8–9). That kind of language is rare in the other three *serekhs* at the beginning of the scroll (cf. columns 3–9) and it probably indicates that the text underwent some redaction.⁶⁸ As regards columns 7 and 12, the parallel texts found in Cave 4 (see manuscripts 4Q491b and 4Q492) indicate that these texts, or at least their themes, were somehow reworked and developed during the transmission process of the War Texts. These textual parallels are further discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, and the *vacats* in the M tradition are again discussed in general in Part 2 after the analysis of the other War Text manuscripts.⁶⁹ At this point, we can conclude that the *vacats* probably concern the transmission process of the War Text tradition and may provide a hint as to where the text was reworked – although it is clear that they are not the only or even the central keys to understanding the textual transmission. In addition, it should be noted that the *vacats* can function in different ways in the same text, and that the scribes' work can probably often be described as impressionistic rather than systematic.

4 Summary of 1QM

1QM is a well-preserved, medium-sized scroll and is beautiful to look at. As such, it stands out from the other War Text manuscripts, as the next chapter will show. The others are in a more deteriorated state, sometimes smaller overall or in script size, and not necessarily as carefully copied. Although 1QM was used, as is proven by the fact that it was not rolled up before being stored in a jar, it was not necessarily used very frequently, as it is in relatively good condition.

Despite its strong eschatological tone, 1QM is primarily a rule, which is demonstrated by its own multiple references to the text as being a rule or a compilation of rules. It constantly uses the word טָרַךְ, also in order to give it a structure. It also includes different sense divisional markings, at least some of

68 See Vanonen, "Vastakkainasettelun aika," 261–64.

69 Cf. also Schultz's discussion on paragraph division in the War Texts: *Conquering the World*, 42–85.

which provide hints as to which sections of the text were reworked and lead to the transmission process of the war traditions.

The 1QM text includes both instructions and hymnic material. Although these different elements are often logically linked to each other (for example, a hymn is performed after the enforcement of certain instructions), the text as a whole does not appear to be a coherent war narrative; it is more like a compilation of material related to the war. This composition-like nature of 1QM allows us to assume that its author was aiming to compile material related to the war and thus, it is plausible to suggest that the direction of the contentual dependency relationship between 1QM and the Cave 4 manuscripts was usually that 1QM was dependent on the other manuscripts (although the possibility of the opposite should also be borne in mind). This hypothesis is further tested in the following chapter.

4Q491a (4QM^{a/a} + 4Q491^{a/c}) and 4Q492 (4QM^b): War Texts That Overlap with Other War Texts

From this chapter onwards, attention turns to the more fragmentary War Text material found in Caves 4 and 11. It should be noted that the way in which the manuscripts are divided into chapters already reflects the results of the study. As hinted above, in this initial chapter, the study will demonstrate that 4Q491a and 4Q492 clearly overlap with other War Text material, whereas 4Q491b and 4Q493, for example, contain more inventive visions of the war. Each chapter assesses the material both as it is and by comparing it with parallel material. On the one hand, the main emphasis is on the manuscripts as they are: each manuscript is scrutinized as a material artifact which is valuable as it is and its text is read in order to find its internal logic, not as complementary material to the (often better preserved) text of 1QM. On the other hand, the aim to understand the mutual relationships between the War Text manuscripts runs throughout the study and requires constant comparative work. The tables in which the relevant manuscripts are read synoptically serve as a previously unpublished way of visualizing the similarity and variation in this material. However, comparing the texts involves not only searching textual parallels of various degrees, but also taking note of what is transmitted and what is not, what is reworked and how, and how new innovations take their place in the transmission process.

1 4Q491a (4QM^{a/a} + 4Q491^{a/c})

One of the most problematic cases in characterizing manuscripts among the War Texts is the group of fragments Baillet gathered under the rubric 4Q491. Baillet represented that generation of scholars who got a huge number of fragments in front of them and as a matter of fact, had no other options but to try to reassemble them into manuscripts – in order to ask any further questions.¹

1 Baillet himself describes the situation of having 2057 pieces of text from Cave 4 in front of him: “Totally disheartened (la mort dans l’âme) I began work on this jumble.” See Fields, *A Full History*, 228, which includes D. Eisenberg and W. Fields’ translation on Baillet’s “Introduction” in DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

Thanks to Baillet's primary and vital work with the fragments, scholars after him were able to start to ask many questions in more detail, for example, how 1QM is used when reconstructing the texts of the other M manuscripts and how material considerations should be taken into account when interpreting the fragments. As regards 4Q491, a still disputed question is which pieces belong to this manuscript or manuscripts and how should these pieces be arranged. Therefore, before going to the actual text of the fragments here called 4Q491a, it is reasonable to take a glance at the research history of "manuscript" 4Q491 and to give some background information that is good to keep in mind when studying the actual fragments.

1.1 4Q491 – One or Several Manuscripts?

Already in 1957, Claus-Hunno Hunzinger reported manuscript 4Q491 in his article "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milḥamā aus Höhle 4 von Qumrān."² In this article, he reported on 70 fragments of this manuscript. Later, however, he joined some of these and ended up having 62 different fragments.³ When Baillet did his own study of this manuscript, the number of fragments decreased further: as a result of the joins made by Baillet, there are only 37 fragments left in the DJD edition.⁴ As many of their colleagues, Hunzinger and Baillet worked primarily to piece together the huge jigsaw they have got in front of them. Putting things together was a necessary beginning – and this work still is an immeasurable valuable basis for further questions.⁵

In addition to joining pieces into larger fragments, Baillet also aimed to place the fragments within the conjectural manuscript. This was not easy, and while arranging the material, Baillet was mostly dependent on 1QM and not so much on the physical characteristics of the fragments themselves. As a result, he managed to put fragments 1–16 in an order that follows the sequence of

2 Before Hunzinger, J.T. Milik had already worked with the fragments (cf. Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung," 131 n. 2).

3 Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 24.

4 Baillet, DJD 7:12. Cf. also Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 24; Davis, "There and Back Again," 123–24. Abegg, for his part, says that there are actually 66 fragments. See Abegg, "The War Scroll," 1. It should also be noted that Abegg uses fragment numbers different from those of Baillet. In this study, I use the numbers of Baillet since his edition of 4Q491 is the most commonly known and used. Schultz has compiled a table that includes Baillet's and Abegg's fragment numbering and helps in comparing their work. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 21.

5 About the challenges faced by the first generation of the Qumran scholars in general, cf. Charlotte Hempel, "Sources and Redaction in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Growth of Ancient Texts," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*, ed. M.L. Grossman (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 162–81 (163–4).

the similar material in 1QM. The rest of the fragment he divided according to their content: fragments 17–22 included regulations and 23–25 were pieces of speeches, prayers and hymns. The content of fragments 26–37 remained undetermined.⁶

Later, both Baillet's joins and his arrangement of the fragments were – naturally – criticized. Now that there was not anymore just a jumble of fragments, it was easier to have a scholarly debate on the manuscripts that they once belonged to. The first extensive rival theory of the placement of 4Q491 fragments was introduced by Martin Abegg who recognized both Hunzinger's and Baillet's work but also saw many unresolved problems – regarding both the individual joins and the arrangement of the fragments.⁷ Abegg followed the next wave of research in which scholar's aimed to reconsider fragmentary material and to separate materials out rather than bring them together.⁸ On the basis of his own investigations, Abegg ended up dividing the fragments of 4Q491 first into two (and finally into three) categories according to the script used in them:⁹ group A was for those fragments which were copied in a rougher way (i.e., fragments 8–10, 11 ii, 13–15, 18, 22, 24–28, 31–33, 35) and group B for those which were copied by using a more elegant style (i.e., 1–7, 16–17,

6 Cf. Baillet, DJD 7:13–44; Duhaime's summary of Baillet's arrangement: Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 25.

7 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 1. For example, Abegg considers Baillet's plates v–vi (in DJD 7) – in which Baillet presents his ensembles of fragments 1–3, 8–10 and 11–12 – to be of "poor quality." As Davis notes, Abegg emphasized the paleographic differences between columns 11 i and 11 ii (cf. Davis, "There and Back Again," 124; Abegg, "The War Scroll," 3–6).

8 To give one example of other cases: in the light of current knowledge, it is uncertain whether all the fragments that the original editor joined to manuscript 4Q184 really belong to it; see Tigchelaar, "Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing," 46. Note, however, that the tendency towards putting things together and the tendency towards separating material out is not just about the different generations of scholars. In every generation, there are scholars with different preferences. As Charlotte Hempel notes "scholars of the non-biblical scrolls include those sensitive to unevenness and differences between and within texts – the splitters.... Then there are others who have a profound dislike of cutting up a perfectly good text – the clumpers." Cf. Hempel, "Sources and Redaction," 164–65.

9 Abegg notes that dividing the fragments into two groups was already seen by those who first photographed the fragments: "the larger fragments representing these general characteristics [i.e., careful script and rougher script] are never photographed together on any of the fifteen photographic plates" (cf. Abegg, "The War Scroll," 1). García Martínez deduces that "originally, Milik has distinguished two groups of fragments with materials related to the *War Scroll*, and that it was Hunzinger who later grouped both sets of fragments in one manuscript (4Q491)"; cf. Florentino García Martínez, "Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The 'I' of Two Qumran Hymns," in *ETL* 78 (2002): 328; on the arguments for this, see esp. idem, n. 38).

19–21, 23).¹⁰ Abegg also found further arguments for this division: According to him, the letters in manuscripts A and B can be proved to be different,¹¹ and slight orthographic differences between manuscripts A and B can be found as well. For example, manuscript B seemed to prefer the long form of the second person masculine singular suffix (הַ-בְּ) while in manuscript A, both long and short (בְּ-) forms occurred.¹² Also, the long forms of the third person plural suffix (מַהְ-, מְהַ-) were, according to Abegg, preferred in manuscript B while in manuscript A, the usage of the long and the short form varied slightly.¹³ In the fragments categorized as belonging to group C (i.e., fragments 11 i and 12), the script was similar to those in group B but the line height was 4.3 mm while the line height in the other fragments of manuscript B was 4.0–4.1 mm. For Abegg, this was a reason to make one more distinction and separate manuscripts B and C.¹⁴ Finally, Abegg argued further that all three manuscripts have a different relationship to 1QM. Manuscript A contained direct parallels to 1QM¹⁵ while manuscript B just vaguely echoed some occasional parts of 1QM. Manuscript C did not contain any clear connection to 1QM.¹⁶

Abegg's theory of 4Q491a, b and c was a welcome opening for the further discussion on the 4QM fragments and it later achieved wide support: For example, Esther Eshel reinforced Abegg by pointing out that the unique vocabulary in 4Q491 is concentrated in 4Q491c and that manuscript also stands out from the others with its orthography.¹⁷ In his edition of the War Texts (1994), Jean Duhaime did not yet divide 4Q491 into three parts,¹⁸ but later in his book

10 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 1–3. Note that according to Hunzinger, the difference between the scripts can be explained by the shrinkage of some fragments. Cf. Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung," 132; Davis, "There and Back Again," 127 n. 7. Abegg does not discuss this possibility.

11 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 6. Abegg analyzes especially the differences between the categories under the letters א, ב, ד, ו and ז.

12 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 7. Note, however, that the second person suffixes are quite rare in both manuscripts.

13 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 7–8. In addition, there are some additional orthographic notes on pages 8–9.

14 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 3. Fragments 29, 30, 34 and 37 remained undetermined (see Abegg, "The War Scroll," 1).

15 Abegg – following Baillet – interprets that 4Q491a "shows an expansion of the final skirmishes in the seven part war" against the Kittim. See Abegg, "The War Scroll," 11.

16 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 9–11.

17 Esther Eshel, "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 175–203, esp. 176. Eshel concludes that 4Q491c is "not part of the War Scroll" but is "from a different composition altogether."

18 Duhaime, "War Scroll," 81–82.

(2004), he introduced Abegg's theory and considered it plausible.¹⁹ Also, Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar followed Abegg's division in their *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*.²⁰ Recently, Brian Schultz supported Abegg's view in his study, and considered his own views of 1QM's textual development to be consistent with Abegg's theory.²¹ It is beyond dispute that in his dissertation – which unfortunately remained unpublished²² – Abegg makes many relevant observations on the script and line spacing of the fragments. However, it should be noted that he leaves out of consideration the physical form of the fragments almost completely; their size, shape and damage are not carefully studied. When discussing the fragments in more detail he denies some of Baillet's joins but in his introduction to his overall theory, these facts remain unconsidered. Also, he does not discuss the alternative explanations for the differences between the fragments: for example, he does not ask whether it might be possible that two different scribes wrote one manuscript with different handwritings or whether the variance of the line spacing could be due to the shrinkage of some fragments. He does not speculate on how the original scrolls looked or how the fragments should be placed in these scrolls, and, in addition, the discussion on the consequences of his theory remains almost non-existent in his dissertation.

Taking all of this into account, it is no wonder that Abegg's theory has also been criticized – and in general, too, the third generation of scholars started to put things back together, at least to some extent. After the publication of the *Study Edition*, García Martínez returned to the topic and came to a new conclusion of the number of 4Q491 manuscripts: in his article “Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The ‘T’ of Two Qumran Hymns,” García Martínez argues that 4Q491a clearly is a separate manuscript but manuscripts B and C should be understood as one.²³ According to him, the differences in the appearance of the manuscripts, in its letters and orthographic features are enough to show the reasonableness of the separation of A and B but the “minimal difference”

19 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 24–30.

20 García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 978–81. This division occurs in both the first and the second edition of the book. Note, however, that García Martínez later changed his mind on the matter: García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 321–39.

21 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 17, 20–22, 373–74. Note also that Yishay does not include the so-called Self-Glorification Hymn in fragment 12ii as a part of the war literature since according to her, it has nothing to do with it, cf. Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 185.

22 A more accessible source for Abegg's ideas is his article “Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 61–73.

23 García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 321–39.

in line spacing “is not of an order to demand such radical surgery,” i.e., a separation between B and C.²⁴ Thus, García Martínez understands 4Q491 as two different manuscripts, A and B of which the last-mentioned is not a copy of 1QM but a “related composition dealing also with the eschatological war.”²⁵ Another scholar who disagrees is Elisha Qimron who has argued that there are no codicological reasons to separate fragment 11 from the rest of the scroll.²⁶ However, Qimron does not discuss this problem thoroughly, and the need for a study that concentrates on the material characteristics of 4Q491 is still obvious. The most recent attempt to satisfy this need is Kipp Davis’ article “‘There and Back Again’: Reconstruction and Reconciliation in the War Texts of 4QMilḥama^a (4Q491^{a-c}).”²⁷ Although Davis too finds Abegg’s observations of scripts, letters and lines to be justifiable, Abegg’s conclusions drawn on their basis appear to be problematic to him – and not least because Abegg made his analysis by using photographs, not the original fragments.²⁸ Davis himself reviews the fragments using the methods of material reconstruction. While García Martínez ended up considering manuscripts B and C to belong together, Davis’ conclusion is that actually, manuscripts A and C should be restored together. This can be demonstrated with the similarities in size and shape of many of the larger pieces of the fragments, which reflect different layers of the manuscript and the patterns of damage that have been preserved in both layers.²⁹ Davis has been able to use the new digitized images and advanced tools for photo-editing with which it is possible to create models of how the original scroll looked. The result of his work is that the fragments considered to belong to 4Q491c and column 2 of fragment 11 of 4Q491a are to be placed as two layers of one manuscript.

Davis’ study is a valuable opening for a more physically oriented discussion on the fragments of 4Q491. It leads to avoiding the division of 4Q491 into too many pieces but also leaves us waiting for the further results of the material reconstruction of the fragments. Davis, too, looks for the future publication of 4Q491 which, according to him, is “to have major implications for

24 García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 327–28. García Martínez notes that Baillet distinguishes ruling in the manuscript (although he says that it is not always apparent) while Abegg is unable to see any traces of it; cf. Baillet, DJD 7:12; Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven,” 64; García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 328 n. 40.

25 García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 328–29.

26 Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, xxxii.

27 Davis, “There and Back Again,” 125–46.

28 Davis, “There and Back Again,” 127.

29 For further discussion on the physical evidence for rejoining these manuscripts, see Davis, “There and Back Again,” 128–37.

the assignment, placement and interpretation for the other fragment groups [i.e., other than fragments 11 i + 12–11 ii], 4Q491 fragments 1–3, and fragments 8–10.³⁰ However, it is clear that currently, his work is the solidest foundation for making observations of these fragments. Therefore, in this study, on the one hand, Abegg's many observations on the differences between the supposed manuscripts A and B are heeded and the division into two is accepted and manuscripts 4Q491a and 4Q491b are discussed separately.³¹ On the other hand, following the lead of Davis, in this study the separation of the supposed manuscript C is considered critically. The arguments that Abegg presents are not strong: varying line spacing within one manuscript is not an anomaly and the shrinkage that was already suggested by Hunzinger is only one possible way to explain it. Also, material arguments presented by Davis – that 4Q491a 11 i and fragments considered to belong to 4Q491c can be shown to form two layers of one manuscript – are convincing. Thus, although in terms of handwriting, 4Q491c could be argued to belong together with 4Q491b (cf. García Martínez), in terms of the shape and size of the fragments it actually belongs with 4Q491a (cf. Davis), and there is no reason to change Baillet's original placement. As regards the content of 4Q491c fragments, it should be noted that understanding 4Q491c as a separate manuscript makes it easier to interpret 4Q491a as a copy or recension of the composition of 1QM. However, since there is no answer to the question of what would then be the context of the hymns presented in 4Q491c, separating the manuscripts seems to be more a matter of making things easier than trying to understand the manuscripts as they are.

In sum, wading through the meandering research history of 4Q491 is necessary not only in order to understand the research subject of this study; the brief survey above also raises at least three factors that have had – and still have – an impact on the study of the Dead Sea scrolls in general. First, the order of availability of the material has inevitably influenced scholars' views, especially on the pieces found in Cave 4. The fact that Cave 1 was found first in many ways gave the Cave 1 manuscripts precedence over the Cave 4 manuscripts, and in many cases, for a long time, the Cave 1 manuscripts served as models for assembling the puzzle of the pieces found in Cave 4. Second, different generations have had different opportunities to make observations regarding the

30 Davis, "There and Back Again," 145–46.

31 If future research shows that all the fragments belong to one and the same manuscript, the differences between the scripts should still be explained in some way – and thus scrutinizing the texts written in different scripts separately still makes sense. If the manuscript should be understood as one, it is possible, for example, that one of the two scribes aimed to combine two different views of the war. This option is briefly discussed at the end of Chapter 3 below.

vast number of pieces found in Cave 4. The pioneers were forced to gather pieces together in any way possible in order to enable the research to proceed, whereas subsequent generations have been able to build on the groundwork already done, criticize the joins, separate the pieces, and finally join them up again using better thought-out arguments. Third, the development of the understanding of the nature of the texts has complicated concepts such as “original” or “recension.” In the current situation, it is increasingly important to be aware that what we call ancient manuscripts are, fundamentally, scholarly constructs. Bearing all this in mind, we now move on to scrutinize manuscript 4Q491a as a material artifact.

1.2 *4Q491a as a Material Artifact*

So, in this study, the manuscript that is called 4Q491a includes (Baillet’s) fragments 8–10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, and 35. The fragments are made of skin of average thickness. The light beige color of the material is here and there darkened. Baillet suggests that this is due to moisture and perhaps also to improper attempts to clean the manuscript. The column width seems to be the average: according to Baillet, it is 9 cm in fragments 8–10 and over 10 cm in fragment 11 column 1.³²

The scripts of the fragments – which reflect Hasmonean or early Herodian style³³ – are small in comparison to the War Texts in general: the letters are about 2 mm high and the line height is about 4 mm.³⁴ According to Abegg,³⁵ the script used in fragment 11 column 1 is more refined than that used elsewhere in 4Q491a but later Davis emphasized that both scribal hands were able to produce clear and legible text even on a small scale and thus, it must be noted that both scripts “exhibit exceptional skill.”³⁶ Furthermore, Davis introduces three models in order to explain the existence of the two different scripts in one manuscript: there may have been either two scribes who worked in the same setting, two scribes who worked in different settings, or one scribe who worked under different circumstances. The first option, that one scribe would have started to inscribe the manuscript and another one would have continued right after the first one, is not very likely – as Davis also

32 Baillet, DJD 7:12.

33 Baillet, DJD 7:12, who discusses 4Q491 as one and only one manuscript, defines the script as Herodian. According to Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 12, the script is Hasmonean or early Herodian.

34 Baillet, DJD 7:12; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 3, 12.

35 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 1.

36 Davis, “The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour: Re-Imag(in)ing the Shape and Contents of 4QM^a” (available through www.academia.edu).

argues – especially because the scroll is seemingly small and therefore there is no clear need to have two scribes write it. A more likely option is that there were two scribes who wrote under different circumstances so that the second scribe wanted to add something to what was earlier produced by the first scribe. According to Davis, there are some material arguments to support the idea that the second column of fragment 11 could have been added later. The fairly narrow margin between the columns in fragment 11 might indicate that there was not much space left at the end of the column and probably the sheet ended there.³⁷ Consequently, it can be suggested that the scribe who wrote the text in column 2 aimed to make as much space as possible available in order to squeeze his text into a small space. This aim can be explained by the scribe's desire to add something to the text that already existed.³⁸ However, what weakens this argument is that rulings were usually not executed by the scribes but by the scroll manufacturers and thus, they usually already were there when a scribe started his work.³⁹ Still another option that Davis finds likely as well is that one scribe wrote the text but at some point, he changed his style a bit. There are many conceivable reasons for this kind of change: the scribe might have changed his writing instrument, he could treat different parts of the text differently and thus inscribe them more or less carefully, he could have aged between writing the two parts of the text or, if there is some time between writing the two parts, scribal conventions may have been changed.⁴⁰ For me, this third option seems to be the most likely, and I consider it probable that one scribe deliberately wrote these passages in a different script to draw attention to their distinctive quality. It should be noted that the part that is written in the divergent script is known as the Self-Glorification Hymn, and its content clearly stands out from its context in 4Q491. Although many hymns in the 4QM material are not only related to the war and are diverse in content, this poem, in which the protagonist describes himself as a divine being and even unique in his glory, clearly differs from all the others – as well as from the battle instructions that follow the hymn in the next column. Moreover, the divergent script is not the only factor that physically separates the text from its context;

37 Davis, "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour," 17 n. 47, notes that "the somewhat dramatic difference between the intercolumnar in frg 11 i–ii measuring often < 10 mm and another measuring approx. 15 mm is a peculiarity that was first pointed out to me by Hanna Vanonen."

38 Davis, "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour," 16–17.

39 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 60.

40 Davis, "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour," 17. In addition to these reasons, the scribe might have injured his hand resulting in a change in his writing capabilities.

a large *lamed* is also inscribed near the left margin of the column.⁴¹ Since both the change of the script and the *lamed* are linked to the divergent text, it is probable that they were the scribe's conscious way of demonstrating the specificity of the material. We will come back to this question later in Section 1.5.

Baillet's placement of fragments 8–10 is quite widely accepted although these three fragments do not have a direct interface.⁴² Placing fragments 9 and 10 next to each other is on safe ground since these two fragments share the

41 Only the top stroke of the letter is visible but scholars have been quite agreed in reading it as *lamed*. Instead, different alternatives have been presented to explain it: According to Eshel, "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn," 183–84 n. 35, Stegemann understood the ל to be part of the name ישראל. However, there are no clear arguments for this. Wise, for example, says that he cannot discern "any particular reason why the scribe might write the name in enormous letters here"; see Michael O. Wise, "מי כמוני באלים: A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q491b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:35–26:10," in *DSD* 7 (2000): 192. Smith assumes that the ל may indicate the number of the poem or the book of poems; see Morton Smith, "Two Ascended to Heaven: Jesus and the Author of 4Q491," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992), 295 – but Wise, "מי כמוני באלים," 192, objects by noting that the letters can serve as numerical notations "only to number a scroll's sheets" and only "a few times in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Scribes used letters as numbers very rarely and more often they "spell numbers out as words." Wise himself suggest that ל has to do with recensional activity that the text in column 11 i has undergone. He refers to manuscript 4Q422, 4QpaleoExod^m, which includes large *wavs* in the left margin of the column, always after the half-line *vacats* that indicate the largest paragraph divisions in the document. In every case, the large ל belongs to the verbal form starting in the next line, at the beginning of the new paragraph (see Wise, "מי כמוני באלים," 192–3). According to Wise, the ל in 11 i can be seen as an analogy for the practice in 4Q422, representing "the inseparable preposition separated, properly attaching to the first word of the Hymn of the Righteous" starting after the *vacat*. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 18, however, questions Wise's suggestion. According to him, concerning 4Q422 the "parallel of the *wavs* in open spaces is invalid as these were written in spaces between the sections in the paleo-Hebrew script." He enumerates some further examples of the large letters that are located in the margins (*mems* in 4Q107 and 4Q546) but does not draw any conclusions.

Although the significance of the ל is not clear, its location near the *vacat* allows me to suggest that it may have something to do with the use of the sources. Also, this scribal practice that is not known elsewhere in 4Q491a or in any other War Texts might indicate that some of the hymnic material was regarded as somewhat divergent from its context. This question is returned in Section 1.5 below.

42 Baillet, *DJD* 7:20–21. Cf. Abegg, "The War Scroll," 13 (note that Abegg renames fragments 8–10 fragments 1–10 of manuscript 4Q491a). Abegg ("The War Scroll," 15–19) wades through all the separate fragments but still ends up thinking that fragments 8–10 i belong together. Cf. also Duhaime, "War Scroll," 146–50. Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 125–7) reads fragments 8–10 i together with 1QM 14 and fragment 10 ii after column 15. Yishay ("The Literature of War at Qumran," 80–81, 100), however, discusses fragments 8–9 separately from fragment 10 – as does already Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung," 135.

bottom margin of the sheet and the blank space in the next to lowest line. In addition, the line spacing of these two fragments fits well and the letters are similar. Placing fragment 8 to the right side of fragment 9 is not as certain but not impossible: the line spacing and the letters are similar enough to make this placement possible. The close textual parallelism with 1QM 14 is something that has been used as evidence for placing the fragments. Textual parallels are not a strong argument when considering material arrangement, but in this case, textual parallels that have been used to estimate the distance between the fragments are at least not in contradiction with the material features.

Another placement which is widely followed is Baillet's location of fragment 11 i with relation to fragment 12, i.e., that fragment 12 is to be placed at the top left corner of 11 i.⁴³ Even Abegg, who does not agree with Baillet that 11 i and 11 ii belong to the same manuscript, thinks that 11 i and fragment 12 belong together, and Davis also argues for this.⁴⁴ According to all of them, fragment 12 should probably be placed at the top left corner of the column of which lines 8–23 are visible in fragment 11. Thus, the lines visible in column 12 are lines 2–5 of this column; although Davis emphasizes that beyond the tentative observations that can be made about the size and shape of the fragment, it is impossible to confirm its placement conclusively.⁴⁵

However, not all of Baillet's placements have received unreserved support. Baillet places fragments 14 and 15 as part of the same column,⁴⁶ but Abegg and Duhaime, among others, edit these two separately.⁴⁷ Baillet combines these two fragments so that fragment 14 was placed to the right of fragment 15 and thus, the text of his lines 5–10 are from both fragments. Nevertheless, he does not give any material reasons for this connection, and thus the placement remains hypothetical. Therefore, I follow Abegg and Duhaime and discuss these two fragments separately.

In addition to arranging the fragments, Baillet also assembled them from smaller pieces. For example, fragment 10 ii consists of two pieces of leather (see PAM 42.472 and PAM 42.474). The join between these fragments seems

43 Cf. Baillet DJD 7: Plate VI.

44 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 3; Davis, "There and Back Again," 135–7.

45 Davis, "There and Back Again," 135–6.

46 Baillet, DJD 7:37–39.

47 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 29–30; Duhaime, "War Scroll," 158–61. See also Yishay, who gives separate editions of these fragments but discusses them together (Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 149–50). García Martínez and Tigchelaar edit only fragment 15 and omit fragment 14 in their *Study Edition* (see p. 978). Note, however, that Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 130–32) agrees with Duhaime and reads the fragments together, placing them between 1QM columns 18 and 19.

to be plausible: the letters and the line spacing are similar, the bottom of the smaller fragment fits together with the top of the left projection of the larger fragment, and these two pieces also have a common vertical interface. In general, it can be said that the critical scholarly discussion on Baillet's edition considers the arrangement of the fragments, not joining the pieces together.

If one follows Baillet's tentative arrangement, the contents of the manuscript appear as shown in Table 4.

Although it is widely noticed that Baillet's arrangement of the fragments was based on their parallelisms with 1QM and not always on material facts like the color and thickness of the skin or the location of damage, there have been a few suggestions for any alternatives. However, recently, Davis has taken up this challenge and outlined one alternative arrangement: In the final part of his paper "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour: Re-Imag(in)ing the Shape and Contents of 4QM^a," he suggests that fragment 11 does not follow fragment 10 but starts what is in this study known as 4Q491a.⁴⁸ Fragments 8–10 followed

TABLE 4 The contents of 4Q491 according to Baillet's arrangement of fragments

Description of the Section	4Q491a
Hymnic section	frgs. 8–10, col. 1:1–16a (line 16b <i>vacat</i>)
Instructions (for the end of the war?)	frgs. 8–10, col. 1:17–
Battle instructions and encouragement speech	fig. 10, col. 2:7–17
Self-glorification hymn	fig. 11 col. 1:8–18 (line 19 <i>vacat</i>)
Song of praise	fig. 11 col. 1:20–
Battle instructions and encouragement speech and battle instructions	fig. 11, col. 2:1–
Encouragement speech (?) and battle instructions	fig. 13
Encouragement speech?	fig. 15:1–3 (line 4 <i>vacat</i>)
Encouragement speech	fig. 15:5–

48 Davis, "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour," 20. From Davis' own point of view, fragments 1–3 open the text of manuscript 4Q491 and fragment 11 follows right after them. Davis ("The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour," 21 n. 61) notes that he has found "discernible overlapping patterns of damage" between fragment 11 I and fragment 2 and he hopes to provide a further discussion on the material relationship between fragments 1–3 and fragment 11 in the future.

at an undetermined distance after fragment 11. The placement of fragments 13 and 15 remains unclear but Davis refers to Yishay's suggestion that fragments 13, 14, 15, 18 and 22 should be placed either side of fragment 10 ii.⁴⁹ In Table 5, which aims to demonstrate Davis' arrangement, fragments 13 and 15 are placed after fragment 10 ii.

However, Davis' main point is to present physical evidence for re-joining columns 11 i and ii and he does not yet show detailed arguments for the arrangement of the other fragments (of which the main question clearly is the mutual order of fragments 8–10 and fragment 11). Therefore, his arrangement must thus far remain hypothetical as well – and the need for a detailed material study of 4Q491 (both a and b) is still evident. At least a descriptive study of the material features of 4Q491 is certainly possible, and, as Davis hints, there are probably some material conclusions that can be made as well.⁵⁰ This is something scholars need to attack further. However, it should be noted that the case of fragmentary manuscripts, the absolute order of the fragments may

TABLE 5 The contents of 4Q491 according to Davis' arrangement of fragments

Description of the Section	4Q491a
Self-glorification hymn	frg. 11 col. 1:8–18 (line 19 <i>vacat</i>)
Song of praise	frg. 11 col. 1:20–
Battle instructions and encouragement speech and battle instructions	frg. 11, col. 2:1–
Hymnic section	frgs. 8–10, col. 1:1–16a (line 16b <i>vacat</i>)
Instructions (for the end of the war?)	frgs. 8–10, col. 1:17–
Battle instructions and encouragement speech	frg. 10, col. 2:7–17
Encouragement speech (?) and battle instructions	frg. 13
Encouragement speech?	frg. 15:1–3 (line 4 <i>vacat</i>)
Encouragement speech	frg. 15:5–

49 Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 303–5.

50 Davis ("The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour," 21 n. 61): "There are discernible overlapping patterns of damage between frg. 11α–δ i and frg. 2, that are confirmable by both methods for shape assessment, and colour selection described above. However, these fragments appear in facing correspondence, which suggests that they were folded together."

simply be impossible to determine. What is clear in any case is that the text of 4Q491a does not follow that of 1QM or vice versa (although these texts sometimes resemble each other even closely) – and this will be further demonstrated in the following sections.

In the following, the best-preserved fragments of 4Q491a will be discussed one by one.⁵¹ In each section, the text of the fragment in question is first presented according to Duhaime's edition, with the necessary emendations, after which the contents of the fragment are discussed. Furthermore, the textual parallels to the fragment in question – from both 1QM and the other texts – are brought into the discussion and the degree of parallelism is defined. If it seems that the text in the fragment in question and its parallel text are mutually dependent, the direction and quality of this dependence is analyzed. As stated above, the hypothesis is that the author of 1QM used the other war material and modified it when compiling his own anthology-styled work and thus, in the following, the dependence is primarily examined from this point of view. The starting point is to observe how the transmission process looks in the light of the idea that the 1QM is a compilation of the war material and redacts it. Another option that is often suggested when discussing the possible literal dependence between two or more texts is the possibility of a common source being behind the texts, and this is of course also one possible option when trying to explain the similarities and differences between the M manuscripts. However, it should be noted that the idea of an unknown common source cannot be verified; it always remains a theoretical model. Moreover, usually, the idea of a common source means that it must have been possible to make changes to the source text or at least to link it to new contexts in creative ways. This raises the question: is it necessary to hypothesize a common source that is not preserved or it would be equally likely that one of the texts was the source of the other? Therefore, the focus of this study is on what we can conclude from the relationships between the materials that actually exist.⁵²

The fragments are presented in numerical order, according to the numbers Baillet assigned them. This order was chosen to make it easy for the reader to find the fragments in which they were interested (Baillet's numbering is the

51 Under every fragment, in the notes, a web address of the photo or photos of this fragment is given. Kipp Davis notes that "the new colour photographs of 4Q491 are especially useful because this manuscript has survived relatively intact from the time of its first capture on infrared film, but also with the added advantage that the text remains quite legible in natural light." Cf. Davis, "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour," 6–7.

52 Cf. also the discussion on 4Q491b and 1QM in Section 3 and Jokiranta and Vanonen, "Multiple Copies of Rule Texts," 50.

most established way to refer to them). The absolute order of the fragments in the original manuscript remains unsolved.

1.3 Fragments 8–10 i (B-371148)⁵³

ב]יְהוֹדִי [1
 [וע]נָּו ואמרו ברוך א]ל [ל]י [שראל ה]שׁוּמְר חסד 2
 [ל]גבורות פלא וקהל גֹּאֲיִם [אסף כללה ואיז]שארִי]תּוּ [להרי]ם [נְמ]ס 3
 4 נאלמים בגבורתּוֹת אֲלֵי[וידי]ם רפות ללמד מלחמה ולִימוּגִי בורכים חוזק מעמד ואומץ
 מ[תנים]
 5 לשכם] מכי]ם [] [שׁוֹת] 54 לבב קושי ובתִּמְיָם [י] דָּרֶךְ יתם 55 כול גואי רשעה
 ולגבוֹ[ריהמה]

53 In B-371148, one fragment which according to Baillet (DJD 7:19–20) is 4Q491 fragment 4 (and according to Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 49–50, 4Q491b fragments 14–15), is situated at the top of fragments 8–9. However, there is no clear material connection between fragment 4 and fragment 8 and thus, the location remains speculative. Therefore, fragment 4 is not discussed here as part of the ensemble of fragments 8–10, nor are fragments 5, 6 and 7 which all seem to be located in the photo on the same suggested sheet.

54 In line 5, there is clear deviation from the corresponding reading in 1QM, but in both manuscripts the text is damaged. At the beginning of line 5, Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 148) reads לשכם] מכי]ם ר]שׁוֹת while Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 80) reads רש]עות [] and Hunzinger (“Fragmente einer älteren Fassung,” 135) מכי]ם [] [ועניי רוה]ל[עות. Duhaime’s reading follows that of Baillet (DJD 7:21) although Duhaime refrains from reconstructing that much (cf. Baillet’s רשׁוֹת רוה]ל[עות]. The ם is clearly visible on the fragment and there is no reason not to read it. In contrast, the letter just after the lacuna is only partly visible: one vertical stroke, slightly tilted to the left. According to Baillet (DJD 7:21), both ש and ע are possible options but he prefers reading רשׁוֹת rather than רעות]. Thus, he specifically calls Hunzinger’s reading into question. This word has been especially difficult for editors since the text of fragments 8–10 seems to deviate here from the text of 1QM 14, which it otherwise seems to follow quite strictly. Now, while 1QM reads ם [ועניי רוה]ל [] [שׁוֹת] (1QM 14:7), fragments 8–10 read either ש or ע (line 5: [עות] or [שׁוֹת]) (and that is why Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, 125, leaves the reading of fragments 8–10 out of his edition and brings it up only in the footnotes, giving one more option for reconstruction: [שׁוֹת]. What supports ש is that elsewhere in the fragment, the right stroke of ע seems to end above the bottom of ך, and, here, the bottom of ך and the bottom of the stroke of the disputed letter are at about the same level. However, defining the letter remains tentative and thus, here, the word is not reconstructed but just [שׁוֹת] is read.

55 Towards the end of line 5, Hunzinger (“Fragmente einer älteren Fassung,” 135) reads יתמו but Baillet (DJD 7:21) and Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 148) read יתם – as it clearly is on the fragment. Hunzinger’s reading probably stems from 1QM: at the corresponding point of the text, 1QM reads יתמו כול גויי (see 14:7). Baillet (DJD 7:22) again rejects Hunzinger’s reading but supposes that there is a scribal error in the text: he suggests that the scribe might confuse the letters ך and ך of his model with ם. Charlesworth and Strawn – who comment on Duhaime’s edition – also see the scribal error as an option for explaining this point (see

6	אין מע[מד בר]וך שמך אל ה[ח]סדים המ[פ]ליא חסדיך בנו בממשלת בלי[על]
7	[ובכו]ל[ל] לוא ה[ה]יחונ[ו]מבריתך []גְעֶרְתָּהּ [ממ]נו ובהתרשע אנשי
8	[]פְדוּתְכָה ועתה הקימוֹת[ה] בעוז]כָּה ורמי קומה תגדע ל[השפילם] ⁵⁶
9	[אי]ן מציל ולקילתמה אין מגוס וּלְנֹכַח בדיהמה []לְבָזוּ וכול יק[ו]ם
10	[ו]אנו עמכה [ב]מְעָשֵׂי אמתכה נהלל[ה] שמכ[ה] ו[בגב]וֹרְתְכָה נרוֹמְמ[ה]
11	[]עת[ים] ומוֹעֲדֵי תעוֹדוֹת עולמים עם []ולילה ומוצא[י] ע[רב]
12	[]מִחֻשְׁבֵּת כְּבֹדְכָה ורזי פֶּלְאֵי־תְּכָה בְּמִרְוִימִיכָה [להרים] לְכָה
13	[]רוֹמָה אל אלים והנשא בעוֹזוֹ 57 מלך הַמְּלָכִים ש[מ]תה עֵל
14	[]מ[ע]לֵיכֶּה יפוצו כול בני חושך ואור גודל[כה] אל[ים] ואנשי
15	[]בוֹ עֲרֵת במחשכי אבי־יָנוּם באבדוֹי־ שֵׁאוֹל תּוֹקֵד [פ]ושעים
16	[]בכול מועדי עולמים [] <i>vacat</i>
17	[כול הו]יות הַמִּלְחָמָה יספרו שמה ואחר ישוּבוּ אל מח[נות] שמה לסרד

Column 1 of manuscript 4Q491a fragments 8–10 includes a poetic text, most likely a hymn or hymns. The text is set off with two *vacats*: the first one is not so clearly visible but probably, line 1 ends with a *vacat*.⁵⁸ In line 16, the empty space at the end of the line is clearly visible. The first *vacat* separates the hymn section from its rubric⁵⁹ which probably lies on line 1 (and perhaps a preceding column or preceding lines if they existed). Near the end of the fragment,

Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 148). Therefore, although reading יתם as it is on the fragment, the translation in the following table is similar to that of the corresponding point in 1QM.

- 56 At the beginning of line 8, Hunzinger (“Fragmente einer älteren Fassung,” 135) and Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 80) mark פ at the beginning of the word פְדוּתְכָה inside the brackets, and it is true that practically, at least in PAM 42.473 and in the color photo in the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, the letter is invisible. Baillet (DJD 7:22) notes that there is an ink spot that is a trace of פ. However, the trace must have been so tiny that without any context, it was probably impossible to identify it even in Baillet’s time. Thus, here, פ is marked in brackets. At the end of the same line, Duhaime’s reconstruction is left out since there is no clear reason for it; it is not even parallel to 1QM 14.
- 57 In line 13, Hunzinger (“Fragmente einer älteren Fassung,” 135) reads ב[ע]וֹז instead of בעוֹז. The word is not very well preserved, but the first letter is quite surely ב. Of ו and ז, the tops of the letters have faded away but they are also mostly visible. Of ע, there is only a small trace left and therefore, it is marked as uncertain here. Here, as in many other places, Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 148) – and Baillet (DJD 7:21) whom Duhaime is following here – would probably not have been so sure of the interpretation of these traces had there not been 1QM 14, which at the corresponding point reads בעוֹז[ו].
- 58 Regarding line 1, Duhaime (“War Texts,” 146 n. 42) notes that after ב[ח]וֹדֵךְ, fragments 8–10 either preserved a longer text than the one known from 1QM 14 or there was a *vacat*. Which one is true is difficult to determine but at the top of fragment 9, there seems to be an empty space longer than just a space between words. That argues for a *vacat*.
- 59 As was the case above with 1QM, the term “rubric” here denotes the short introductory element leading to the hymn. Cf. examples of using this term elsewhere: Falk, “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls,” 1, 12; Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 104.

another *vacat* closes the hymn section. After it, the description of what to do after reciting the hymn follows. The *vacats* here may indicate that the hymn was a more or less established piece of text that is here embedded in one context (while elsewhere, it can be implanted into the other – as will soon be demonstrated.) Although the rubric and the end description are fragmentary, they tell us that in this context, the hymn is connected to a group of people (cf. verbal forms in the plural in line 17, the word יחד in line 1) and to the war (cf. הַמְלַחְמָה [הו] דְּוֹת in line 17). Probably, this hymn is to be recited on the battlefield since line 17 seems to urge a return to the camps after repeating them (cf. [וְאַחַר יָשׁוּבוּ אֶל מַחֲנֵי] נֹת).

The hymn section starts with a simple introductory formula, וְאָמְרוּ [וְעִנְיָן], also known from 1QM 13:12, 14:4, 18:6.⁶⁰ As noted, the hymn section is not divided into smaller parts with *vacats* or any other sense division marks, but, considering the content and some formal characteristics, the text can be divided into three major parts. First, the two blessing formulas in lines 2b and 6b can be used for dividing the text: The first formula (בְּרוּךְ אַלְ [יִשְׂרָאֵל]) starts the first part of the hymn in which God is addressed with third person forms. This part does not exploit Hebrew poetic devices like chiasms or repetitions,⁶¹ but some use of parallelism can be distinguished (in lines 2 and 4 synthetic parallelisms and in line 2b–3a an antithetic parallelism),⁶² and the part seems to roughly follow the following structure: blessing formula (2b) – bicolon (2c–3a) – bicolon (3b) – tricolon (3c–4a) – bicolon (4b–5a) – bicolon (5b).⁶³ The core message of the part is that those who are weak will be strengthened

60 In all these cases, the formula is followed by the words בְּרוּךְ שְׂמֵכָה אֵל / בְּרוּךְ אֵל.

61 On the poetic style, see, e.g., Pajunen, *The Land to the Elect*, 270–80.

62 These parallelisms are more clearly discernible after reconstructing the text of fragments 8–10 according to the parallel text in 1QM 14 (cf. Table 6 below): Line 2: “he who keeps mercy for his covenant / and testimonies of deliverance for the people whom he redeems”; line 4: “to the staggering knees strength to stand, / and the steadiness of loins to the smitten back”; lines 2b–3a: “He has called the stumbling to wonderful [mighty deed] s. / He has gathered an assembly of nations for destruction without any remnant.”

63 The colons – which almost always start with the conjunction ו – consist of a verbal form, an object and a modifier (starting with the preposition ל or the preposition ב), each 1–3 words long. The order of these three sentence elements can vary. At the end of this part of the hymn, the structure becomes impossible to determine (cf. 5c–6a). Ordered by the colons and supplemented by what is known in 1QM 14, this part of the hymn goes as follows (what is clearly only in 1QM 14 is marked with brackets):

בְּרוּךְ אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל / הַשׁוֹמֵר חֶסֶד לְבְרִיתוֹ / וְתַעֲדוֹת יִשׁוּעָה לְעַם פְּדוּתוֹ / וְיִקְרָא כּוֹשְׁלִים
לְגַבּוּרוֹת פְּלֵא / וְקָהַל גּוֹאִים אֶסֶף לְכֹלָה אֵין שְׂאֵרִית / וְלֹהֲרִים בְּמִשְׁפֵּט לֵב נִמְס / וּלְפִתּוּחַ פֶּה
לְנִאֲלָמִים לְרֵנָּן בְּגִבּוּרָת אֵל / וְיִדִים רַפּוֹת לְלַמֵּד מִלְחָמָה / (וְנוֹתָן) לְנִמּוּגֵי בּוֹרְכִים חֲזוּק מַעֲמֵד /
וְאִמּוּן מִתְנִים לְשִׁכְּם מִכִּים / וּבְעֵנֵי רוּחַן [שׁוֹת לְבַב קוֹשֵׁי / וּבְתַמִּימֵי דֶרֶךְ יִתְמוּ כּוֹל גּוֹאֵי
רִשְׁעָה / וְלִ(כּוֹל) גְּבוּרֵיהֶם אֵין מַעֲמֵד

with the help of God and this is illustrated by different images, many of which are known from the Hebrew Bible texts.⁶⁴ The second introductory formula (בר[ו]ך שמך אל) starts the second part of the hymn in which God is addressed with second person forms and those who approach him are referred to as “we” – a feature that is sometimes interpreted to indicate the collective use of the hymn and the recital situation.⁶⁵ Again, no special poetic devices are used except one or two parallelisms in lines 8–9.⁶⁶ The idea of the weak becoming strong is still present (line 9) but now, the focus is turned around: with many different images (lines 9–10) emphasizing that those who are powerful will become feeble. Belial’s dominion has not managed to break the covenant between God and his people. In lines 6b–8a, the confrontation between “we” and Belial and the “men of his dominion” is strongly emphasized while in the previous part of the hymn in lines 2b–6a, neither Belial – nor any other adversary – was mentioned. In lines 11–12, time seems to be an important theme; enumerating times of day (night, departure of evening) may refer to praying at different times of the day.

At the end of the section, the final part can be separated on the basis of its content and the imperative form (line 13b–).⁶⁷ This third part calls on God to rise up (רומה, *qal* imp. of רום). The part starts with a synthetic parallelism (line 13b) but after that, the text is so fragmentary that it is difficult to distinguish any structure. God is still addressed with second person forms. The Sons of Darkness are mentioned and there is some kind of juxtaposition between light and darkness (line 14). Sheol is referred to and the word אבדון (“place of destruction”) occurs twice. Rising (or raising), however, links the third part

64 Cf., e.g., 4Q491a 8–10 3 and Zeph 3:8; 4Q491a 8–10 4 and 2 Sam 22:35, Ps 18:34, 144:1, Isa 35:3 (on the image of the weakness of knees in the Hebrew Bible, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 327); 4Q491a 8–10 5 and Ezek 3:7, Ps 119:1. The verses that describe teaching the weak about warfare are often part of either victory songs or prayers for victory: 2 Sam 22:35 is part of David’s song of thanksgiving for victory, Ps 18:34 belongs to royal thanksgiving for victory, and 144:1 starts a prayer for security. The other verses are not necessary related to war and it seems that in their case the author of 4Q491a just uses “biblical” vocabulary – rather than linking their text clearly to certain “biblical” contexts.

65 Cf. Pajunen, *The Land to the Elect*, 298: “A third factor pointing to a communal use is the first and second person plural forms....”

66 Again, these parallelisms are more clearly discernible after reconstructing the text of fragments 8–10 according to the parallel text in 1QM 14 (cf. Table 6 below): In line 9, synonymous parallelism “for all their mighty men there is no savior, / for their swift ones there is no refuge”; possible antithetic parallelism in line 8: “Now you have raised up the fallen by your vigor, / but the (men) of high stature you have hewn down to [...]”

67 One should also note that in the parallel text in 1QM 14, this hymn is separated from the previous ones with a *vacat*.

of the hymn with its previous context: in line 12, it is said that the mysteries of God's wonderful acts will raise up (להרים, *hiphil inf. cstr. of רים*) from the dust.⁶⁸ God destroys the adversaries, but little more can be concluded from the contents.

As was already noted and as Table 6 clearly demonstrates, the text of 4Q491a 8–10 i bears a remarkable resemblance to 1QM 14. In the table, the two texts are placed side by side and their similarity is accentuated with red text.

As the table shows, the two texts are very consistent and with the help of 1QM 14 the text of fragments 8–10 can be fairly trustworthily reconstructed in many lines. They can be defined as close parallels to each other and it is plausible to think that there is a literary dependence between the texts. However, the table demonstrates as well that there are also differences that can be distinguished between these two texts.⁶⁹ Especially, it can be noted that the contexts of the hymns clearly differ from each other. On the basis of the preserved text, while in 4Q491a, the hymn section is linked to its context afterwards, in 1QM 14, the same is done before the hymn section starts, in lines 2–3.⁷⁰ Both contexts share characteristics: in 1QM 14, the camp is mentioned (line 2, *המחנה*) as well as in 4Q491a (line 17, *מח, נות*). However, in 4Q491a the hymns are not performed in the camp but “there,” which in 1QM 14 is defined as the battlefield, “the place where they had taken position, where they had arrayed the line before the enemy’s slain fell down” (see line 14:3). In 1QM 14, it seems that the soldiers first withdraw to the camp and then, in the morning, after having purified themselves, return to the battlefield to perform the hymns. In 4Q491a, after singing “all the praises of the war” the soldiers are to return to the camps and purifying is not mentioned at all, at least in the preserved lines. It should be

68 The end of the sentence (*מעפר ולהשפיל מאלים*) is preserved only in 1QM 14.

69 Davies (who refers to Hunzinger) also enumerates some differences between the texts. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 84.

70 Note also that lines 14:2–4a have much in common with 1QM 19:9–13 (cf. 14:2 and 19:9, 14:3 and 19:10–13, 14:4 and 19:13) – although there are also great differences between these two passages. The most significant differences are, first, that in 1QM 19 there is enumerated a large group of actors (the chief priest, the chiefs of the battle lines, the officers) but in 1QM 14, only the pronoun “they” is used to refer to the actors (cf. 19:11–12 and 14:3), and, second, while in 1QM 19 the author speaks of the “slain of the Kittim,” in 1QM 14 the author discusses generally the “slain of the enemy” (cf. 19:13 and 14:3). At least Philip Davies and John Zhu-En Wee have presented their own theories of these similarities and differences by suggesting that column 19 represents a later, specified version of the material of column 14. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 73, and Wee, “A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns XV–XIV of the War Scroll (1QM),” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 268–69.

TABLE 6 The texts of 4Q491:8–10 i and 1QM 14:4–18

4Q491, fragments 8–10 column 1		1QM 14	
1	[בִּיהוּ]	1	ואחר העלותם מעל החללים לבוא המתנה ירננו כולם את תהלת המשוב ובבוקר יבסו בגיהם ורחצו
2	[ועוֹ] ואמרו ברוך אל־[ישראל ה'] שוֹמֵר חסדו	2	3 מדם פגרי האשמה ושבו אל מקום עומדם אשר סדרו שם המערכה לפני נפול חללי
3	[וגבורות פלא וקהל גוֹ] אסף לכלה ואין [שאר] תִּן [להרי]	3	האויב וברכו שם
4	[גִּמְ]	4	4 כולם את אל ישראל ורוממו שמו בחדד בחדד שמחה
5	נאלמים בגבורת־אֵל־[יידי]ם רפות ללמד מלחמה ולִימוֹגי ברכים חזק מעמד ואמוץ מ[אתנים]	5	וענו ואמרו ברוך אל ישראל השומר חסד לבריתו ותעודות 5 ישועה לעם פדותו ויקרא כושלים
6	לשכס[מכי]ם [שות לבב קושי ובתמלִמֵ]ן דֹּךְ יתם כול גואי רשעה ולנב[ייהמה]	6	לִ[גבורת]ת פֵּלא וקהל גוֹיִים אסף לכלה אין שארית ולהרים במשפט 6 לב נמס ולפתוח פה
7	בנו בממשלת בלי[על]	7	לנאלמים לרנן בגבור[ת]
8	[ובכו]ן [לוא ה'] מבריתך [גֵּעֻתה] ממִן]	8	7 ואמוץ מתנים
9	ובתרשע אנשי	9	לשכס מכים ובעני רוח]
10	[פ]תחכה ועתה הקימות־הָ [בעוֹ]כה רומי קומה תגדע	10	8 ולכול גבורה־ם
11	[אי]ן מציל ולקלִת־מה אין מעס וְצַנֵּף [בדיתה]ה לַבּוֹ	11	אין מעמד ואנו שא[רית] שמכה אל החסדים ברוך]
12	[ואנו עמכה]ב[מְעוּשֵי אמתכה הִלֵּל־הָ] שמכ[ה']ן [בגב]	12	השומר ברית לאבותינו ועם 9 כול דורותינו הפלטה חסדיה לשא[רית] בממשלת בליעל
13	[וְחִכָּה נְרוֹמֵמֵ]ה]	13	ובכול רדי שטמתו לוא הדיחִנוּ [ו]ן 10 מבריתכה ורוחי [ת]בלו גערתה מִפְּנֵי [ובהתרשע אנ]שי
14	[עוֹ]ן [מְעוּשֵי תעודות עולמים עם] [לילה ומוצאי]ן [עֲרֵב]	14	ממשלתו שמִיתָה נפש פדותכה ואתה הקימותה 11 ונפלים בעוֹכֶה רומי קומה תגדע לכול גבורה־ם אין מציל ולקלִת־הֶם אין מעס ולנכבדיה־ם

TABLE 6 The texts of 4Q491 8–10 i and 1QM 14:4–18 (cont.)

4Q491, fragments 8–10 column 1		1QM 14	
12	[מְחַשְׁבֵּת כְּבוֹדָהּ וְהִי פְלִיאָה] אֶת־כֹּה־בְמִן [רֹמִיכָה] לְהַרִים	12	12 תִּשְׁבַּב לְבוֹז וְכוּל יָקוּם
13	[רִן] מָה אֵל אֱלִים וְהַנְּשֵׂא בְעָז מֶלֶךְ הָמְלִכִים [שְׁמָתָה עָלֶיךָ]	13	הַבְּלִיָּה־הֵם אִיָּו וְאֵנוּ עִם קוֹדֶשְׁכֶּה בְּמַעֲשֵׂי אִמְתִּיכָה נְהַלְלָה שְׂמִיכָה 13 וּבְגִבּוֹרֹתֶיכֶה
14	[מִן] עֲלֵיכֶה יִפּוּצוּ כוֹל בְּנֵי חוֹשֶׁךְ וְאוֹר גּוֹדֵל [כֶּה] אֵלִים וְאַנְשִׁים	14	נְרוֹמְמָה 14 [עֲתִים וּמוֹעֵדִי תַעֲוֹדוֹת עוֹלָמִים עִם מִן] אִיּוֹם וְלִלְלָה 14 וּמוֹצָאֵי עֶרֶב
15	בִּן עֶרְתָּת בְּמַחֲשֵׁבִי אֲבִיָּים בְּאֲבָדֹי שְׂאוֹל תּוֹקֵן [פ] וְשַׁעִים	15	וּבֹקֵר כִּיָּא גְדוּלָה מִן [חֲשִׁבְתָּ כִּבְן] זָכָה וְהִי נִפְלְאוֹתֶיכֶה בְּמַחְמֵי [חֵי] לְכָה לְכָה מַעֲפָר 15 וְלֹהֲשִׁפֵּל מֵאֱלִים vacat
16	[בְּכוֹל] בְּכוֹל מוֹעֵדִי עוֹלָמִים vacat []	16	16 רֹמָה רֹמָה אֵל אֱלִים וְהַנְּשֵׂא בְעוֹן זָ
17	[כוֹל הוּא] דִּית הַמְלַחְמָה יִסְפְּרוּ שְׂמָה וְאַחַר יִשׁוּבוּ אֵל מַחְנֵינֹת [שְׂמָה לְסֶרֶךְ]	17	17 [כִּן] לְ [ב] אִי חוֹשֶׁךְ וְאוֹר גּוֹדֵלְכֶה יִיָּו []
		18	18 [ש] אֱלֹהִים תּוֹקֵד לְשֶׁרֶפֶת []
			15 וְכִיָּא הִיאָה עֵת צִרָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל [דַּת מַלְחָמָה (עַל) כִּיָּוֹל הַגִּיִּים וְגוֹרֵל אֵל בְּפִדּוֹת עוֹלָמִים
			2 וְכוּלָה לְכוֹל גִּי רִשְׁעָה וְכוּל עַל [מַלְחָמָה יִלְכוּ וְחִנוּ נֶגֶד מֶלֶךְ הַכְּתִיִּים וְגִגֵּד כוֹל חֵיל
			3 בְּלִיעֵל הַנּוֹעֵדִים עִמּוֹ לְיוֹם יָוָם [כַּחֲרָב אֵל vacat
			4 וְעַמּוֹ כוֹהֵן הָרֹאשׁ וְאַחִיו הַכֹּהֲנִים] וְהַלְוִיִּים וְכוּל אֲנָשֵׁי הַסֶּרֶךְ עִמּוֹ וְקָרָא בְּאוֹזְנֵיהֶם
			5 אֵת תַּפְלַת מוֹעֵד הַמְלַחְמָה [מֵה] סֵפֶר סֶרֶךְ עֲתוֹ עִם כוֹל דְּבַר־הַיְּהוּדִים וְסֹדֵר שֵׁם
			6 אֵת כוֹל הַמַּעֲרֻכּוֹת כִּכְּ [] וְהַתְּהַלֵּךְ הַכוֹהֵן הַחֲרוֹץ לְמוֹעֵד נֶקֶם עַל פִּי
			7 כוֹל אַחִיו וְחֹזֵק אִתּוֹ [] וְעִנְיָהּ וְאִמְרָהּ

TABLE 6 The texts of 4Q491 8–10 i and 1QM 14:4–18 (cont.)

4Q491, fragments 8–10 column 1	1QM 14
<p>1 [... in] a community [...] [...] 2 They shall [spe]ak up, saying:</p> <p>Blessed be the G[od of] I[srael], he who] keeps mercy [...]</p> <p>3 [to] wonderful mighty deeds. He has gathered an assembly of na[tions], for destruction, without any [remnan]t i[n order to raise u]p [...] me[]ted ...]</p> <p>4 the mute with the might of God, to teach war [to the] weak hands, to the staggering knees the strength to stand, and the steadiness of [loins] 5 to the [smitt]en back [...]... the stubborn heart, and by those w[hose] way is perfect shall the whole wicked nation be destroyed. [Their] migh[ty men] 6 shall not stand....</p>	<p>2 When they have departed from the slain to enter the camp, they shall all sing the hymn of return. In the morning they shall clean their garments and wash themselves 3 of the blood of the guilty corpses. They shall return to the place where they had taken position, where they had arrayed the line before the enemy's slain fell down. There they shall bless 4 all together the God of Israel and they shall exalt his name in a joyful community. They shall speak up, saying,</p> <p>Blessed be the God of Israel, he who keeps mercy for his covenant and testimonies of 5 deliverance for the people whom he redeems. He has called the stumbling to wonderful [mighty deed]s. He has gathered an assembly of nations for destruction without any remnant in order to raise up in judgment 6 the melted heart, to open a mouth of the mute to sing with the might [of ...], to teach war to the weak [...]</p> <p>He gives to the staggering knees strength to stand, 7 and the steadiness of loins to the smitten back. Through the poor in spirit [...]... the stubborn heart, and by those whose way is perfect shall all wicked nations be destroyed; 8 any of their mighty men shall not stand. We are the remna[nt]....</p>

TABLE 6 The texts of 4Q491 8–10 i and 1QM 14:4–18 (cont.)

4Q491, fragments 8–10 column 1	1QM 14
<p>Blessed be your name, O [mer]ciful God, who has shown through wonders your mercy in our midst during the dominion of Bel[ial].</p>	<p>Blessed be] your name, O merciful God, you who keep the covenant for our fathers and with 9 all our generations! You have shown through wonders your mercy for the remna[nt ...] during the dominion of Belial.</p>
<p>7 [With al]l [... he has not] d[ravn us [away]] from your covenant [...] you have driven away [from] us.</p>	<p>With all the mysterites of his hatred, he has not drawn [us] away 10 from your covenant;</p>
<p>When the men of [...] were acting wickedly 8 [...] your redeemed.</p>	<p>you have driven his spirits of [des]truction away from [us]. When the me]n of his dominion [were acting wickedly], you kept the soul of your redeemed.</p>
<p>Now [you] have raised up [... by] your [vigor], but the (men) of high stature you have hewn down to [...]</p>	<p>You have raised up 11 the fallen by your vigor, but the (men) of high stature you have hew[n down....]</p>
<p>9 [... there is n]o savior, for their swiftness there is no refuge. To their no[bles ...] contempt. All crea[tu]res 10 [...]</p>	<p>For all their mighty ones there is no savior, for their swift ones there is no refuge. To their nobles 12 you render contempt. All [their] creatures of vanity [... no]thing.</p>

TABLE 6 The texts of 4Q491 8–10 i and 1QM 14:4–18 (cont.)

4Q491, fragments 8–10 column 1	1QM 14
<p><i>We, your people,</i> <i>[because of] your truthful works, shall praise[e yo]ur [name],</i> <i>and [because of] your [mighty d]eed, shall exal[t]</i> 11 <i>[... time]s</i> <i>and holy days of the everlasting fixed times, with [...] and</i> <i>night,</i> <i>and the departu[re]s of e[vening] 12 [...] your glorious plan.</i> <i>The mysteries of your won[der]ful acts are in [your] h[eights]</i> <i>to raise up to [you ...] 13 [...]</i></p>	<p><i>We, your holy people,</i> <i>because of your truthful works, shall praise your name,</i> 13 <i>and because of your mighty deeds, shall exalt ... [...] times</i> <i>and holy days of the everlasting fixed times, with the ar[ri]val of the day and</i> <i>night,</i> 14 <i>and the departures of the evening and morning.</i> <i>For great is your [gloriou]s p[lan].</i> <i>The mysteries of your wonderful acts are in [your] heights</i> <i>to r[ais]e up to you those, from the dust</i> 15 <i>and to bring low among the divine beings. (vacat)</i></p>
<p><i>R[ise] up, O God of gods!</i> <i>Lift yourself up with vigor, O King of ki[ngs]! ...]</i> <i>you have [s]et on 14 [... in, fro]nt of you shall be scattered</i> <i>all the Sons of Darkness,</i> <i>and [your] great light [... divine be]ings and men</i> 15 <i>[... ki]ndling in the places of darkness and destruction,</i> <i>in the places of destruction (in) <i>Sheol</i> it shall bur[n ... re]bels</i> 16 <i>[...] in all the appointed times set forever. vacat [...] vacat</i></p>	<p>16 <i>Rise up! Rise up, O God of gods!</i> <i>Lift yourself up with vig[or] ...]</i> 17 <i>[at] [the S]ons of Darkness.</i> <i>And your great light ... [...]</i> 18 <i>[... Sh]eol shall burn (?) in a fi[re]....]</i> 15:1 <i>For this shall be a time of tribulation for Isr[ael] ...] ...</i> <i>of war against all the nations.</i></p>

TABLE 6 The texts of 4Q491 8–10 i and 1QM 14:4–18 (cont.)

4Q491, fragments 8–10 column 1

1QM 14

17 [All the pr]aises of the war they shall rehearse there.
After that, they shall return to the ca[mps ...] there, to order
[...]

The lot of God (shall be) in everlasting redemption,
2 but a destruction (is) for all the wicked nations.
All those ... [...] the battle shall go and encamp
against the king of the Kittim and against all the army of 3 Belial
gathered with him for the day ...
[...] by the sword of God. *vocat*

4 The chief priest shall take position, his
brothers the pr[iests], the Levites and all the men of the rule (being) with him.
He shall read in their hearing 5 the prayer of the appointed time for wa[r ... the
bo]ok (?) of the rule of that time, with all their words of thanksgivings. He shall
array there 6 all the lines ... [...].... The priest shall walk along, the one assigned
for the appointed time of vengeance according to the decision 7 all his broth-
ers, and he shall strengthen ... [...].... He shall speak up, saying:

noted that only one word is preserved before the hymn section in 4Q491a and thus, one should not draw hasty conclusions. However, it seems that the section does not continue similarly all the way to the end: In 4Q491a, after the hymns, the text goes back to the situation in which the hymns are to be recited and then continues – in another fragment – with something that finds its parallel in 1QM 16 (cf. the discussion of 4Q491a 10 ii below). In 1QM, instead, priestly instructions follow, something that do not have any clear parallels with 4Q491a (cf. 1QM 15).⁷¹ Thus, these texts seem to demonstrate that the hymns were more or less mobile as literary entities and that basically similar hymn sections could gain slightly different meanings depending on their contexts.

In the following analysis, the hymn is discussed in the three sections into which it is divided above, now by comparing the texts preserved in 4Q491a and 1QM.⁷² In this analysis, I also discuss the obvious literary dependence between the texts and what would explain the small differences between them. First, I simply make observations about these possible redactional elements and in the end, I briefly discuss the motives behind them and what do they tell us about the group behind these texts. The starting point is, because of the collection-like nature of 1QM, that 1QM is dependent on 4Q491a. Due to the fragmentariness of the end of 1QM 14, the comparison between the third part of the hymn of 4Q491a and the third part of the hymn of 1QM is difficult and thus the third part of the hymn receives less attention.

1.3.1 First Part of the Hymn (4Q491, Fragments 8–10, Lines 2b–6a/
1QM 14:4c–8a)

The brief hymn in lines 4Q491, fragments 8–10, 2b–6a/1QM 14:4c–8a blesses God and enumerates his good deeds. 1QM includes two verbal forms that are not in 4Q491a: לָרִנָּה in the tricolon in the middle of the hymn and נִרְתָּן in the bicolon right after that. While 4Q491a merely describes the opening of the mouth of the mute, 1QM says that the mouths are open “to sing” (לָרִנָּה). While in 4Q491a, opening the mouths, teaching the weak hands, and strengthening the knees and loins seem to belong to one and the same sentence, in 1QM, there is a new predicate verb וְנֹתֵן “he gives” which is a participle form. This breaks the structure that is built upon the combination לָ + infinitive and begins a new sentence.

71 Cf., however, 4Q491a 10 ii, where lines 13–14 give instructions for the priest. These instructions are reminiscent of those in 1QM 15. For further discussion on this, see Table 10 below and the analysis before and after it.

72 Cf. also the comparison between these texts in Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 96–99, 312.

As regards לרנן, it is possible that it was omitted in the text of 4Q491a: perhaps unintentionally or maybe deliberately, in order to avoid any misunderstandings since all the other infinitive forms in the immediate context refer to the acts of God (while singing refers to the mute). However, it is more convincing that לרנן was added in the text of 1QM as an interpretative clarification. The idea that God does something “with the might of God” (בגבורת אל) may have been inconsistent to the author and he added לרנן in order to say that the might of God has actually to do with the mute. The verb רנן occurs quite often with the preposition ל which indicates the cause of rejoicing but the preposition ב is not impossible either: Ps 20:6 urges rejoicing over God’s victory by using רנן and ב (גִּרְנָה בִּישׁוּעָתֶךָ).⁷³ Thus, the addition was not problematic from a grammatical point of view. What may also explain this addition is Isaiah 35 (especially verses 3–6) of which the hymn is strongly reminiscent: common vocabulary includes at least the parts of the body ידיים רפות, לב and the verbal roots חוק, אמן, פתח and אלם. The root רנן occurs in Isa 35:6 in the same sentence as אלם – and the purpose of the author could also have been to tie the hymn in 1QM even more clearly together with Isa 35. In the hymnic section of 1QM, namely in columns 10–14, the references to the biblical texts are numerous and the aim to connect the hymns to biblical traditions is evident (especially in columns 10–12). Thus, it is not far-fetched to think that in column 14 as well, the links to the biblical texts were strengthened when possible. This fits together with the idea that is later comes up as a motivation for the redactional work; namely the tendency to emphasize the eternal, special relationship to God – the relationship that is visible both here and in the all other known holy tradition.

Like לרנן, נותן too can be interpreted as an explanatory addition: the long chain of objects related to the infinitive form ללמד was difficult and the sentence was reconstructed with the verbal form ונותן. Also, it is possible that נותן was added in order to clarify the poetic structure: the author wanted to make a distinction between the tricolon and the subsequent bicolon and added a participle form (while the verbal forms in the tricolon are infinitives).⁷⁴ By contrast, there is no apparent reason why the verbal form would have been omitted.

73 In most of the cases in which the preposition ב occurs after רנן, it indicates either the location where the shouting takes place (cf. Jer 31:12; 4Q 427 7 i 14) or the time when the shouting comes to pass (Lam 2:19).

74 In addition, Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 96) suggests that נותן was added to emphasize that the strength to stand is not any random resource but that it is given by God. This is an option as well; in any case, there are many reasons to interpret נותן as an explanatory insertion.

Regarding the first hymn, there is still one more line in 1QM 14 where something more exists in comparison to fragments 8–10: line 5 of 4Q491 reads “their mighty men” while line 8 of 1QM reads “*all* (כול) their mighty men.” This expression occurs again in 1QM 14:11 where it is said that there is no savior “for all their mighty men.” In 4Q491a, the corresponding line 9 does not express for whom there is no savior but there is a lacuna in the text at this point and thus “for all their mighty men” was probably originally part of this hymn too. In any case, it is difficult to explain why כול would have been omitted in line 5 of 4Q491a. Instead, it is plausible to think that it was added in the text of 1QM in order to emphasize that none of the mighty men of the enemy side will be saved. It should be noted that at this same point, there are some other differences as well: as Table 7 demonstrates, in 4Q491a fragments 8–10 line 5b, the bicolon is a bit different from the corresponding wording in 1QM 14:7.

The table shows that in 1QM 14:7, there are the letters ט and ס after the lacuna in the middle of the line. Instead, at the corresponding point, 4Q491 8–10i, line 5 reads]שׁוֹת]. The text of 4Q491 is extremely difficult to read here and thus not much can be concluded about the difference between the texts. The difference is not necessarily a significant one; Baillet demonstrates that the visible words of 1QM would fit into the lacuna of 4Q491a (]ובעניי ריח ר[שׁוֹת]). However, the word after them, partly damaged in both fragments, is clearly different. Unfortunately, due to the lacunas, the further speculation on the direction of the change is impossible.⁷⁵ Another difference at this point is that while in 4Q491a, the “whole wicked nation” shall be destroyed, according to 1QM, there are several wicked nations to be destroyed (see both גוי and the verb תמם). It is again possible that the difference came into being accidentally but it is also possible that in 1QM the number of enemies was increased deliberately in order to make the destruction more impressive.

In 4Q491 fragments 8–10, lines 2–3, the text corresponding to the end of 1QM 14:4 and the beginning of 1QM 14:5 remains in the lacuna. However, it seems that all the words of 1QM do not fit here in 4Q491a. Thus, in Baillet’s reconstruction, the word פְּדוּת (redemption) is absent,⁷⁶ but this possible difference between the texts must remain speculative since it is not possible to determine with certainty what was written in the lacuna.⁷⁷ However, this point, as well as

75 Note also the difference between יתמו and יתם at this point which should probably be explained as a scribal error in 4Q491a.

76 See Baillet, DJD 7:20.

77 In addition, there are some orthographic differences between the texts: in 4Q491 8–10 4, two words are written a bit differently in comparison with the corresponding point in 1QM (see lines 6–7): the dual form of בְּרֵךְ, “knee,” is in 1QM ברכים but in 4Q491 אַמְרֵי. The construct form of the word אֶמְצָא “strength” is in 4Q491 אומץ but in 1QM אמוץ.

TABLE 7 Differences between 4Q491 fragments 8–10 line 5 and 1QM 14:7

4Q491 fragments 8–10 line 5	1QM 14:7
<p style="text-align: center;">] שׁוֹת לִבֵּב קוֹשִׁי [</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וּבַתְּמִימֵי [י] דָּרָךְ יִתֵּם כּוֹל גּוֹאֵי רִשְׁעָה</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">] סֵם לִבֵּב קוֹשִׁי [</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וּבַתְּמִימֵי דֶרֶךְ יִתְמוּ כּוֹל גּוֹיֵי רִשְׁעָה</p>
<p>[...]... <i>the stubborn heart,</i> <i>and by those w[hose] way is perfect</i> <i>shall the whole wicked nation be</i> <i>destroyed</i></p>	<p><i>Through the poor in spirit [...]</i> <i>... the stubborn heart,</i> <i>and by those whose way is perfect</i> <i>shall all wicked nations be destroyed</i></p>

those discussed above, can be explained as reflecting that the author of 1QM, when reusing the texts of 4Q491a, was adding some words here and there when needed, probably mostly to clarify or to emphasize something.

1.3.2 Second Part of the Hymn (4Q491, Fragments 8–10, Lines 6b–13a/1QM 14:8b–15a)

In 1QM 14:8–9, there is a short section that cannot be found in the corresponding lines of 4Q491a: in 1QM, God is described not only with the epithet “merciful” (אל החסדים) as in 4Q491a but he is said to be the one who keeps the covenant (השומר ברית לאבותינו ועם כול דורותינו). These words in 1QM link the second part of the hymn to the beginning of the first part as Table 8 demonstrates:

TABLE 8 Similarities between 1QM 14:8b–9a and 1QM 14:4b/line 2b of 4Q491

1QM 14:4b/line 2b of 4Q491	1QM 14:8b–9a
<p style="text-align: center;">ברוך אל ישראל השומר חסד לבריתו</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ברוך [שמכה אל החסדים השומר ברית לאבותינו ועם כול דורותינו</p>
<p><i>Blessed be the God of Israel,</i> <i>he who keeps mercy for his covenant</i></p>	<p><i>Blessed be] your name, O merciful God,</i> <i>you who keep the covenant for our fathers</i> <i>and with all our generations!</i></p>

Also, there is a small orthographic difference concerning the plural construct form of גוי “nation”: In 1QM 14, it is גויי (see lines 5 and 7) but in 4Q491 גואי (see lines 3 and 5).

This suggests itself as the reason why these words were added to 1QM: the author of 1QM wanted to link the two parts more tightly together. With this addition, the author emphasized the idea that there is an eternal bond between the “we” group and God.⁷⁸ This emphasis would also explain the difference between line 10 of 4Q491 and line 12 of 1QM 14: at this point in 1QM, the “we” group is described as “your holy people” (עם קודשכה) while the corresponding line of 4Q491 reads “your people” (עמכה). The author of 1QM 14 wanted to highlight the “we” group’s eternal relationship to God by not only saying that they were people “whose fathers already” had made the “covenant” with God (14:4b) but also describing them as God’s “holy” people (14:12).⁷⁹

Both in 4Q491a and in 1QM, it is emphasized that God’s wonders are shown throughout generations but the following words again differ: in 1QM 14:9, the words [לשארית] (‘‘you have shown through wonders your mercy for the remna[nt ...]’’) follow while in 4Q491a, the corresponding point (line 6) reads הַמֵּן לִי אֵלֹהִים חֲסִידֶיךָ בְּנוֹ (‘‘who has shown your mercy through wonders in our midst’’). The verbal root used is the same, פלא (hiphil), but in 1QM, it is in the perfect form (הפלתה, 2nd person masculine), and in 4Q491a, a participle form (המפליא, 3rd person masculine) is used. The difference can be explained as a change towards a more special relationship to God. The third person form (4Q491a) was changed to the second person form (1QM) in order to emphasize the strong bond between God and his people.⁸⁰ The fact that these three differences can all be explained using a similar reason, namely a wish to emphasize the “we” group’s long and personal relationship to God, is an argument for the redactional nature of 1QM and the priority of 4Q491a.

While in 1QM 14:9 the wonders discussed above were shown “to the remnant” (לשארית), in line 6 of 4Q491a they are shown “among us” (בנו).⁸¹ The word שארית does not occur in the preserved lines of fragments 8–10 but it is reconstructed (quite plausibly) according to 1QM in line 3 of 4Q491a. There, however, the “remnant” is not identified with the “we” group but is related to the

78 According to Yishay (‘‘The Literature of War at Qumran,’’ 97), the author of 1QM wants to specify the impression of the mercy of God and that is why he adds חסד.

79 Cf. also Yishay, ‘‘The Literature of War at Qumran,’’ 97.

80 In this second hymn, there is also another point where the verbal root פלא occurs in different forms: 1QM (14:14) reads נפלאותיכה while fragments 8–10 reads, in the corresponding line (12), פְּלִיאָתִיכֶם. Thus, while in 1QM, there is a verbal form of פלא, in fragments 8–10, a noun occurs. There is probably not any deliberate change of text behind this difference.

81 For Davies (1QM, *the War Scroll from Qumran*, 84), this is a mark of the brevity of the 4Q text.

enemy who will be completely destroyed without any remnant.⁸² In 1QM 14, שארית occurs three times and twice it is identified with the “we” group: in line 14:8 and in the line now under discussion (1QM 14:9). The idea of the identification of the “we” group with the “remnant” is rare in the War Texts in general. In addition to 1QM 14, it occurs only in 1QM 13 (line 8) which is often considered to be a late part of the composition of 1QM.⁸³ This leads one to think that changing “us” to the “remnant” is more probable than changing the “remnant” to “us.” This change provided the “we” group one more designation and thus enlarged its meaning so that the message would be more easily accepted in different contexts: “among us” carries a sense of immediacy while the “remnant” includes the idea of the periodization of history that moves forward and invites people to identify with the correct group to be included in that remnant. The conclusion on the “remnant” being the later of the two options would get more support if we could show that the clause וּאֲנֵנוּ שְׂאֵרִית (“we are the remnant[nt ...]”) was missing in 4Q491 (and then probably added in 1QM in order to link the first and the second hymn). Unfortunately, the contents of the lacuna at the beginning of line 6 is not known.⁸⁴

At the beginning of 1QM 14:13, the word גבורה is in the plural (בגבורותיכה) while in 4Q491a fragments 8–10, if reconstructed correctly, it occurs in the singular (line 10, וּבְגִבּוֹ[וֹרְתִיכָה]). In both manuscripts, the term occurs both in the singular (line 4 of 4Q491/1QM 14:5) and in the plural (line 4 of 4Q491/1QM 14:6). In general, the word גבורה occurs in 1QM mostly in the singular: only five of 24 occurrences are in the plural (see 3:5; 13:9; 13:14; 14:5; 14:13). However, in this case, it is noteworthy that בגבורותיכה is part of the parallel structure and in the preceding verse, the expression that corresponds with בגבורותיכה is in the plural (במעשי אמתכה). Therefore, one would expect גבורה to be plural as well – and consequently, the probable explanation of the difference is that the author of 1QM changed the form from the singular to the more expected plural.

1QM 14:10 has at the end of the line the personal pronoun אתה, while 4Q491 fragments 8–10 read at the corresponding point (line 8) עתה “now.” One option

82 Cf. also 1QM 1:6 and 4:2. The word שארית also occurs in 4Q491 fragment 17, line 7 but this is such a fragmentary point that one cannot determine anything about the context of the expression. In general, the term שארית occurs both as a positive group designation (e.g., CD 1:4; 1QH^a 14:1, 15:22) and as a threatening term (e.g., CD 2:6; 1QS 4:14, 5:13; 1QSa 1:7 [reconstructed]; 1QH^a 14:32, 27:2).

83 Cf. Vanonen, “Vastakkainasettelun aika,” 266.

84 Baillet (DJD 7:21) reconstructs the beginning of line 6 as follows: אֵין מַעַמְד וּאֲנֵנוּ שְׂאֵרִית. Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 327), for his part, reconstructs 1QM 14:8b as follows: עֲמַד בְּרוּךְ שְׂמַכָּה אֵל הַחֲסִדִים. According to these reconstructions, it seems that in 1QM, there is space for some more letters than there are in 4Q491a and that indicates that the texts were in some way different.

is that the difference is a scribal error – either of a scribe of 4Q491 or a scribe of 1QM – since the words are very similar. However, this difference – if it is a change from עתה to אתה – could also be explained by the previously mentioned wish to emphasize the “we” group’s personal relationship to God.⁸⁵

There is still one difference which was already noted but which should be taken under closer scrutiny. In 4Q491, all three parts of the hymn are written directly one after another, without any *vacats* between them. By contrast, in 1QM a *vacat* in line 15 ends the second part of the hymn. After the *vacat*, the third part begins in line 16. As already noted, the author of 1QM wanted to bind the first and the second part more tightly together. Therefore, he added the reference to the covenant (השומר ברית לאבותינו ועם כול דורותינו), which is similar to the beginning of the first part (ברוך אל ישראל השומר חסד לבריתו; cf. line 2b of 4Q491a/1QM 14:4b). At the end of the column, instead, he made a clear distinction between the second and the third part and separated them with a *vacat*. Perhaps for him, the third part was so different from the previous ones that it was reasonable to relegate it to its own paragraph in the text. Also, it is possible that he wanted to emphasize the power of the third part and give space to its strong, imperative beginning. The end of 1QM 14 and the beginning of 1QM 15 are fragmentary, but it is possible that the author of 1QM linked the third part of the hymn of 1QM 14 to the hymn at the beginning of column 15 – while in 4Q491 an instructive part of the text follows the third part (see line 17).

1.3.3 Summary

What can be concluded about the nature of 4Q491a and its similarity to and differences from 1QM? Lines 1–16 of 4Q491a 8–10 i can be defined as a close parallel to lines 4–18 of 1QM 14. It is highly improbable that such similar texts would have developed completely separately from each other. Thus, Davies has already argued that 4Q491a fragments 8–10 probably represent a text older than 1QM 14 (and that, in addition, there probably already is a textual history behind 4Q491a fragments 8–10). However, he also brings out the possibility that 1QM and 4Q491a fragments 8–10 could equally well be chronologically independent and, instead, their similarity could be explained as “a parallel development.”⁸⁶ The latter option is of course possible but would require demonstrating the common source text. Above, it was demonstrated that the

85 This difference is also interesting since from line 8 in 4Q491 fragments 8–10 the scribe begins to write the second person suffixes in the long form (כה-) while earlier, in lines 6–7, they occurred in the short form (ך-). In 1QM, the long form occurs systematically. There is no apparent reason why consistent suffixes would be changed to inconsistent; the more plausible explanation is that the author of 1QM has standardized them.

86 Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 84.

differences can as well be explained without the idea of a common source and with the idea of 1QM rewriting the text preserved in 4Q491a – an option that was more probable according to Davies as well. This option is not far-fetched when considering that 1QM seems to reflect a tendency towards collecting material and organizing it to unities. The minor changes made to the text can be explained as being the author's clarifications (his aim to emend the poetic structure of the text) or reflections of his desire to emphasize the special relationship between God and his people – the people with which the community behind these texts identifies itself.⁸⁷ The special relationship with God was possibly a drawing power of the community and strengthened the authority of the leaders of the community. As a collection and a finished manuscript, 1QM was probably addressed to a slightly wider audience than the other War Texts, which may explain the desire to add weight to the authority of the community and its leaders.⁸⁸

-
- 87 Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 97, 99, argues as well that the differences between the two hymns are the deliberate changes made by the author of 1QM and that they are made in order to clarify the content of the hymn and to deepen its message. However, she finds it more probable that the two manuscripts share a common source from which the hymn is taken. About this, cf. the discussion on the theory of common source in Section 1.2 above.
- 88 As regards the "wider audience," cf. Charlotte Hempel, "Reflections on Literacy, Textuality, and Community in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*, ed. M. Cioatã, A. Feldman, and C. Hempel, STJD 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 69–82, who argues that not all the members of Qumran community were part of the elite: "While affirming the determinative leadership of a stratum of elite scholars and scribes, we noted the inevitable though largely unrecognized presence of a significant proportion of the membership who were illiterate or semi-literate while nevertheless identifying themselves as part of the same textual community" (p. 82). What may also be noteworthy is that below I demonstrate that in the M manuscripts, whether the war is conducted by only the priests and the Levites, or also by the laymen, varies. It seems that in 1QM, the perspective widens from the priestly characters to the laymen and their role is seen as more active than, for example, in 4Q493. The role of the laymen in the Qumran community has long been debated. At an early stage of the study, for example, Jerome Murphy O'Connor suggested that originally, in the Qumran community, the priests had authority, but that over the course of time, the laymen increasingly took root, cf. Murphy O'Connor "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté," *RB* 76 (1969): 528–49 (534, 548–49) (note that Murphy O'Connor bases his argument on 1QS, before the S manuscripts from Cave 4 were published). Since then, this argument has been both supported and criticized, and from the beginning, the discussion has intertwined with the debate on the origin of the Qumran movement. Both discussions are still alive. What should also be noted is that another possibility is that the discrepancy between the priests and laymen is actually somewhat artificial, making it more appropriate to ponder how "priestliness" was actually understood in the Qumran movement. Cf. e.g., George J. Brooke, "Some Issues behind the Ethics in the Qumran Scrolls and

What should be noted is that as manuscripts 1QM and 4Q491a were copied simultaneously: both were assigned a date in the second half of the first century BCE. Thus, at the level of manuscript, we cannot argue for a chronological development from one phase to another (e.g., from a more exclusive group to a more inclusive one). Instead, what this evidence probably demonstrates is that it was possible to modify the transmitted hymn according to the purpose for which the manuscript in question was used and/or among whom it was meant to be used.

The comparison between 4Q491a 8–10 i and 1QM 14 also demonstrates that the hymns were somewhat mobile literary entities and the context may make the mainly similar hymn sections seem to be a bit different. However, in this case, the hymn itself was decidedly established since only minor changes were made while transmitting it. In the next sections (see especially Section 1.6 below), we will see examples of the greater changes and how the hymns offered a place for more creative redactional activity as well.

1.4 Fragment 10 ii (B-367012; B-367013)

7 הָלָּ []ֹ
 8 בַּכְּתִיבָא [י]ֹ
 9 יַחֲלוּ אַנְשֵׁי הַבֵּינָא [י]ֹ
 10 הַמִּלְחָמָה בַּכְּתִיבָא [י]ֹ
 11 חֲלָלֵי הַמִּצְרָף לַנְּפוֹלָא [רזי]ֹ אֶל וְהָבָּ⁸⁹

their Implications for New Testament Ethics,” in *Early Christian Ethics in Interaction with Jewish and Greco-Roman Contexts*, ed. J.W. van Henten and J. Verheyden, STAR 17 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 83–106 (100), who argues that “if members are not priests by descent, they become priestly through their participation in the ‘sanctuary of men’. As such, all members have a cultic priority in their self-understanding, which influences how they conceptualize the world and their own place in it.” However, the War Text manuscripts seem to indicate that at least some discussion on the role of the laymen was underway and that some redactional activity was practiced in relation to it. Consequently, it is possible that some of the M manuscripts were addressed to a priestly audience (who probably took part in transmitting and even creating the texts) while others were addressed to a wider audience, including the laymen or those who represented a different kind of priestliness (in the broader sense of the word). We will come back to this question below in Chapter 3.

89 At the end of line 11, Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 100) reads ׀הָבָּ [instead of ׀הָבָּ. The letter after הָ is very weakly visible – only a small spot at the bottom of the line – and, at least with the photos available, it is difficult to argue that it would specifically be ׀. However, since the temporal distance between the editors is fairly long, it should be taken into account that when Baillet (DJD 7:25) – whom Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 150) is following here – studied the fragment, the traces were preserved in the fragment. Thus, since there is no clear reason to disagree with Baillet and Duhaime, the reading follows

מלחמה בכתיאים ולמערכה הראיש[ונה]	12
ונגש הכוהן החרוש למלחמה ועמד [ל]פני]	13
וחזק את ידיהמה בגבורות פלאו וענה ואמ[ר]	14
נקם לאכול באלים ובאנשים ⁹⁰ כיא לוא]	15
בשר לאם עפרו ⁹¹ כיא עתה ח[ר]	16
ועד שאול תוקדכל וסוד רשעה]	17

them. Yet, in order to demonstrate the challenging nature of the reading, the reconstruction suggested by Baillet and Duhaime (והב[והנים]) is left out.

- 90 Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 150 n. 97) remarks that ך is “written over ל ... by the scribe.” Duhaime suggests that this error of the scribe results from dittography: the previous word begins with ב, א and ל. See also Baillet, DJD 7:25; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 974; Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 100.
- 91 While Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 150) reads here עפרו, Baillet (DJD 7:25) reads עפה, Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 100) עפון and Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 127) עפר. Duhaime here follows Puech who has given his own opinion on Baillet’s reading in his review of DJD 7; see Émile Puech, “Recension: Qumrân grotte 4 III (4Q428–4Q520),” in *RB* 95 (1988): 405. What makes the reading especially difficult is that there are two supralinear letters just below the word; it seems that Yishay interprets the long vertical stroke of the supralinear ל as continuing the last vertical stroke of the questionable word and that is why she reads final *num*. However, the color photo of the fragment (B-367012) shows clearly that the long vertical stroke is not a vertical stroke of ך but the top stroke of the interlinear ל. Qimron’s reading does not come into the question since the last trace of the word is a vertical stroke and this does not fit with ר. Baillet suggests that the vertical stroke is the left stroke of ן. However, when comparing the final strokes of this word to the ן’s earlier in the fragment, it becomes clear that the most probable option is rather ך, ן, ן, ן or ן. When the sign is ן, the left vertical stroke and the top horizontal stroke form the point of a wide triangle at the top of the letter. In this case, however, a very narrow triangle is formed at the top of the letter/letters. Duhaime suggests the combination is ןר but this is not likely: the top of the penultimate stroke curves rapidly down while in ר, the top of the letter is practically a right angle (cf. ר at the end of the first word of line 16 and Abegg’s samples of letters in “The War Scroll,” 4). So, the likely reading would be either עפון, עפוי, עפי or עפיו with perhaps the first one being the most probable; if the letters are compared to the ך’s nearby, their horizontal strokes seem to be longer than those of the other ך’s.

None of the suggestions is unproblematic with regard to the meaning of the word. עפר denotes “dust” which would fit the context, and thus Baillet translates “poussière” although he reads עפה. Another known word that comes to mind is עפי which occurs in Psalm 104:12 and means “foliage” or “leafage.” This word is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible but occurs five times in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls (1QH^a 14:15, 4Q302 2 ii 7; 4Q302 11:2; 4Q385a 17a–e ii 3; 4Q433a 2:8). Some form of the verb עוף may also come into consideration. According to Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 127), both this word (which he reads as עפר) and the previous one could be proper nouns. However, there is no clear evidence of this, and it would be surprising to have unidentified proper nouns in the context. In the following table, the word is read as עפון but translated according to Baillet and Duhaime as “dust” but with a question mark. Cf. also Wise et al. “1Q33 (1QM[ilhamah]) = 1QWar Scroll [Rule],” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, ed. E. Tov (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

The text of this fragment (consisting of two pieces) can be divided into two parts: lines 7–14a form the instructive part of the text while lines 14b–17 include a speech given by a priest. No *vacats* are preserved. What can safely be concluded is that the instructions and the speech are not separated in any way: there probably is no space for a *vacat* at the end of line 14. Nor are there any other section markers visible.

When scrutinizing the actual text, it must be first noted that only little is left of both passages. However, regarding the instructions, it can be said that they concern the battle against the Kittim (lines 2:8, 10, 12), and at least the skirmishers (2:9) and a priest (2:13) are taking part in this clash. Some participants are going to fall in the battle but this will happen according to the divine plan (2:11). “The priest appointed for the battle” has a special task to strengthen the soldiers and to give a speech (2:13–14), probably to encourage the soldiers since “strengthening the hands” in line 14 refers to heartening. The speech itself is even more fragmentary but it gives the impression that both human and divine beings are involved in the battle (2:15). The speech mentions vengeance, and some stigmatized language is used (see רשעה טוד in line 2:17).⁹² Sheol is mentioned (2:17)⁹³ and the verb אכל is used twice (2:15, 17).

The text of 4Q491 8–10 ii (henceforth, the column is referred to as 4Q491a) has often been linked with the text of 1QM 16:3–17:14.⁹⁴ This 1QM passage belongs to a section that gives instructions for the beginning of the battle. The priests shall direct the war with trumpets, and the gates of the battle shall be opened, and the soldiers shall take their position (16:4–5). Instructed by the trumpet signals, the soldiers shall take up arms and begin the battle (16:6–9). Later on (cf. the *vacat* in 16:10), another relay shall go to the battlefield and the previous one shall withdraw (16:11–13). The chief priest shall give a speech of encouragement (16:13–14) in order to strengthen the new battle line for the future. The actual speech that follows (16:15b–17:9) includes many ideas that do not occur very frequently in 1QM: first, the idea that God is testing his own people in wartime (16:15b), which indicates that the encouragement is not only needed in the case of panicking before the enemy but also because of panicking when one’s own side suffers losses; second, the idea of a leading figure of the enemy side, the “commander of the dominion of wickedness” (17:5–6); and

92 Note that טוד occurs here for the only time in the War Texts.

93 In addition to this, Sheol occurs in the War Texts only in 1QM 14:18 and the parallel passage of 4Q491 8–10 i 15.

94 Cf. Duhaime (*The War Texts*, 43), who in his table of parallels and similarities between 1QM and Cave 4 manuscripts, draws a parallel between 4Q491 8–10 ii 7–14 and both 1QM 15:2–7 and 1QM 16:3–17:14.

third, the idea of the heavenly figure, an “everlasting help” to whom is given the “might of the majestic angel” (17:6).

Table 9 demonstrates the similarities and the differences between 4Q491a and 1QM 16:8b–17:9.

In 4Q491a, the instructive part of the text seems to be close to 1QM 16:8b–15a. Especially lines 11–14 of 4Q491a and lines 11–15a of 1QM 16 are textually close to each other. However, the differences between the texts are not just sporadic additions or omissions but large and recurrent. While in 4Q491a the slain are “the slain of the crucible” (חללי המצרף; cf. line 11) in 1QM 16 they are “the slain of the skirmishers” (חללי הבינים; cf. line 11). Also, the dissimilarity between the priests (למלחמה) in 4Q491a, line 13 and כוהן הרואש in 1QM 16:13)⁹⁵ marks a difference between the two texts. The same is true concerning the body member which is strengthened: in 1QM 16 it is the heart and probably also the hands (16:14) while in 4Q491a it is only hands (cf. line 14). At this point, the text of 1QM is probably a bit longer than that of 4Q491a. In addition, it seems that the text in 4Q491a is shorter than that of 1QM 16 in some other places: in lines 11–12 of 4Q491a, something about the priests follows right after the slain have fallen “according the mysteries of God,” but at the corresponding point in 1QM there is an explanation that the falling of the slain is meant to be a test for “all those appointed for the battle” (16:11–12). And while in 4Q491a only the first battle line is mentioned before the priest’s speech (see line 12, ונה[מערכה הראיש], in 1QM 16 the other battle line (see line 12, מערכה אחרת) is also discussed. All in all, 4Q491a and 1QM 16:8b–15a cannot be categorized as anything more than remote parallels.

As regards the end of the text of 4Q491a 10 ii, it includes an encouragement speech as does 1QM 16:15b–17:9. However, these speeches share just a few words, and, especially in the case of 1QM, those words are quite frequent (אלים, בשר).⁹⁶ In addition, the speech in 4Q491a includes vocabulary that is not known from anywhere in 1QM (see סוד in line 17). Thus, this speech is distinct

95 It is difficult to determine whether one should read הכוהן החרוץ or הכוהן החרוש in line 13. Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 150) follows Baillet (סנד 7:25) and reads הכוהן החרוש but in the footnote, he suggests that the latter word should be read as החרוץ (see also García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 974, who give החרוץ in parentheses right after the word החרוש). Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 20), Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 100), and Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 127) read החרוץ here. The more likely option is that the final letter is ש and not צ since the ink trace in the smaller piece of 10 ii does not fit צ. However, החרוש does not mean anything, which leads one to think that the scribe accidentally wrote החרוש when he meant to write החרוץ.

96 The relationship between the speeches can be assessed only on the basis of vocabulary: since there is so little left of the speech of 4Q491, the possible structural similarities or differences are impossible to see.

TABLE 9 The texts of 4Q491.10.ii and 1QM 16:8b–17:9

4Q491 fragment 10 column 2		1QM 16	
7 ... [...] ^o [...]	7 הָלַלְתָּ [] ^o	8b ועם צאת הקול	
8 set [...] ^o [...]	8 בכתובי־אֵל [] ^o	8 חלו ידם להפיל בתללי כתיים וכול 9 העם יחשו קול הַתְּרוֹעָה [והכוהני־ם היו	
9 set [...] ^o [...]	9 יחלו אנשי הבינ־יִם []	10 מריעים בחוצרות החללים והמלחמה מתנצחת בכתיים 10 vacat 11 ובהתאור	
10 set [...] ^o [...]	10 המלחמה בכתובי־אֵל [] ^o	11 חללי הבינים יחלו לנפול ברזי אל ולבחון כס כול חרוצי המלחמה 12 והל־יִהוּ []	
11 set [...] ^o [...]	11 חללי המצרף לנפול ב־ [רזי] אל והל־יִהוּ []	13 המערכות 13 ולמתקרב־יִם [במ־לְחֻמָּה יִתְקַע לשׁוֹב	
12 set [...] ^o [...]	12 מלחמה בכתובי־אֵל ולמערכה הראשי־נה	14 ונגש כוהן הרואש ועמד לפני המערכה	
13 set [...] ^o [...]	13 ונגש הכוהן החרוץ למלחמה ועמד [ל־פְּנֵי]	15 וחזק את 14 לבבם ב [אֶל וְאֵת דִּי־הֵם במלחמתו 15 vacat וענה ואמר	
14 set [...] ^o [...]	14 וחזק את ידיהמה בגבורות פלאו וענה ואמר־י	16 [ל־ב] עמו יבחן ב־מִצְדָּי וְלֹא [] חֲלִילִיכֵם כִּיא מאז שמעתם	
15 set [...] ^o [...]	15 נקם לאבל באלים ובאנשים כיא לוא []	16 בְּרִזִי אֵל []	
16 set [...] ^o [...]	16 בשר לָאֵם עפּוּ עתה חר־י		
17 set [...] ^o [...]	17 ועָי שאֵל תּוֹקְדִי וסוד רשעה []		

7 ... [...]^o [...] 8 against the Kittim of ...]^o [...] 9 the skirmishes [r]s shall set [...] 10 the battle against the Kittim [...] ... [...]

8b When the sound is emitted, they shall set their hand to bring down among the slain of the Kittim. The whole 9 band shall cease the sound of the alarm, [but the priest]s shall keep blowing on the trumpets of the slain so that the battle against the Kittim shall still be conducted. 10 (vacat)

TABLE 9 The texts of 4Q491 10 ii and 1QM 16:8b–17:9 (cont.)

4Q491 fragment 10 column 2	1QM 16
<p>11 the slain of the crucible to fall according to [the mysteries of] God, then the ... [...] 12 a battle against the Kittim. For the fir[st] line [...]</p> <p>13 The priest appointed for the battle shall draw near and take up position [in] front of [...] 14 He shall strengthen their hands with his wonderful mighty deeds.</p>	<p>11 When [...] girds himself to help the Sons of Darkness, when the slain of the skirmishers begin to fall according to the mysteries of God, when all those appointed for the battle are put to test by them, 12 then the pri[est]s shall blo[w] the tr[um]pets of summoning for another line of the reserve to march out to the battle, and they shall take up position between the lines.</p> <p>13 For those engag[ed] in the b[attle], they shall blow (the signal) for withdrawal. The chief priest shall draw near and take up position in front of the line; he shall strengthen 14 their heart ... [... of Go]d and their hands for his battle. (<i>vacat</i>)</p>
<p>And he shall speak up, say[ing], “ ...] 15 vengeance, to devour among gods and men, for no [...] 16 flesh except dust (?). For now ... [...] 17 It shall devour as far as Sheol, and the wicked assembly [...].”</p>	<p>15 And he shall speak up, saying, “[...] the he[a]rt of his people, he puts to test within the crucible. Do not [...] your slain. For you have heard long ago, 16 according to the mysteries of God [...] ... to be warm.</p>

in comparison to 1QM but since it represents a genre that is also known in 1QM, it can be categorized to be a genre parallel of 1QM 16:15b–17:9.

What is noteworthy is that although the priest of 4Q491a (/הכוהן החרוץ) (הכוהן החרוץ למלחמה in line 13) does not occur in 1QM 16, it does occur in 1QM 15. Consequently, it has been suggested that 4Q491a 10 ii has a link to 1QM 15 too.⁹⁷ In addition, what has probably made scholars endorse this suggestion is Baillet's arrangement of the fragments. Fragment 11 which in Baillet's order follows 10 ii includes a close textual parallel to 1QM 16:3–14 (see 11 ii 1–12a),⁹⁸ and it has been considered improbable that 4Q491a would include two successive passages parallel to one 1QM passage. The similarities and the differences between 4Q491a and 1QM 15:4–7 are indicated in Table 10.

The instructive parts of the texts share some terminology but they cannot be defined as close textual parallels – and when looking at Tables 9 and 10 it is clear that the instructive part of 4Q491a 10 ii is more reminiscent of that of 1QM 16 than of that of 1QM 15. The speeches in 4Q491a and 1QM 15 share some terms (אילים in lines 14 of 1QM 15 and 15 of 4Q491a, בשר in lines 13 of 1QM 15 and 16 of 4Q491a, רשעה in lines 9 and 14 of 1QM 15 and 17 of 4Q491a) but all these terms also occur in the encouragement speech in lines 16:15b–17:9 (see lines 6–8). Therefore, if one has to choose only one of these two texts to be parallel (in some degree) to 4Q491a 10 ii, 1QM 16:8b–17:9 must be the choice.

The brevity of 4Q491a 10 ii easily leads us to hypothesize that it represents an earlier textual form in relationship to 1QM 16–17. Lines 1QM 16:13b–14 could be explained as an elaborated version of lines 13–14a of 4Q491a 10 ii: the author has added “heart” before “hands” and thus widened the description of the encouragement. Similarly, the text in line 11b of 1QM 16 could be an expansion of line 11 of 4Q491a 10 ii: while in the last-mentioned passage, it is stated that the slain fall according to the mysteries of God, the first-mentioned adds that by these mysteries, all those appointed for the battle are tested. The idea of testing could hark back to the word מצרף “crucible” which is often thought to be something in which people are tested and refined.⁹⁹ These kinds of additions would have sharpened the confrontation in 1QM: they would have been used in order to create, or at least to strengthen, the sense of threat in the community that used and reworked the War Texts. However, 4Q491a fragment 11, discussed below, shows that these “additions” were already included in manuscript 4Q491a, and if the author of 1QM knew 4Q491a—as he probably did – he rather followed fragment 11 than fragment 10 when writing column 16.

97 Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 43.

98 Cf. Table 12 below.

99 Cf., e.g., Mal 3:2–3.

TABLE 10 The texts of 4Q491 10 ii and 1QM 15:4–7

4Q491a 10 ii	1QM 15
7 הָלַל]°[7	
8 בַּכְּתִיבָא]°[י]°	4 ועמד כוהן הראש ואחיו הַכֹּהֲנִים]
9 יחלו אנשי הבינָ]ם[]	והלויים וכול אנשי הסרד עמו וקרא באזניהם
10 המלחמה בכתיאי]ם[בְּשׁוֹ]°°	5 את תפלת מועד המלחָ]מה[ס]פר
11 חללי המצרף לנפול בְּ]רזי[אל והַכֹּ	סרד עתו עם כול דברי הודותם וסדר שם
12 מלחמה בכתיאים ולמערכָה הראיש[ונה]	6 את כול המערכות ככ[ה]
13 ונגש הכוהן החרוש למלחמה ועמד]ל[פְּנִי]°	והתהלך הכוהן החרוץ למועד נקם על פי
14 וחזק את ידיהמה בגבורות פלאו וענה ואמְ]ר	7 כול אחיו וחזק אתְ] ה[
15 נקם לאכול באלים ובאנשים כיא לוא]	וענה ואמר חזקו ואמצו והיו לבני חיל
16 בשר כְּאֵם עפּוּ כיא עתה חרְ]	
17 ועדְ שאול תּוֹקְדִל וסוד רשעה]	
7 ... [...]°[...] 8 against the Kittim [m of ...]°[...]	
9 the skirmishe[r]s shall set [...] 10 the battle against the Kittim [...] ... [...]	4 The chief priest shall take a position, his brothers the pr[iests], the Levites and all the men of the rule (being) with him. He shall read in their hearing 5 the prayer of the appointed time for wa[r ... the bo]ok (?) of the rule of that time, with all their words of thanksgiving. He shall array there 6 all the lines ... [...].... The priest shall walk along, the one assigned for the appointed time of vengeance according to the decision of 7 all his brothers, and he shall strengthen ... [...]....
11 the slain of the crucible to fall according to [the mysteries of] God, then the ... [...]	
12 a battle against the Kittim. For the fir[st] line [...] 13 The priest assigned for the battle shall draw near and take up position [in] front of [...] 14 He shall strengthen their hands with his wonderful mighty deeds.	
And he shall speak up, sa[ying], “...] 15 vengeance, to devour among gods and men, for no [...] 16 flesh except dust (?). For now ... [...] 17 It shall devour as far as Sheol, and the wicked assembly [...].”	And he shall speak up, saying, “Be strong and brave, be sons of worth!

This is a good example of the fact that the War Text material has to be evaluated as a unity, not just by comparing two sporadic passages. In 4Q491a, the slightly different instructions in fragments 10 and 11 are probably meant to describe different phases of the war: the confrontation is sharpened while the war is proceeding. In 1QM, instead, the author seems to favor an even sharper

confrontation by including column 15 in his text at the same place where the text of fragment 10 is in 4Q491a. What links column 15 to 4Q491a fragment 10 is the “appointed priest” (הכוהן החרוץ/החרוץ). The reference to him might reflect some kind of need to correct and specify priestly terminology: the possibility emerges that while הכוהן החרוץ in 4Q491 does not refer to any known priest, in 1QM 15, the term is corrected to הכוהן החרוץ and a completely new situation is created in order to find a task for this new priestly character.

In order to conclude more on the relationship between 1QM 15–17 and 4Q491a and to analyze the way the author of 1QM transmits the War tradition in these columns, fragment 11 ii must be included into discussion. Thus, the conclusions are drawn in the end of Section 1.6 below. Before that, we focus on fragment 11 i which represents text that is not transmitted by the author of 1QM.

1.5 *Fragment 11 i + fragment 12 (B-371355; B-370893)*

]◦[Frg. 12:1
]מעונתו ונכבד[2
]ערים לרחיבי[3
]ואני הדר ה[4
]וני◦ ¹⁰⁰ ולא[5
]◦[6
]◦◦[]◦[Frg. 11:8¹⁰¹
בצדק[]הפלה ¹⁰² נואות[9
]◦◦[]◦◦[]◦◦[
]ם ¹⁰³ ויגלו קדושים ב[

100 Both Baillet (DJD 7:30), Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 62), and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 980) see an unidentified letter before ך. Baillet notes that in PAM 41.846, the reading is most visible and when scrutinizing the photo, one can clearly see a tiny ink trace at the top of the line on the right edge of the fragment. Thus, at this point, there is reason to amend Duhaime’s (“War Scroll,” 152–56) reading from ך◦ני◦ to ך◦ני◦¹⁰¹.

101 The line numbering here (cf. Baillet, DJD 7:26–27; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 152) is based on the suggestion that fragment 11 columns 1 and 2 belong together and there are the same number of lines in both columns; contrary to this, see Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 1–3), who argues that columns 11 i and ii belong to different manuscripts. Lines 1–7 are visible in column ii. Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 56–57), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 980), and Wise (“מי כמוני באלים,” 184) use line numbers 1–17.

102 According to Baillet (DJD 7:27), the original text here was המה and it has been corrected to הפלה so that מ has been corrected to פ and ל was added above the line. Baillet’s explanation is convincing: the מ was converted to פ by filling in the space between the “horns” of the מ and thus giving the letter a rounded top. The bottom part of the letter retains its מ-like characteristics.

103 In 11 i, in the middle of line 9, Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 152) reads only ך◦ני◦, while many other editors distinguish more letters: Baillet (DJD 7:26) reads ך◦ני◦ [ך◦ני◦] here and

- י[שראל הכינה מאז אמתו ורזי ערמתו בכו]ל [חיל] 10
 [ם] [] [מים ועצת אביונים לעדת עולמים] [תמימי] 11
 12 [עו]למים כסא עוז בעדת אלים בל ישבו בו כול מלכי קדם ונדיביהמה לו]א¹⁰⁴ [דומ] 12
 13 [כבודי ליא¹⁰⁵ ידמה ולוא ירומם זולתי ולוא יבוא ביא כיא אני ישבתי ב] [ה בשמם] ואין 13
 14 [יבום¹⁰⁶ אני עם אלים אתחשב ומכוני בעדת קודש לוא כבשר תאו]תי [כול יקר] לי בכבוד 14
 15 [מע]זון הקודש [מ]יא לבוז נחשב ביא ומיא בכבודי ידמה ליא מיא הו]א [כבא]י ים ישובוטר 15
 16 [תו מיא יש] [צערים כמוני ומיא] [ל רע הדמה ביא ואין נשיתי והוריה לוא תדמה] 16

Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 56) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 980) also see **צ** and **ד** between the lacunas. Instead, Wise (“מי כמוני באלים,” 182) sees there **א** and **ו** and reads **ם**[הי]א[ל]ו[הי]א and Davis (“There and Back Again,” 141–2) suggests yet another reading **ם**[ל]א[כי]א. There really are small ink traces left at the bottom of the line (best visible in PAM 42.474) but it is extremely difficult to say to which letter or letters they might belong. According to Wise (“מי כמוני באלים,” 184), “the traces are too far apart to represent contiguous *šade* and *dalet*” but he does not give any special material explanation for his own readings either. The most plausible solution here would be to just mark two undefined letters according to two tiny traces and read **ם**[]¹⁰⁴ [ו]רננ].

- 104 There is no space between **א** and the preceding unidentified letter; contrary to what Duhaime suggests (“War Scroll,” 152). There are, though, some cases in which the space between the words is really short or even non-existent but there is no reason to suggest that **א** would be a separate letter here. Cf. also, e.g., Baillet, DJD 7:27.
- 105 As is the case with many fragments, in fragment 11 too it is often practically impossible to distinguish between **ו** and **י** and this causes interpretative problems. In line 13, Wise (“מי כמוני באלים,” 182) reads ליא instead of Duhaime’s (“War Scroll,” 152) לוא. According to Wise, the reading לוא “either produces a clause that yields no meaning, or fails to take account of the scribe’s evident intention to erase ידמה.” Therefore, Wise (“מי כמוני באלים,” 186–7) ends up comparing the line with line 15 where ליא and other words known in this line also occur (cf. line 15b: ליא ומיא בכבודי ידמה ליא). Baillet (DJD 7:27), who reads לוא in line 13, suggests that the scribe failed to mark the deletion dots around לוא that precedes ידמה. This would mean that the scribe intended to write ולוא ירומם but accidentally wrote לוא ידמה and therefore, after noticing his mistake, decided to start again and marked ידמה as erased, meaning that also לוא should be skipped. The problem with this interpretation is that for this mistake, one would expect to have **ו** before **י** (ולוא). Therefore, Wise’s explanation is more reasonable and here, the text is corrected to follow it.
- 106 At the beginning of line 14, Baillet (DJD 7:27), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 980), and Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 56) read יבום¹⁰⁶ instead of Duhaime’s (“War Scroll,” 152) יבום. A really tiny ink trace is visible on the right edge of the fragment, just before **י**, so at this point Baillet’s reading better reflects what one sees on the fragment. However, **ו** and **י** are clearly visible and a small difference in size between them is distinguishable – and thus, Baillet’s marking of these letters to be uncertain is unnecessary caution.

	ומיא יגידוֹנִיא בפת[חי פיא]זמול שפתי מיא יכיל ומיא יעדני וידמה	17
	במשפטי ¹⁰⁸	
	כ[יא אניא עם אלים אֲחֶשׁ]ב ו[כְּבוּדִיא עם בני המלך לזא]פ[י ולוא כתם אופירים	18
	<i>vacat</i> ¹⁰⁹ <i>vacat</i> [] <i>vacat</i> [] []	19
	צְדִיקִים באלוהי] [במעון הקודש זמרוֹה[ו	20
	ה[שְׁמִיעוּ בהגיא רנה] [בְּשִׁמְחָת עולמים ואין] ¹¹⁰ ○	21
	ם[להקים קרן מַעַ] []	22
	ה[להודיע יְדוּ בכוח] []	23
]ל[]	24

Fragment 12 is so small and includes so few complete words that it is difficult to analyze its content. What can be said with fair certainty is that there is a protagonist speaking in the first person singular forms (line 4) but this protagonist is not the only figure: the dwelling that is mentioned (line 2) is not “my” but “his.” Of other fully preserved words both כבד and הדר (in lines 2 and 4) refer to honor, which is thus probably something important in the text. These two words are common in the Dead Sea Scrolls but הדר does not occur anywhere else in the preserved War Texts. The words מענה and רחוב (in lines 2–3) are rarer (4–7 occurrences in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls) and they do not occur anywhere else in the preserved War Text manuscripts. Both refer

107 Here, contrary to Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 152), Baillet (DJD 7:27), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 980), and Wise (“מי כמוני באלים,” 182) see a letter before ומיא. Baillet and García Martínez and Tigchelaar do not define it but according to Wise it is possibly א. A really weak trace of ink is distinguishable in PAM 42.474 (see the third fragment in the top line) but which letter it might have belonged to is impossible to say. The most plausible solution here is to mark ומיא ○[.

108 Baillet (DJD 7:27), Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 56), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 980) and Wise (“מי כמוני באלים,” 182) all read במשפטי here instead of Duhaime’s (“War Scroll,” 152–56) במשפתי. Since ט is quite legible on the fragment, it must be suspected Duhaime’s ת is just a typo (and/or confusion between two t-letters).

109 At the end of the line, there is one big lamed of which the top stroke is preserved. See Section 1.2 above and the end of this section.

110 At the end of line 21, Wise (“מי כמוני באלים,” 182) reads הַשְׁבַּת instead of Baillet’s (DJD 7:27) and Duhaime’s (“War Scroll,” 153) כְּ○ [and in this case, there is a reason to doubt Baillet’s and Duhaime’s reading: the remaining traces of the first letter seem not to form the top stroke of כ since there is a noticeable notch in the traces (which is not so typical of כ). However, this notch does not fit very well to Wise’s suggestion either, namely ה – although ה seems to be a more probable option than כ. Other options might be מ, ע, or צ, but ע and צ would probably require more space between the strokes and in the case of מ, there would probably be a sharper stroke in the top left part of the letter. Therefore, at this point, it is safest to mark just ○. Of the second letter, not enough is left to define it, so one must be content with reading]○○.

to locations. It is noteworthy that all the preserved words of the fragment also occur in 1QH^a – a collection that also preserves parallels to the hymns in 11 i.

Column 11 i is better preserved. One full-line *vacat* (line 19) divides the text into two sections which Baillet named “Cantique de Michel” and “Cantique des justes.” The hymn before the *vacat* can possibly be divided into smaller sections on the basis of its content, but beyond the *vacat* in line 19, nothing else indicates any ancient structuring of the text.

At the beginning of the column, God is addressed with third person forms (cf., e.g., line 10). Other actors are “holy ones” (קדושים, line 9), the “council of the poor ones” (עצת אביונים, line 11), and the “perfect ones” of something (תמימי, line 11) which all probably refer to one group that has a special status in God’s eyes. The hymn is related to a joyous occasion, probably to a victory; verbal forms tell that a group of people will sing (רנן, line 8) and be glad (גיל, line 8). In addition, God is described as having established his truth a long time ago and something is said about “his mysteries” (רזי, line 10).

Somewhere in lines 12–13, the description changes from the third person forms to the first person: “I” starts to praise himself. In line 12, the “powerful throne in the congregation of the divine beings” is mentioned and it is stated that entrance to this throne is restricted since the kings of the East cannot sit (ישבו) on it. The reader gets the impression that the kings of the East and “I” are somehow contrasted since it seems that the “I” is one who has actually sat (ישבתי) on the throne. In line 14, the “I” is described as being something very different from ordinary human beings: in addition to being “among the divine beings” and “in the holy congregation” (which probably form a parallelism), his desire is “not according to the flesh.” This seems to indicate dissimilarity to humans. However, when the comparative setup continues with the questions starting in line 15, these questions suggest that the protagonist is not only unique in his glory (cf. line 15) but also in grieving and being in distress (line 16) – which are more easily to be connected with human beings than with angels. The question section ends with a very similar phrase to one that was found in its beginning (cf. lines 14 and 18: אני עם אלים: “I reckon myself among the divine beings ...”). Before the *vacat* in line 19, something is said about the gold from Ophir which is known only from four other non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q437, 4Q405, 4Q427,¹¹¹ 4Q472).

The hymn starting in line 20 is far more fragmentary than the text before the *vacat*. Presumably, this hymn also starts by using the third person form. The

111 Note, however, the different spellings: אופיריים in 4Q491 and אופירימ in 4Q427. Scholars have usually suggested that the latter form is a scribal error (cf. Eshel, “4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 192).

“righteous ones” (צדיקים) in line 20 are the actors in this hymn and probably those who are ordered to sing praise or play (זמר) for God “in the holy dwelling” (במעון הקודש). Victorious tones are present in this hymn as well – as reflected by terms like “jubilation” (רנה, line 21), “everlasting joy” (שמחה עולמים) (line 21) and “power” (בוה) (line 23). Not much more can be said about the content of this hymn.

The scholarly discussion concerning these hymns is mainly focused on the question of the identity of the protagonist speaking in the first hymn.¹¹² The

112 The identity of the speaker of the so-called Self-Glorification Hymn (thought to be preserved in 4Q491a, 4Q431 [4QH^e] fragment 1, 4Q427 [4QH^a] 1 i and 1QH^a fragments 46 and 56) has generated a huge scholarly discussion. I present here some key points in a concise manner. In his edition, Baillet named 11 i *Cantique de Michel et cantique de justes*, meaning that lines 8–18 should be attributed to the archangel Michael while the rest of the text was the song of the righteous. However, the identification of the speaker as Michael was soon criticized. Morton Smith stated that 1QM cannot be used for arguing this identification since there, Michael does not appear as a person but is only mentioned in some shield inscriptions (1QM 9:15–16) and in the chief priest's promise (1QM 17:6–7) where the authority of Michael (משרת מיכאל) is twice mentioned; see Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 185. In addition to this, Smith asks why the archangel would compare himself to the kings of the East or to sailors and why would such a supernatural being need to glorify himself at all; cf. Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a,” 186–97. In his opinion, the speaker must be a human being and the hymn reflects the idea of deification which might also have to do with “some practices that produce extraordinary experiences understood as encounters with gods or angels”; cf. Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a,” 187–88. Later, many scholars agreed with Smith that the speaker is a human being and the most supported suggestions of his identity have been the Teacher of Righteousness or some later teacher, the eschatological high priest, or a Messianic leader of the Qumran community. On the Teacher theory, cf. John J. Collins, who brought the Teacher of Righteousness out as one option – cf. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London, New York, NY: Routledge, 2002), 147 – but later ended up considering the later teacher from the late first century BCE as the more probable option – cf. Collins, “A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in pre-Christian Judaism,” in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*, ed. J.J. Collins and M.A. Fishbane (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995) – and Martin Abegg (“Who Ascended to Heaven,” 72), who argues that the Teacher might have identified himself as the speaker or another after him might have done this. About the eschatological high priest, cf. Collins (*Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 147), to whom this priest is also a messianic character and Eshel (“4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 196–201). About the messianic leader, cf. Israel Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, trans. David Maisel (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000), 20. More recent suggestions have been that the speaker should be interpreted as a collective: Wise argues that in the hymn, “each individual member of the user group spoke of himself or herself” (cf. Wise, “מי כמוני באלים,” 216). Fletcher-Louis connects the hymn to

vast interest in analyzing this question and the hymns in general is partly to be explained by the fact that the two hymns are not preserved only in 4Q491a: there are three passages among the Hodayot manuscripts that are considered to represent them together with 4Q491a fragment 11. These passages are in 4Q431 (4QH^e) fragment 1, 4Q427 (4QH^a) 1 i and 1QH^a fragments 46 and 56. Of these, 4Q427 is relatively well preserved whereas especially fragments of 1QH^a are very small and include only a very few complete words. 4Q427 is also the oldest of the manuscripts that have preserved the two hymns: it can be dated to the first half of the first century BCE while 1QH^a, 4Q431 and 4Q491a are from the second half that same century.¹¹³ Since 4Q427 is the best preserved of the three Hodayot passages, and since it can be plausibly reconstructed according to 4Q431, it is best to use it as a point of comparison to 4Q491a fragment 11. Table 11 below demonstrates that, on the one hand, there are some clear lexical similarities between 4Q427 and 4Q491a but, on the other hand, the texts of the two passages do not follow each other very closely.

In 4Q427 7 i, no *vacats* or other sense divisions have been preserved. However, the loose similarity with 4Q491a 11 i guides us to divide the text in two, at least for study purposes: the first part ends in line 13a and the second part begins in line 13b. The first part is reminiscent of the text of 4Q491a 11 i 8–18. In this part, by using the preposition כמו and the verbs שוה, יעד, דמה and חשב, it is shown that the protagonist (“I”) is incomparable among other beings. Only the last two words are also known in 4Q491a, but the thematic setting is clearly similar: lines 8–18 of 4Q491a form a description of the protagonist who is unique. The references to refined gold (פז) and the gold of Ophirim (בתם או ביוזימ/בתם אופירים) preserved in both texts – being otherwise rare in the Dead Sea Scrolls – link the two passages. In addition, both texts state that their protagonist somehow is akin to the divine beings.

the liturgical context and argues that “the most plausible identity for the speaker ... is a priest who describes his experience of apotheosis during the liturgy of the community’s worship”; cf. Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 215. And finally, Baillet’s old identification has gained some recent support: García Martínez argues that “the original attribution by Baillet of the hymn to the Archangel makes more sense than all other attributions proposed because it is the only one that respects the elements preserved in 4Q491.” García Martínez makes a significant observation by emphasizing the importance of interpreting the hymn in its context. According to him, while in 4Q491 the protagonist probably is an archangel, in the Hodayot, the protagonist must be the Teacher of Righteousness who also speaks through the first-person singular forms elsewhere in the collection. Cf. García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 336, 338–39.

113 Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 41.

The second part of the text in 4Q427 fragment 7 is an exhortation to praise God. This hymn reflects the close relationship between human and divine beings: those who praise (probably human beings) are to be in the “congregation of God,” in the “holy habitation,” among “the eternal hosts” and in the “common assembly” where the worship takes place (cf. lines 13b–18a). There, their task is to sing praise (זמר), sing (שיר), rejoice (שמח), ring out joy (נגן *hiphil*), give praise (הלל *piel*), extol (רום *polet*), consider God to be great (יהב גדול), sanctify (קדש *hiphil*) God’s name, raise up (רום *hiphil*) their voice, sound (שמע *hiphil*) a joyful music, pour out (נבע *hiphil*) their joy, and bow down (שחה *hiphil*). The hymn is reminiscent of 4Q491a 11 i, lines 20–24 which is not, however, preserved as well. In addition to the lexical similarities between these two passages, in lines 18b–23 of 4Q427, God is described in many ways of which at least doing wonderful deeds (פלא) and helping those who have stumbled (כשל) are also known from 4Q491a, in the preceding context of the hymn of 11 i 20–24 (פלא in 8–10 i 6, cf. also 1QM 14:9 and 18:7, 10; כשל in 8–10 i 2: can be reconstructed according to 1QM 14:5). Despite the clear lexical links, the hymns in 4Q491a 11 i 20–24 and in 4Q427 7 i 13b–23 are not entirely similar: the righteous ones (צדיקים) occur only in 4Q491a and the same is true of proclaiming the meditation (השמיע בהגיא) and raising the horn (הקים קרן).

Many scholars have observed the similarities between 4Q491a and 4Q427 and tried to create models to explicate their relationship. Esther Eshel explains the differences and similarities between the two texts by suggesting that they represent two different “recensions”: 4Q427 fragment 7 belongs to recension A and 4Q491a 11 i belongs to recension B. Eshel tends to think that recension B is a later version of recension A but she also introduces the possibility that the two recensions might have developed from one common source.¹¹⁴ This latter option is to be regarded as hypothetical for at least two reasons.¹¹⁵ First, it is an undeniable fact that the source is not known. Second, if there was a similar source behind the hymns preserved, one must conclude that this source was considered to be quite freely editable. Consequently, if one argues that the scribe of 4Q491a was able to make many changes to his unknown source, it is equally possible that he made substantial changes to the text of 4Q427.

114 Cf. Eshel, “4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 189–91, 201. Eshel argues for the lateness of recension B by noting that it duplicates some of the phrases known in recension A and adds some new themes in comparison to recension A, namely the difference between the protagonist and ordinary people and the horn that she interprets to be the “horn of the Messiah.”

115 Cf. also the discussion concerning 4Q491a 8–10 i and 1QM 14:4–18 in Section 1.3 above.

Therefore, it is simpler to think that either of the hymns might just as well be dependent on the other.¹¹⁶

However, not everyone agrees with Eshel that it is the “recension” preserved in 4Q427 that is the older of these two: Wise argues that, as a longer text (according to his reconstructions), the one preserved in the Hodayot manuscripts more probably rewrites the text of 4Q491a than vice versa.¹¹⁷ García Martínez, for his part, has challenged the whole question of the direction of influence: for him, in the end, the two “recensions” are very different, linked only by “some lexicographical affinity, a few common expressions, and a common theme.” Furthermore, in this case, García Martínez finds the term “recension” useless and he ends up emphasizing that the hymns should be read and interpreted within their own literary contexts.¹¹⁸

There is no reason to disagree with García Martínez about the unhelpfulness of the term “recension”: the term as Eshel uses it leads too easily to the presupposition of some “original” text of which different variant versions have been preserved.¹¹⁹ However, no evidence can be presented for this “original,” but what one has is the manuscripts and the text in them. Consequently, what should primarily be studied is the concrete material, not any hypothetical composition. In addition, García Martínez’s observation about the significant differences between the texts is noteworthy: the originality of each text is easily dwarfed by labeling the texts as “recensions” or “versions.” Instead, the concepts created for this study make it possible to describe different levels of parallelism¹²⁰ – without yet arguing anything about their possible literary dependence. It is clear that the texts in 4Q491a and 4Q427 cannot be categorized as close parallels since, for the purposes of this study, the close parallelism appears on the level of wording. Instead, as García Martínez notes, the texts share a common theme (and also some expressions and words) – a theme that is, to crown it all, special. Also, both texts represent a hymnic genre. Therefore, despite the differences between them, the texts can undeniably be labeled as remote parallels or at least as genre parallels.

116 Wise, “מי כמוני באלים,” 214: “[W]hy posit a third source for which there is no evidence?”

117 Wise, “מי כמוני באלים,” 214.

118 García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 332.

119 In her article “Self-Glorification Hymn,” in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. L.H. Feldman, J.L. Kugel, and L.H. Schiffman (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 1924–26, Esther Eshel argues that the Self-Glorification Hymn is “partially preserved in four Qumran manuscripts” (see p. 1924).

120 See the definitions of “close parallel,” “remote parallel,” and “genre parallel” in Section 4 in the Introduction.

TABLE 11 The texts of 4Q491:12 + 11:1 and 4Q427:7^a

4Q491 fragment 12 + fragment 11 column 1		4Q427 (4QH ^a) fragment 7 column 1	
]⋈[
]⋈[Fig. 12:1	
2]מענותו ונכבד[2	
3]ערים לרחובי [3	
4] ואני הדר ה[4	
5]ולאני ולוא[5	
6]⋈[6	
]⋈[]⋈[]⋈[Fig 11:8	
]הפלה נודאות[8	
]בצדק	9	
]שראל הבינה מאז אמלתו ורזי ערמתו בב[ל]חיל	10	
]ס[]⋈[]⋈[11	
]מזעזעז אביונים לעדת עולמים []⋈[]⋈[]⋈[12	
]דומו	13	
]כבודי ליא ידמה ולוא ידומס זולתי ולוא יבוא ביא אני ישבתי ב[]ה בשמלים ואין	14	
]יבום אני עם אלס אתהישב ומכוני בעדת קודש לוא כבשר תאו[תי] כול יקר לי	15	
]בכבוד	16	
]מען הקודש [מ]א ^a לחשב ביא ומלא בכבודי ידמה לוא מוא ה[א] כבא ^a ים		
]ישובספר		
]תו מוא יש[]צערים כמוני ומוא []ל רע הדמה ביא ואין נשניתו והוריה לוא תדמה		

a Since the Hodayot manuscripts are not the main subject of this study, their texts and translations are not analyzed here in detail. Consequently, in this table, the translations are not harmonized but the translation of 4Q427 is taken directly from its editor Eileen Schuller (DJD 29:77–124). The red text indicates the similarities between the texts although their translations may differ.

[1-4] [5] 6 [נבוה כמוני 7 ידמה בי 8 ומי ישוה לי 9 מול שפתי מי יכל[מ] [בלשון יעדוני 10 ידיר המ]לל רע לקדושים ולוא יבא 11 ולכבו[י] לוא ידמה ב[א]ג אנ עמ אלמ מעמ[י] 12 [לא בפו אנכו לי וכתם או ביורמ לוא 13 לוא יחשב בי ו ידידמ שירו למלכ 14 [הכבוד שמחו בע]ת אל הרנינו באהלי ישועה הללו במעון

TABLE II The texts of 4Q491 12 + 11 i and 4Q427 7 i (cont.)

4Q491 fragment 12 + fragment II column 1		4Q427 (4QHa) fragment 7 column 1	
15	וּמֵא יְעֻדְנִי וְיִדְמָה בְּמִשְׁפַּתִּי	17	יְדוּנָא בְּפַתְ[חִי פִיא]וּמֵל שְׁפַתִּי מֵיָא יְכִיל וּמֵאָּ יְעֻדְנִי וְיִדְמָה לְמַלְכֵנִי
16	כִּי־אָּ אֵינִי עִם אֱלֹהִים אֲהִשְׁבֵּן[וְכִבְדִּי־עִם בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ לֹאָּ]וְלֹאָּ כְתָם	18	כִּי־אָּ אֵינִי עִם אֱלֹהִים אֲהִשְׁבֵּן[וְכִבְדִּי־עִם בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ לֹאָּ]וְלֹאָּ כְתָם
17	אֹפִירִים	19	אֹפִירִים
18	לְ vacat [] vacat []	20	לְ vacat [] vacat []
19	צְדִיקִים בְּאֵלוּהִי []	21	צְדִיקִים בְּאֵלוּהִי []
20	בְּמַעַן הַקּוֹדֶשׁ זְמוּרָהְ[]	22	בְּמַעַן הַקּוֹדֶשׁ זְמוּרָהְ[]
21	וְשָׁמַעַּ בְּהִגַּי רְנָה []	23	וְשָׁמַעַּ בְּהִגַּי רְנָה []
22	וְלֹאָּ כְתָם	24	וְלֹאָּ כְתָם
23	וְלֹאָּ כְתָם		
24	וְלֹאָּ כְתָם		

1	[...] ... [...]	2	[...] his dwelling and honored [...]	3	[...] ... to the widths of [...]	4	[...] And me, splendor of ... [...]	5	[...] ... and no [...]	6	[...] ... [...]
8	[...] ... [...]	9	[...] wondrously terrible things [...]	10	[...] shall sing and the holy ones shall be glad in [...]	11	[...] in righteousness 10 [...]	12	[...] Israel. He has established long ago his truth, and his mysteries	13	[...] and who

TABLE II The texts of 4Q491 12 + 11 i and 4Q427 7 i (cont.)

4Q491 fragment 12 + fragment 11 column 1	4Q427 (4QHa) fragment 7 column 1
<p>prudence in all [...] worth 11 [...] ... [...] ..., and the council of the poor ones to an everlasting congregation ... [...] those perfect ones of 12 [...] fore[ver] a powerful throne in the congregation of divine beings, on which all the kings of the East cannot sit, and their nobles ... [...] ... be similar 13 [...] my glory to me; {shall be similar}, none is exalted besides me, and none comes to me, for I have sat on [...] ... in the heavens. There is no 14 [...] ... I reckon myself among the divine beings, and my place (is) in the holy congregation. [My] desire (is) not according to the flesh [...] all what is precious to me (is) in the glory 15 [...] the holy [dwe]l[ing]. [Wh]o is reckoned as contemptible because of me, and who is similar to me in my glory? Who, like sea travellers, will come back to tell 16 [...] ... Who ... [...] grieves as I do, and who [...] ... distress as compared with me? There is none. I have been taught, and no instruction is comparable 17 [...] Who will attack when I ope[n my mouth], and the flow of my lips, who will prevail against (it)? Who will summon me and stand the comparison with my judgment? 18 [...] or I am recko[ned] among the divine beings, [and] my glory with the king's sons. No [refine]d gold nor gold from Ophir ...</p> <p>19 [...] <i>vacat</i> [...] <i>vacat</i></p>	<p>will compare to me and who (is) like me] among the heavenly beings 9 [/ the outpourings of my lips who will sustain;] wh[o] by speech is similar to me; 10 [beloved of the ki]ng, a companion to the holy ones, and it will not come 11 [and to] my [g]l[or]y it will not be comparable; a [s f] or me, [my] place is with the heavenly beings, 12 [and glory] r not by gold will I k for myself, and the gold of Ophirim not 13 [in me, and h] will not be reckoned for me.</p> <p>Sing praise, O beloved ones, sing to the king of 14 [glory, rejoice in the congre]gation of God, ring out joy in the tents of</p>

TABLE 11 The texts of 4Q491 12 + 11 i and 4Q427 7 i (cont.)

4Q491 fragment 12 + fragment 11 column 1	4Q427 (4QHa) fragment 7 column 1
<p>20 [...] the righteous ones in the God of [...] in the holy dwelling, play for hi[m ...] 21 [...] let] jubilation be heard in meditation [...] in everlasting joy, and there is no ... [...] 22 [...] ... to raise the horn ... [...] 23 [...] ... to make his hand known with power [...] 24 [...] ... [...]</p>	<p>salvation, give praise in the [holy] habitation, 15 [ex]tol together among the eternal hosts, ascribe greatness to our God and glory to our king. 16 [Sanc]tify his name with strong lips and mighty tongue, raise up together your voice 17 [at a]ll times, sound aloud joyful music, rejoice with everlasting joy 18 [um] ceasingly, worship in the common assembly. Bless the one who wonder- fully does majestic deeds, and makes known his strong hand, 19 [se]aling mysteries and revealing hidden things, raising up those who stumble and those among them who fall 20 [by res] toring the step of those who wait for knowledge, but casting down the lofty assemblies of the eternally proud, 21 [confirm]ing mysteries of sp[en]dour and establ[ishing] glorious [mar]vels; (bless) the one who judges with destructive wrath 22 [l] in lovingkindness, righteousness, and in abundant mercies, favour 23 [] mercy for those who frustrate his great goodness, and a source of</p>

What conclusions can then be drawn on these texts? One is that their distinctive theme, the so-called self-glorification, was not a one-time innovation but considered to be worth transmitting. Furthermore, implanting this theme into different contexts and reworking it into different textual forms was allowed, and consequently, its interpretation was somewhat flexible. At this stage of the study, one can infer that hymns and speeches seem to offer a place to pursue literary creativity and also allow the presentation of novel ideas. In the case of the two hymns in 11 i, the exceptional scribal practices used in this fragment can probably be explained as signifying the distinctive nature of the text as well: as was pondered in Section 1.2, the large *lamed* near the left margin of the column could be explained as an indication of distinctive text embedded in the war material. A further, perhaps noteworthy point is that in 4Q491a the hymns are written in a script different from the text in their context. There are different explanations for this fact (see Section 1.2) but what should also be taken into account is the divergent content of the part written in this divergent script. As with the large *lamed*, changing the script may also point to the distinctiveness of the material. The *vacat* in line 19 – one practice that marks a difference between the self-glorification material in the Hodayot texts and 4Q491a – indicates a desire to structure the text that may support the idea that the material was taken from the Hodayot texts and was reworked for its present context.¹²¹

What should also be noted is that although the protagonist glorifying himself is a rare theme, the general idea of the connection between human and divine beings is not that divine (אלים) beings are mentioned in 4Q491a many times (8–10i:14; 10ii:15, 11i:12, 14, 16; 13i:1; 15:8; 24:3, 4) and although most of the mentions are fragmentary, it can be concluded that they appear together with human beings (cf., e.g., 10 ii 15: באלים ובאנשים).¹²² In 11 i, the connection between humans and the divine is strongest. When reading the hymns in their present context, i.e., combined with the military instructions, emphasizing the special relationship to God and/or divine beings, and even blurring the boundary between human and divine appear to be a way of whipping up the spirit, the will to fight. Steven Weitzman notes that it is a well-known

121 One fact that might also support the idea that the text of 11 i was reworked for its present context is that most of the scribal corrections of 4Q491a are concentrated in this column (see 11 i 13, 14, 15, 17, 18 whereas elsewhere in the Scroll, see only 8–10 i 15 and 10 ii 17). There are many different correction procedures used (cancellation dots, interlinear letters, a box-like shape), which may indicate that the corrections were not made all at once.

122 Note, however, that in 4Q491b, the “holy angels” (מלאכי קודש) are described to be “within their lines” (cf. line 10) and the “commander of his angels” (שר מלאכיו) (cf. line 3) seems to play some role in the war, while in 4Q491a, angels (מלאכים) are not mentioned at all.

fact that “religious belief can motivate soldiers to fight harder and take more risks.”¹²³ This kind of motivation and encouragement appears frequently in the War Texts and especially in their speeches and hymns (cf., e.g., 1QM 10:2–5a; 15:7–16:1; 16:15–17:9). Thus, it is quite possible that by reworking the two hymns already known from the Hodayot tradition and combining them with the war material, the idea of the special connection between human and divine – that was already in embryo in other parts of the text – was made stronger and the psychological influence of the text was reasserted.

When scrutinizing the War Text material as a whole, the question arises as to why the Self-Glorification hymn was not transmitted in 1QM. It has been demonstrated many times elsewhere in this chapter that the author of 1QM used 4Q491a and thus it is likely that he knew the hymn as part of the War tradition. The preserved material suggests that he missed the opportunity to use the Self-Glorification Hymn in his compilation.¹²⁴ One reason for this may be that the hymn was not considered to belong to the War material. This may have been the interpretation of the author of 1QM, or the hymn may already have been initially considered an explanatory addition to the war material – an idea which is supported by the fact that the hymn was written in a different script to the other parts of 4Q491a and that it was flagged with an exceptional scribal marking. Another noteworthy point here may be that we have already assumed that when the war material was gathered, the author of 1QM had a wider audience in mind than the author of 4Q491a. Perhaps the Self-Glorification hymn was considered to represent unconventional thinking that was not needed for making the war material relevant for broader use. It has been demonstrated above that the author of 1QM aimed to link the war material more tightly to the “biblical” traditions probably widely known and used. Perhaps his intention was to make the War Text material more accessible and in order to do this, he omitted some elements that were considered (or

123 Cf. Steven Weitzman, “Warring against Terror: The War Scroll and the Mobilization of Emotion,” *JStJ* 40 (2009): 219. In general, in his article, Weitzman argues that 1QM reflects Greco-Roman theories of troop psychology according to which supernatural portents and ritual activity could be used to promote militancy. What should be noted is that as regards the War Texts, it is not necessary to think that (only) the soldiers in the real war situation were those who were encouraged and motivated. The idea of waging war against more problems was present in many texts in the Second Temple period, cf. e.g., Eph 6:10–17. It is probable that the M tradition works in many levels.

124 In theory, it is of course possible that the author of 1QM knew a version of the 4Q491a text that did not include the Self-Glorification Hymn. Moreover, it may be possible that the Self-Glorification Hymn was part of 1QM but was damaged along with the end of the manuscript. Being conscious of these theoretical options, I choose here to ponder how the situation appears in the light of the material preserved for us.

may have been considered) eccentric and added elements he considered to be more familiar and conventional.¹²⁵ However, it is not impossible that the Self-Glorification Hymn still had some effect on the author of 1QM: the idea of the close relationship between the divine and human beings is clearly present in 1QM, for example in column 1, which describes the assembly of gods and the congregation of men as fighting the war together (see 1QM 1:10). As will be demonstrated below, the role of the angels was also a theme that was discussed during the transmission process of the War Texts. The Self-Glorification Hymn may have been part of this discussion.

The next chapter again presents an example of text that can be categorized as parallel to 1QM. We now return to the discussion on the redactional activity practiced by the author of 1QM in columns 15–17, namely the discussion that began in Section 1.4.

1.6 *Fragment n ii (B-371355; B-370893)*

	עו[מ]דם	1
	המל[חמה ויצ]או אנשי	2
	תרו[עות סד]ר	3
	והכו[הנים יתקעו]	4
	כד[י]ה[ט]ל[ירימ]ו[אי]ש ידו בכלי מ[לחמתו]	5
	ט[ו]ר[ו]ל[נצח מלחמה והל]ויאים	6
	ב[קול גדול ו]ע[ם]צ[א]ת הקול יחלו ידמ[ה]	7
	ו[המלחמה מתנצחת בכתיאים ו] <i>vacat</i>	8
	[ב]ני חושך וחללי הבינים יחלו לנפול[ם]	9
	[י]תקעו לצאת מערכה אחרת חליפה למ[לחמה]	10
126]	[י]תקעו לשוב ונגש כוה[ן] הרא[ש] וט[ע]מד	11

125 It should be noted that we can not necessarily know what was considered conventional or unconventional/experimental in the late Second Temple times. The Hebrew Bible as we know it was not yet established and there may be many reasons why some text was often copied and used (e.g., the text could be either well-known and perceived as authoritative and thus broadly copied in order to keep it in use or not so well-known and without authority and broadly copied in order to make it more familiar and to strengthen its position). However, for example, the ideas presented in columns 10–11, namely that the salvation history proceeds from creation to the kingdom of David and further on to the prophets, were very likely to be generally accepted and considered conventional (cf. e.g., several references to these themes in the New Testament, e.g. in Hebrews, see 4:3, 9:26, 11:32).

126 Somewhere before the end of this line, Baillet (DJD 7:31), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 976), and Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 128) read כ and Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 23) reads כ while Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 154) does not read anything. In my view,

12]א[ת ידיהמה במלחמתו]	ל' וְלָב עִמּוֹ יַחַן בְּמִצְרָף לּוֹא מָ
13	13 כיא מאז שמעתם ברזו] י אל	[עמודו בפרץ ואל תי[רא]ז באמק]
14	14]מצ[]	[נאמן ועזר פדותו] ל'
15	15 בנ]י אמת ולהסיג לב נמס לחזק ל]ב	
16	16 מלח]מה היום הזה יכניענו אל ישר[אל] כ]	
17	17 [לאין מעמד והיתה ¹²⁷ לאל[המלוח]ה ולעמו הישוע]ה	
18	18]תו[כ]מעט לבליעל וברית אל שלום [לי]שראל בכול מועדי]	
19	19 ואחר הדבר[י]ם האלה יתקעו הכוהנים לסדר מלחמה שנית עם כתי]אים	
20	20 על מצבו יתקעו הכוהנים תרועה שנית על ידי התקרב ובהגיעם למ]ערכת	
21	21 ה[ט]ל[ירי]מו ידם אש בכלי מלחמתו והכוהנים יר[יע]ו בחרצ[וצר]ות ה[חללים]	
22	22]וכול עם השופרות יר[יע]ו בק[ול] ל'	
23	23 להפ[יל] בחללי האשמה תרועת]ה	
24	24]ל[]א[ה	

4Q491 11 ii is not preserved very well. What can be seen is that the text is divided in two by placing a *vacat* in line 8. The text that precedes the *vacat* seems to consist of battle instructions and what can be quite clearly seen is that the battle is conducted by sounds and the war is waged against the Kittim. After the *vacat*, instructions continue and now the text refers to losses in the battle (cf. line 9: “the slain of the skirmishers shall begin to fall”). In line 12, it seems that a hymn/speech section starts and at least in line 13, second person forms are used.¹²⁸ The themes of the hymn are encouragement (line 14), God’s help/salvation (lines 14, 17) and Israel’s special relationship to God (lines 16, 18). Belial is also mentioned (line 18). In line 19, the text moves on to instructions again and they are given for “a second battle against the Kittim.” A priest conducts

there really is a horizontal stroke, obviously the bottom of a letter, visible in the top of a piece of fragment 11. Here, כ is added, but ultimately it is impossible to say whether the stroke belongs to כ or ב. In any case, it seems clear that one or the other of these letters was on the fragment.

127 Here, Duhaime reads יהתה but argues in the footnote that this word should be read והיתה (see Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 156 n. 126), and other editors, too, have preferred this reading. Baillet (DJD 7:31–32), Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 23), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 976), and Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 128) read והיתה, and Baillet explains that the scribe has corrected the form והתה to והיתה by marking an interlinear י in the middle of the word. Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 113) reads והיתה, but for this reading the fragment provides no evidence. Since the interlinear י can readily be seen on the fragment, it is added here and the word is read as והיתה.

128 That the text in lines 12b–18 is a hymn can also be argued by noting that line 19 begins with the phrase ואחר הדבר[י]ם האלה “after these words” that is elsewhere used as a transition from a hymn (cf. 1QM 17:10 and possibly 4Q491a fragment 13 line 3).

the war by blowing alarms (lines 20, 21) and “all the people with trumpets” are also mentioned.

In spite of the relatively damaged nature of the fragment, it can easily be seen that 4Q491 11 ii 1–12a closely parallel 1QM 16:3–14, and, again, 4Q491 11 ii 19–23 are a close parallel to 1QM 17:10–13. The middle parts of the texts, namely the hymn parts (12b–18 of 4Q491a and 16:15–17:9 of 1QM) also bear some resemblance to each other, albeit noteworthily less than the instructive parts. Table 12 indicates the similarities and the differences between the two texts.¹²⁹

By placing these texts side by side, it is easy to confirm many conclusions reached on the content of 11 ii above. Baillet reconstructs 11 ii 1–13 and 19–23 on the basis of 1QM 16 and 17 and shows that the words of 1QM 16:3–14 and 17:10–14 can largely be quite plausibly fitted into the lines of the fragment.¹³⁰ Between these very similar instructive sections, both texts include a hymnic section (lines 13b–18 of 4Q491a and 1QM 17, lines 1–9). Although 4Q491a is again fragmentary, it clearly begins similarly to the end of 1QM 16: the chief priest is brought to the stage and he is encouraging the soldiers (cf. line 12 of 4Q491a). Also, the encouragement part ends with the words *ואחר הדברים האלה*, “after these words” (line 19 of 4Q491a, cf. 1QM 17:10) which demonstrates that the previous part was a speech. Although with regard to their actual content the speeches of 1QM 16–17 and 4Q491a differ here and there greatly from each other, they still share many thematic (and lexical) elements like the idea of God testing his people’s heart in crucible and the idea of God humiliating the wicked.¹³¹ Therefore, these speech passages can be defined to be remote parallels. In the table above, these terminological similarities were marked with red text.

In the following analysis, the texts of 4Q491a and 1QM 16–17 are discussed according to the three sections into which it is divided according to the *vacats* in 1QM.¹³²

129 In this table (Table 12), the two texts are disposed to make the comparison between them as easy as possible. Therefore, some space is left before the different sections of the texts. These spaces are not visible in the manuscripts.

130 Baillet, DJD 7:30–31. Note that the content of 1QM 16 was already described in Section 1.4 above.

131 These differences and similarities are also noted by Jean Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran,” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 32–56 (esp. 49).

132 The *vacat* in line 17:3 is ignored in this division.

TABLE 12 The texts of 4Q491 ii and 1QM 16:3–17:15

4Q491 fragment ii column 2	1QM 16–17
1 עו]מ]דס	3 את כול הסדר הזה יעשו] ה[הואה על עומדס נגד מחני כתיים ואחר יתקעו להמה הכהונים
2 המל]חמה ויצ]או אנשי	4 בחצוצרות 4 הזכרון ופתחו שערי המ]לחמה וי]צאו אנשי הבינים ועמדו ראשים בין
3 תרו]עות סד]ר	5 המערכות ותקעו להם הכהונים 5 תרועה סדר והראשים]]ים לקול החצוצרות עד
4 והכו]נים יתקעו]	6 התיצבם איש על מעמדו ותקעו להם 6 הכהונים תרועה שנת]ת] התק]ר]ב ובעומדם ליד
5 כד:] ה] ירימ]ו או בכלי ידו בכלי מלחמה והל]ויים	7 מערכת כתיים כדי הטל ירימו איש ידו בכלי 7 מלחמתו וששת]ת] ח]יצרות
6 סו]ר]ת לצנח מלחמה והל]ויים	8 החללים קול חד סרוד לצנח מלחמה והלויים וכול עם 8 השופרות יריעו]ת] מ]ן
7 בקול גזול ועם צאת הקול יחלו ידמ]ה	9 [קול גזול ועם צאת הקול יחלו ידם להפיל כחללי כתיים וכול 9 העם יחשו קול הַתְּדוּעָה
8 ו]המלחמה מתנצחת בכתיים vacat 10	10 [והכוהנים]ם יהיו מריעים בחצוצרות החללים והמלחמה מתנצחת בכתיים 10 vacat 10 ובהתאור] לעוֹרֹת
9 ב]ח]ושר וחללי הבינים יחלו לנפול	11 בני חושר וחללי הבינים יחלו לנפול ברזי אל ולבחון בם כול חרצי המלחמה 12 והכ]ו]תגים
10 י]תקעו לצנח מערכה אחרת חליפה חלמה	13 יתק]עו] בחצ]ו]ר]ת המקרא לצאת מערכה אחרת חליפה חלמה ועמדו בין המערכות
11 י]תקעו לשוב מלחמתו ברזי אל	14 ולמחברק]ים במ]להמ]ה
12 לוא מ]א	15 יתקעו לשוב מלחמתו vacat 15 וענה ואמר] [ל]ב עמו יבחן בַמַּצְרֵף לוא] א]ללים
13 כ]א מאז שמעתם ברזי אל	16 כ]א מאז שמעתם 16 ברזי אל]]הם לחים 17 ב]מ]א
14 עמדו בפרץ ואל תו]ראו	17 נ]קו ושם שלומם בדלק]] בחוני מצרף ושנן כלי מלחמה ולוא יכחו עד 2 [רשע
15 בנ]א ומת ולחטיג לב נגמס לחוק ל]ב	18 ואחמה זכור משפט] נדב ו]אב]ו]ה בני אהרן אשר התקדש אל במשפטס לעיני 3 [ואיתמר
16 מלח]מה היום היה יכניעו א]ל שו]ר]אל	19 החזיק לו לברית] עוֹלָמִים vacat 4 ואתם התחזקו ואל
17 לאין מעמד והתה ל]א	20 תיראום]] המה לתהו ולבהו תשווקתם ומשענתם בלוא ה] ה] ו]וא 5 [ישראל כול הויה
18 המלכ]ה ולעמו הישוע]ה	21 ונהיה ו] ה]]ל ככול נהי
19 [תו]ר]ת כ]מעט לבליעל וברית אל	22 עלמים היום מועדו להכניע ולהשפיל שר ממשלת 6 רשעה וישלח עור עוֹלָמִים לגוֹל [פ]דוֹתו
20 שלום [לי]שור]אל ככול מועדו]	23 בגוברת מלך האדיר למשרת

TABLE 12 The texts of 4Q491 ii and 1QM 16:3–17:15 (cont.)

4Q491 fragment ii column 2	1QM 16–17
19 ואחר הדבר[ים] האלה יתקעו הכוהנים לסדר מלחמה שנית עם כהן[ים]	מכאל באור עולמים 7 להאיר בשמחה ברית ישראל שלום וברכה לוגרל אל להרים באלים משרת מכאל וממשלת
20 על מצבוי יתקעו הכוהנים תרועה שנית על ידי התקרב ובהגיעם לִמְעַרְבָת	8 ישראל בכל בשר ישמח צדק בְּמִרְוִמִים וכול בני אמותו יגילו בדעת עולמים ואחם בני בריתו 9 התחזקו במצרף אל עד יגוף ידו זמלא מצרפיו רזיו למעמדכם <i>vocat</i>
21 ה[ט]ל[ים] רי[ב]ו מו[ט]ו אִישׁ בְּכָלִי מִלְחָמָתוֹ וְהַכּוֹהֲנִים יִרְעוּ בְּחֻצּוֹתָם 13 הַחֲלָלִים [וְהַלְוִיִּים בְּהִצָּרָתָם] וְהַתְּקֵרְבָתִים הַחֲלָלִים	10 ואחר הדברים האלה יתקעו הכוהנים להם לסדר דגלי המערכה והראשים נפשטים לקול החצוצרות ו עד התיצ[בו]ם א[ש]
22 [ל] [וכ]ל עם השופרות יר[עו] בק[ו]ל [הפ]ל בחללי האשמה תרועת ה[ט]	על מעמד[ו] [תִּקְעוּ הַכּוֹהֲנִים בְּחֻצּוֹת תְּרוּעָה שְׁנִית יְיָ הַתְּקֵרֵב וּבְהִגַּעַ 12 אֲנָשִׁי [הַבְּנִינִים לִיד מֵעַ] כְּתִיבִים כְּדִי
23 [ל] [וכ]ל עם השופרות ירעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי הבינים ישלחו ידם בחיל 14 הכתיים [ועם צאת קו] [הת]רועה יחלו להפיל בחלליהם וכול העם יניח[ו] קול התרועה והכוהנים 15 יהיו מריעים בְּחֻצּוֹת הַחֲלָלִים	11 הטל ירימו איש ידו בכלי מלחמתו והכוהנים ירעו בחצוצרות 13 החללים [והלויים וכו] ל עם השופרות ירעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי הבינים ישלחו ידם בחיל 14 הכתיים [ועם צאת קו] [הת]רועה יחלו להפיל בחלליהם וכול העם יניח[ו] קול התרועה והכוהנים 15 יהיו מריעים בְּחֻצּוֹת הַחֲלָלִים
24 [ל] [וכ]ל עם השופרות ירעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי הבינים ישלחו ידם בחיל 14 הכתיים [ועם צאת קו] [הת]רועה יחלו להפיל בחלליהם וכול העם יניח[ו] קול התרועה והכוהנים 15 יהיו מריעים בְּחֻצּוֹת הַחֲלָלִים	12 ואחר הדברים האלה יתקעו הכוהנים להם לסדר דגלי המערכה והראשים נפשטים לקול החצוצרות ו עד התיצ[בו]ם א[ש]
25 [ל] [וכ]ל עם השופרות ירעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי הבינים ישלחו ידם בחיל 14 הכתיים [ועם צאת קו] [הת]רועה יחלו להפיל בחלליהם וכול העם יניח[ו] קול התרועה והכוהנים 15 יהיו מריעים בְּחֻצּוֹת הַחֲלָלִים	13 ואחר הדברים האלה יתקעו הכוהנים להם לסדר דגלי המערכה והראשים נפשטים לקול החצוצרות ו עד התיצ[בו]ם א[ש]

TABLE 12 The texts of 4Q491 ii ii and 1QM 16:3–17:15 (cont.)

4Q491 fragment ii column 2	1QM 16–17
1 [... where they s]ta[nd ...]	16:3 They shall act according to this entire rule [...] where they stand, in front of the camps of the Kittim. Then the priests shall blow for them on the trumpets of 4 memorial, the gates of ba[ttle] shall open, and the skirmishers shall [m]arch out and take position in columns between the lines. The priests shall blow for them 5 the alarms of formation. The columns [...] ... at the sound of the trumpets until each man is stationed at his own position. The priests shall blow for them 6 a second alarm [...] to en]gage, and when they stand near the line of the Kittim, within throwing range, each man shall raise his hand with 7 his weapon. The six [...] the t]rumpets of the slain a shrill staccato sound to conduct the battle; the Levites and all 8 the people with trumpets shall blo[w ...] [...] a great sound. When the sound is emitted, they shall set their hand to bring down among the slain of the Kittim. The whole 9 band shall cease the sound of the alarm, [but the priest]s shall keep blowing on the trumpets of the slain so that the battle against the Kittim shall still be conducted. 10 (vacat)
2 [... of the bat]tle, and [they] shall march [out ...]	
3 [... the al]arms of forma[tion ...]	
4 [... the pri]ests shall blow [...]	
5 [... within th]row[ing rang]e, [each ma]n shall rais[e] his hand with [his] wea[pon ...]	
6 [... st]ac[ca]to [...] to conduct the battle; the Le[vites ...]	
7 with a great sound. [Wh]en the sound is e[mit]ted, they shall set the[ir] hand [...]	
8 [so that] the battle against the Kittim shall still be conducted. (vacat)	
And [...] 9 [the So]ns of Darkness, and the slain of the skirmishers shall begin to fall [...]	11 When [...] girds himself to help the Sons of Darkness, when the slain of the skirmishers begin to fall according to the mysteries of God, when all those appointed for battle are put to test by them 12 then the pri[e]sts shall blo[w] on the tr[u]mpets of summoning for another line of the reserve to march
10 they [shall] blow for another line of the reserve to march out to the ba[ttle ...]	

TABLE 12 The texts of 4Q491 ii ii and 1QM 16:3–17:15 (cont.)

4Q491 fragment ii column 2	1QM 16–17
<p>11 they [shall] blow the withdrawal. The [chi]ef pries[t] shall draw near and take up position ... [...]</p> <p>12 their hands for his battle</p>	<p>out to the battle, and they shall take up position between the lines. 13 For those engag[ed] in the battle, they shall blow (the signal) for withdrawal. The chief priest shall draw near and take up position in front of the line; he shall strengthen 14 their heart ... [... of Go]d and their hands for His battle. (vacat)</p>
<p>[...], and the heart of his people he shall put to test within the crucible. Do not ... [...] 13 For you have heard, long ago, the mysteri[es] of God ...] stand in the breach, and do not be afrai[d] when [...] support [...] 14 [...] ... [...] ... [...] faithful, and his redemptive help [...] ... [...] 15 [...] the Son]s of Truth and move away (?) the melted heart, to strengthen the hea[r]t ...] 16 [...] batt]le this day. The God of Isra[el] shall humiliate [...] ... [...] 17 [...] so that none could stand. [The kingsh]ip shall belong to God and the salvati[on] to his people. [...] 18 [...] ... [sh]ortly to Belial, and the covenant of the God of peace (shall be) [for I]srael in all the appointed times [...]</p>	<p>15 And he shall speak up, saying, “[...] the he[a]rt of his people, he puts to test within the crucible. Do not [...] your slain. For you have heard long ago, 16 according to the mysteries of God [...] ... to be warm. 17 ... [...] ... [...] 17:1 He will set peace for them in the burning ... [...] ... those who are put to test within the crucible. He will sharpen his weapons, and they shall not get blunt until [...] 2 wickedness. As for you, remember the bloodshed [of Nadab and] Ab[i]hu, the sons of Aaron, by whose judgment God showed his holiness in the eyes of [...] 3 and Ithamar, he has bound them to him for a covenant [...] forever. (vacat)</p> <p>4 As for you, strengthen yourselves. Do not be terrified by them! [...] Their own desire (aims) towards nothingness and voidness! Their support (is) not in ... [...] and not [...] 5 Israel (in) all that is and will be ... [...] ... in all everlasting happenings. (This is) the day he has set to humiliate and to bring low the commander of the dominion of 6 of wickedness. He has sent an</p>

TABLE 12 The texts of 4Q491 ii ii and 1QM 16:3–17:15 (cont.)

4Q491 fragment ii column 2

19 After these word[s] the priests shall blow to array for a second battle against the Kittim ...] 20 in his station, the priests shall blow a second alarm, the signal to engage. When they reach the li[ne ...] 21 th[ro]wing [...] each man [shall raise his hand with his weapon. The priests shall bl[ow] the trum[pe]ts of the [slain ...] 22 [...]. All the people with trumpets shall bl[o]w a [...] sou[nd ...] [...] 23 [...] to fa]ll among the guilty slain. The alarm of the [...] 24 [...] ... [...] ... [...]

1QM 16–17

everlasting help to the lot whom he has [re]deemed through the might of the majestic angel. (He will set) the authority of Michael in everlasting light.
7 He will cause the covenant of Israel to shine in joy! Peace and blessing to the lot of God! He will exalt over the divine beings the authority of Michael and the dominion 8 of Israel over all flesh. Righteousness shall rejoice in the heights and all his Sons of His Truth shall be glad in everlasting knowledge.
As for you, sons of his covenant, 9 strengthen yourselves in the midst of God's crucible until he waves his hand and fills up his crucibles (according to) his mysteries so that you may stand." (*vocat*)
10 After these words, the priests shall blow for them to array the battalions of the line, and the columns shall spread at the sound of the trumpets,
11 until each [ma]n is statio[ned] at [his] position. The priests shall blow on the trumpets a second alarm, the signal to engage. When 12 the skir[mishers almost] reach [the li]ne of the Kittim, within throwing range, each man shall raise his hand with his weapon. The priests shall blow on the trumpets of 13 the slain. [The Levites and all] the people with trumpets shall blow a war alarm and the skirmishers shall stretch out their hand against the army of 14 the Kittim. [When the sou]n[d] of the al[arm] [is emitted], they shall begin to bring down among the slain. The whole band shall cease [e] the sound of the alarm, but the priests 15 shall keep blowing [the trumpets of the slai]n, and the ba[ttl]e against the Ki[tim] shall still be conducted: [they shall begin] to [fall, those who are s]litten before them.

1.6.1 First instructions (4Q491a fragment 11 ii 1–12a/1QM 16:3–14)
 There are a few orthographical differences (cf., e.g., כתיים and כתיים in line 6 of 4Q491a and 1QM 16:10), but in addition some more noteworthy points of difference exist: in 4Q491a, line 4, the subject and the predicate seem to be in a different order in comparison with 1QM (see lines 5b–6a) and the predicate verb תקע is in a different form (in the imperfect יתקעו while in 1QM 16:6, it is in the perfect ותקעו).¹³³ The difference is at the point where the narrative is changing from the consecutive perfect forms to the imperfect: the previous four verbs in 1QM are in the consecutive perfect while the following verbs are in the imperfect. The preceding perfect forms are all placed before their subjects. Therefore, it seems possible that the author of 1QM was expecting perfect forms to continue and thus wrote a perfect here, before the subject, in contrast to what was in his source. The expression להם perhaps originally followed the verbal form in 4Q491a (cf. Baillet's reconstruction)¹³⁴ and that is why the scribe of 1QM 17 wrote it here. Another option is that the scribe got it from the previous line in which it probably existed (cf. 1QM 17:4–5, according to which Baillet reconstructed line 3 of 4Q491a)¹³⁵ or that the scribe, after recognizing his mistake, added it in order to clarify the sentence, which now was different in comparison with the manuscript he was copying.¹³⁶ Finally, he wrote the subject הכוהנים and continued again according to his model text. It is difficult to explain the difference the other way around; for example, why would the author of 4Q491a have omitted להם?

In 1QM 16:12, there are two extra words in comparison with 4Q491a (see line 10): while in 4Q491a, the text says that the priests shall “blow for another line of the reserve to march out,” in 1QM, it is specified that the priest shall blow “the trumpets of assembly” (חצוצרות המקרא). These trumpets occur nine times in 1QM (in addition to this, see 3:1–3, 7; 7:3, 15; 8:3; 9:3) but never in 4QM material. It is noteworthy that in 1QM, these trumpets are mentioned several times in the instructive columns 3–9 but in the end columns 15–19, only once. Therefore, one possible reason to add them in 1QM 16:12 is that when 1QM was written in its present composition, it became important to create links between its different units, and the trumpets of assembly were added to column 16 in order to link the end columns more closely to the narrative columns 3–9.

133 Note that there is a similar difference between 4Q491a 11 ii 20 and 1QM 17:11. Both the imperfect form and the perfect form of the root תקע occur eight times in 1QM. The perfect form does not occur in 4Q491a at all but the imperfect form occurs five times.

134 Baillet, DJD 7:30.

135 Baillet, DJD 7:30.

136 Note that in line 17:10, להם is also probably an addition (see the discussion of the second narrative, 4Q491a 11 ii 19–23 / 1QM 17:10–14).

1.6.2 Encouragement Speeches (4Q491a Fragment 11 ii 12b–18/
1QM 16:15–17:9)

As noted above, despite the obvious textual dissimilarity of 1QM 17:4–8b and 4Q491 11 ii 13b–18, there are many lexical and thematic links between these texts. The most significant of these are that both texts describe God as testing his people within the crucible¹³⁷ (4Q491a 11 ii 12/1QM 16:15) and humiliating the wicked (11 ii 16/17:5) and both urge the combatants not to be afraid (11 ii 13/17:4). However, it seems that the text of 1QM is somewhat longer than that of 4Q491a. Duhaime argues for the idea that 1QM 17:4–8b represents a reworking of 4Q491 11 ii 13b–18 and he introduces four cases where the author of 1QM has, according to him, expanded the text of 4Q491.¹³⁸

TABLE 13 Four cases where, according to Duhaime, the author of 1QM has expanded the text of 4Q491

4Q491 11 ii	1QM 17	
Case 1	ועזר פדותו 14b	עזר עולמים לגורל [פ] דותו (6b)
Case 2	היום הזה יכניענו אל ישר[אל]	ולוא [] ישראל כול הויה ונהיה ו [] היום מועדו להכניע ולהשפיל שר ממשלת (4b–5)
Case 3	וברית אל שלום [לי] שראל בכל מועד ^י	להאיר בשמחה ברית ישראל שלום וברכה לגורל אל (7a)
Case 4	18aβ בליעל	שר ממשלת רשעה (5bβ–6a)

In case 1, it seems logical that the author of 1QM 17 has further defined the text: he gives to the עזר “support” an attribute עולמים “eternal,” and by adding the word גורל “lot,” he explains in more detail to whom the support is to be given. In case 2, the situation is more complicated: the common words of 4Q491a and 1QM are in a different order in each text. However, Duhaime argues that in 1QM, the word יום “day” is further defined as the “appointed (מועד) day” and another verb referring to humiliation has been added (שפל in addition

137 Cf. Section 1.4 above.

138 Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 47–51. Duhaime’s starting point in his argumentation is the assumption that texts tended to expand.

to בנע).¹³⁹ The third case resembles the second one since there too, the common terms are in a different order. Duhaime thinks that the author of 1QM has further defined Israel and its covenant: Israel is said to be גורל אל “the lot of God” and the covenant is to be joyfully lit up (להאיר בשמחה). As regards case 4, there are no common terms in 4Q491 and 1QM but Duhaime suggests that בליעל “Belial” and שר ממשלת רשעה “the prince of the realm of wickedness” refer to one and the same figure. In 1QM, the name of this figure refers to the dualistic arrangement (there is a realm of wickedness and thus, another realm different from that must also exist).¹⁴⁰

It cannot be helped that this kind of comparison remains always somewhat speculative – and not least because of the fragmentariness of 4Q491a. However, since the links between the texts are significant and the contexts of the hymn follow each other closely, the burden of proof would rather lie for those who would assume that there is no relationship between these hymns. It seems probable that as was already suggested, the author of 1QM knew the text of 4Q491a and used it when compiling the war traditions. However, while he demonstrably transmitted some of the hymnic material very faithfully (see Section 1.3 above), here he reworked the hymn considerably. While doing so, the author probably aimed at adding the “biblical” flavor of the hymn which is above all demonstrated in two cases. First, in the encouragement speech of 1QM 16:15–17:9, the author of 1QM is clearly referring to the tradition dealing with the fate of Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10, Num 26:60–61, 1 Chron 24:1–2), i.e., how Yahweh calls fire down from heaven to kill the men who have offered “foreign fire” before him.¹⁴¹ Second, as Gregory Beale has noted, there can be

139 As regards this case, Duhaime (“Dualistic Reworking,” 50) supposes that the word אל could be reconstructed at the end of line 4. However, he is careful not to draw any conclusions on the basis of this reconstruction.

140 Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 50. Actually, Duhaime argues that all the additions in 1QM 17 are dualistic in nature. The terms גורל “lot” and אור “light,” for example, are dualistic to him, and, as he argues, in case 1 and case 3 these terms (or their derivatives) are additions in 1QM. In case 2, the addition of the verb שפל points to dualism since it, according to Duhaime, “stands in contrast with the elevation of Michael and suggests a dualistic opposition.” An important part of his argumentation is that he also finds this kind of dualistic reworking from two other texts, first, from the Community Rule (1QS 3:13, 18b–23a, 23b–25a) and second, from the Damascus Document (CD 5:17c–19), and in addition, from 1QM 13:9b–12a), cf. “Dualistic Reworking,” 50, e.g., p. 32.

141 It must be taken into account that the whole name נדב אביהו and most of the letters of the name אביהו are reconstructed – but the continuation of the text makes this reconstruction quite reliable. In addition, Dean O. Wenthe argues that “the author connects the idea of fire in the crucible and testing the elect by his use of Leviticus” and that “1QM also retains the accent of Lev 10:3 by indicating that through such an action God hallows

seen links between 1QM 17:4–9 and Daniel 12.¹⁴² The idea of the authority of Michael occurs in both passages and in addition, the idea of “shining” occurs in both passages although it is expressed by different verbs (אור in 1QM 17:7 and נהר in Dan 12:3).¹⁴³ These links to the Hebrew Bible texts do not seem to be part of the encouragement speech of 4Q491a. Below (see Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, Section 2), we see that when the War Texts were transmitted, the angels’ role in the war was debated, and the idea of a authority of Michael probably forms part of this debate. It seems that angels’ role grew during the transmission process; a conclusion that is again referred to when we discuss manuscripts 4Q492 and 4Q493 below.

It is possible that when aiming to add links to the “biblical” tradition, the author of 1QM may have followed a more general trend. For example, a comparison of 1QS and its parallel passages in 4QS^b and 4QS^d reveals that the citations in 1QS reflect redactional activity.¹⁴⁴ However, 1QS has direct citations, whereas 1QM does not quote any text directly in columns 16–17. Columns 10 and 11 of 1QM include biblical citations (see 10:3b–5a, 6b–8a; 11:6b–7a, 11b–12a) but no parallels are extant in the Cave 4 manuscripts, as they do not contain any. However, it is possible that these columns are as a whole a kind of review of the salvation history from creation to the kingdom of David and further on to the prophets, and thus represent material that was created for 1QM only and reinforce the links between 1QM and the biblical tradition. Thus, the author may well have been aiming to link the idea of war with the well-known “biblical” traditions when compiling 1QM, and possibly thought this would serve a wider readership of the material.

himself before the people”; see Dean O. Wenthe “The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 313.

142 Gregory K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984), 29. However, Beale also brings out that John J. Collins, although remarking the parallel elements between 1QM 17 and Dan 7 and 12, states that 1QM plausibly owes most of all to the Persian mythological background; see John J. Collins “The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic,” *VT* 25 (1975): 604.

143 Wenthe also sees here some kind of link and argues that “the use of material from Daniel is (here) reminiscent of column 1”; see Wenthe, “The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM,” 313.

144 Metso, *Textual Development*, 144; and idem, “Biblical Quotations in the Community Rule,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov (London: British Library, 2002), 81–92 (86–91).

1.6.3 Second Instructions (4Q491a Fragment 11 ii 19–23/1QM 17:10–14)
 In 1QM 17:10, it is emphasized that the priests shall blow “for them” (להם) while in 4Q491 (see line 19) the audience of the signal is not mentioned. The most plausible explanation for this difference is that the author of 1QM expected הם here since in lines 16:4 and 16:5 it follows the verb תקע (and precedes the subject הכוהנים). This expectation then causes a scribal mistake. Another possibility is that the author of 1QM accidentally skipped the word הכוהנים, moving to the next word beginning with ל (לסדר). After realizing this, the scribe wrote the suffix הם after ל and wrote the missing word הכוהנים above the line. It could also be possible that the author of 1QM wanted to be more specific than his source text and added the object להם in the text. However, since הכוהנים is written between the lines here, it is more likely that it is a matter of a scribal mistake.

There are also other differences between the beginnings of the passages. It seems that in 1QM 17:10, there is something more in comparison with line 19 of 4Q491a: the effects of blowing the trumpets are described in more detail when stating that the columns shall spread at the sound of the trumpets. These words would not fit at the end of line 19 of 4Q491a and thus, in comparison with 4Q491a, they seem to be additional. By contrast, the words are partly visible in 1QM 16:5, and the whole clause can be reconstructed there. Thus, here too, the author of 1QM probably waited for a sentence similar to that in 1QM 16 and wrote according to that suggestion – or else he deliberately wanted to harmonize the two passages by adding these words to 1QM 17.¹⁴⁵

But if the author of 1QM primarily followed the text of 4Q491a, where did he get the idea of the priests arraying the “battalions (דגל) of line” when in 4Q491a, the priests blow for arraying a “second battle against the Kittim”? This cannot be explained by 1QM 16 since there, at the corresponding point, the priests blow the “alarms of formation.” One explanation is that he got the word from 4Q491a fragment 13. The term דגל occurs there in line 5, in the instructive passages, which in many respects are reminiscent of those of 1QM 17 (and 1QM 16 and 4Q491a fragment 11). If the author of 1QM used the text of 4Q491a as a source, it is clear that he had to abridge the text since all the phases of the war that are enumerated in 4Q491a do not occur in 1QM. When abridging, the author of 1QM perhaps combined elements from the omitted passages with the text of the preserved passages.¹⁴⁶

145 The third passage where these “additional” words occur is 1QM 8 (see line 6). There a very similar instructions about the battle are given, although the weapons (8:11) and the trumpet signals (8:7, 12) are described in more detail.

146 Note also that the word “battalion” or “division” (דגל) can also been found in 1QM 8, in lines 4 and 14, which frame the instruction part very similar to that of 1QM 17.

In 4Q491a line 23, something in the text is happening among the “guilty slain” (חללי האשמה) while in 1QM at the corresponding point (17:14) there is only “their slain” (חלליהם). This difference is difficult to explain. If the author of 1QM had aimed to harmonize the passage with that of 1QM 16, he would have written בחללי כתיים (cf. 1QM 16:8). Unfortunately, the corresponding points elsewhere in 4Q491a have not been preserved and thus it is not possible to check whether חללי האשמה occurs only here or whether it was also used elsewhere in the scroll. In general, the expression was known in the War Texts: it occurs in 4Q491b fragments 1–3 line 13 and in 1QM 6:17 – although in the last-mentioned line אשמה appears in a suffixed form, without any article (חללי אשמתם). Another possibility is that 4Q491a preserves a later reading here, in which case האשמה could be added in order to emphasize the enemies’ wickedness. All in all, explaining this difference remains speculative.

1.6.4 Summary

As the analysis above demonstrates, the similarity between 4Q491 11 ii and 1QM 16–17 can be explained by the idea of 1QM rewriting the text preserved in 4Q491a. In addition, the author of 1QM probably did not use just the text in 11 ii but also that of some later columns (cf. fragment 13), which explains at least some of the differences between the texts. As already noted, 1QM tends to collect the war-related material and organize it. The idea that the author of 1QM used the text of 4Q491a selectively, aiming at combining different elements, fits together with this tendency. Also, the study of 4Q491a 11 ii and 1QM 16–17 gives further support to the ideas presented above, namely, that the hymns and speeches were seen as more unstable literary entities than the instructions: it was possible to use them in order to pursue literary creativity and insert new ideas into the text.¹⁴⁷ Here, the reworking of the hymn especially reflects the author’s aim to create links to the “biblical” tradition which probably was well-known among the audience he has in mind – a wider, not so specialized audience. This kind of “scripturalization” appears as well in 1QM columns 10 and 11 which do not have any parallels among Cave 4 manuscripts and which possibly were created for this composition.

¹⁴⁷ The differences between the speeches could also be explained by suggesting that they pertain to different occasions, i.e., they have different settings. However, the question about the settings is very difficult in the case of such fragmentary manuscripts. As was demonstrated in Section 1.2 above, even the question of the arrangement of the fragments of 4Q491a is extremely difficult to answer, and furthermore this makes it difficult to discuss the settings of the speeches in this manuscript (and compare them to 1QM). Therefore, it is ultimately suggested here that the very similar passages in 4Q491a and 1QM are probable related to similar settings.

In the following three chapters, the text preserved in the more deteriorated columns is introduced and analyzed, as far as it is possible. The smaller the pieces are, the more difficult the task becomes but there are still some relevant observations to be made.

1.7 *Fragment 13 (B-363818; B-363819)*

ע]ם אֱלִים נשׁ ¹⁴⁸ ◦	1
ה]הֶקטן בכס ירדוף אל]ף	2
עול]מְ[י]ם] הד]בָּרים האלה יתקעו]	3
]חצו]צרות ובעומדם לדגליהמה אי]ש] עָל]	4
]ם למערכת ¹⁴⁹ כתיאים כדי הטל ירימו ידסה]	5
]בח]צוצרות החללים קול חד טרוד והלויאים וכול]	6
]מִים זוֹאת אחר זואת ואין רוח ביניהמה כיא]	7
]ל] [ו]◦[ענו כול העם והרימו קוֹל] [אח]ד ואמרו]	8
]עול◦]	9

The empty space at the top of the fragment is too wide to be a space between lines. This can be noticed by comparing the space to the lower spaces between the lines; they are not completely equal in size but none of the is as wide as this is. Therefore, it seems that the preserved line 1 of fragment 13 is either the first line of a column or a first line after a *vacat*. The content of the fragment is reminiscent of the battle instructions in 4Q491a 11 ii and 1QM 16–17. However, lines 1–3a probably do not belong to the instructions but to a speech or hymn; this is indicated by the second person forms and the discussion on divine beings.

148 Just after the letters נשׁ, Baillet (DJD 7:35), Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 29), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 976), Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 136), and Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 130) see remnants of an undetermined letter, and there really is a spot at the bottom of the line just before the tear. Since the trace is tiny, it is practically impossible to say which letter it belongs to and thus, it is here marked with a mid-line circlet.

149 Here, Baillet (DJD 7:35), Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 29), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 978), Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 136), and Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 130) read *למערכת* ׀ ובהגיע]ם (with markings sometimes divergent from each other) instead of Duhaime’s (“War Scroll,” 158) *למערכת* ל. This is justified since there are traces of two letters at the beginning of the line: just before ׀, there is a part of ל clearly visible: the horizontal stroke at the top of the line and the beginning of the vertical stroke that goes above the line. Before this ל, there is a small stroke below the line, probably the bottom stroke of a final *mem*. Thus, here, Duhaime’s reading is corrected from *למערכת* ל to *למערכת* ׀ (the trace could perhaps also be the tail end of ף or ן, and therefore it is better to mark ׀ as an uncertain letter). The somewhat speculative reconstruction ׀ ובהגיע] suggested by other editors is still omitted.

In addition, line 3b probably reads **ואחר הדברים האלה** “after these words,” which also mark the transition from speech to instructions in fragment 11 ii line 19 and in 1QM 17:10. Table 14 demonstrates the similarities and the differences between fragment 13 and 1QM 16–17.

The instruction part in lines 3b–8 has many words in common with 1QM 16 – for example, the expression **קול חד טרוד** “a shrill staccato sound” (see line 6 of fragment 13 and 1QM 16:7). However, every now and then, 4Q491a fragment 13 lines 3b–8 still includes fewer words than the passage in 1QM 16.¹⁵⁰ What should also be noted is that the battle instructions given in fragment 13 differ from those in 1QM 16 (and almost all the other instructive passages in 4Q491a and 1QM) in three ways. First, fragment 13 suggests that the soldiers are to take position “among their battalions” (**דגלים**, the word is also used in 1QM 17 but in a different context). Second, after mentioning the Levites, the text again describes some kind of arrangement of the soldiers while in 1QM 16 and 17, the battle already begins. Third, the text seems to end with a speech or hymn given by the whole people – whereas in other preserved cases, a speech given by a priest follows (cf. 11 ii and 1QM 16) or instructions for the battle continue (cf. 1QM 17, 1QM 8). This demonstrates that although the formula for giving the battle instructions was stabilized to a certain degree, it was still possible to modify it. The special characteristics of the instruction passage in fragment 13 probably indicates that in 4Q491a, there were more phases in the war than there are in 1QM 16–17. For 1QM, the number of phases was reduced and some elements of the battle instructions were re-combined.

1.8 *Fragment 15 (B-363816; B-363817)*

]וא[י[1
]עֹזָה וְתֵהֱלֹךְ]ה	2
]ואנו הננו עומדים להתקרב]	3
¹⁵¹] <i>vacat</i>]	4
]וענה ואמר אליהמה חזקו ואמצו]	5
]יד[אל נטויה על כול הגואים לוא]	6
]עלי[ון המלוכה ולעמו הישועה ואת]	7
]ט[מאתו יתקרבו אליכ[ם] אלים ב]	8

150 See, e.g., 1QM 16:7 and fragment 13 line 6 where 1QM says that the shrill staccato sound is blown **מלחמה לנצח** “to conduct the battle” while this kind of explanation is not found in fragment 13.

151 In line 4, there is clearly a *vacat* although Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 160) does not explicitly mark it in his text or translation.

TABLE 14 The texts of 4Q491:13 and 1QM 16:3–8a and 1QM 17:10–13

4Q491 fragment 13	1QM 16	1QM 17
ע]ם אֲלִים נש]]	1	10 ואחר הדברים האלה יתקעו ^{הכותנים} להם לסדר
א]הקטן בכס ירדוף אֵלָךְ]ף	2	דגלי המערכה והראשים נפשטים לקול
הד]בְּרִים האלה יתקעו]]	3	עול]מַי]סו]] החצוצרות ⁱⁱ עד התזף]בם א]ש על מעמדו]]
החצו]צרות ובעומדם לדגליהמה א]ן]ש] עוֹל]]	4	ועמדו ראשים בין המערכות ותקעו להם הכהונים 5 תרועה
ם] למערכת כתיאים כדי הטל ירימו]	5	סדר והראשימ]] על מעמדו ותקעו להם 6 הכהונים תרועה שנית]]
י]דסה]	6	כתילים כדי הטל ירימו איש 7 בכלי מלחמתו
ח]צֹצְרוֹת החללים קול חד טרוד והלויים	7	וכו]ל עם השופרות יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
מ]ים זוֹאת אחר זואת ואין רוח ביניהמה	8	הכהונים יריעו בחצוצרות 13 החללים [הלויים
כ]יא]	9	וכו]ל עם השופרות יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
מ]ים זוֹאת אחר זואת ואין רוח ביניהמה	10	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	11	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	12	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	13	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	14	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	15	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	16	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	17	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	18	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	19	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי
עוֹל]]	20	הכהונים יריעו תרועת מלחמה ואנשי

TABLE 14 The texts of 4Q491:13 and 1QM 16:3–8a and 1QM 17:10–13 (cont.)

4Q491 fragment 13	1QM 16	1QM 17
<p>1 [...] amo]ng the divine beings ... 2 [...] the small one among you shall pursue a thousa[nd ...] 3 [ever]a[st]i]ng</p>	<p>3 They shall act according to this entire rule [...] where they stand, in front of the camps of the Kittim. Then the priests shall blow for them on the trumpets of 4 memorial, the gates of ba[ttle] shall open, and the skirmishers shall [m]arch out and take position in columns between the lines. The priests shall blow for them 5 the alarms of formation. The columns [...] ... at the sound of the trumpets until each man is stationed at his own position. The priests shall blow for them 6 a second alarm [...] to engage, and when they stand near the line of the Kittim, within throwing range, each man shall raise his hand with 7 his weapon. The six [...] the [tr]umpets of the slain a shrill staccato sound to conduct the battle; the Levites and all</p>	<p>10 After these words, the priests shall blow for them to array the battalions of the line, and the columns shall spread at the sound of the trumpets, 11 until each [ma]n is station[ed] at [his] position. The priests shall blow on the trumpets a second alarm, the signal to engage. When 12 the skir[mishers almost] reach [the li]ne of the Kittim, within throwing range, each man shall raise his hand with his weapon. The priests shall blow on the trumpets of 13</p>
<p>4 [the trum]pets. When they have taken position among their battalions, each ma[n] to [...] 5 [...] to] the line of the Kittim, within throwing range, they shall raise their hand [...] 6 [...] in the tr]umpets of the slain a shrill staccato sound; the Levites and the whole [...] 7 [...]... one after another, with no interval between them, for [...] 8 [...] ... [...] ... [...] The whole people shall answer and lift up a [sing]le voice, saying,</p>	<p>8 the people with trumpets shall blow [...] ... [...], a great sound. When the sound is emitted, they shall set their hand to bring down among the slain of the Kittim. The whole 9 band shall cease the sound of the alarm, [but the priest]s shall keep blowing on the trumpets of the slain so that the battle against the Kittim shall still be conducted. 10 (vacat)</p>	<p>the slain. [The Levites and al]l the people with trumpets shall blow a war alarm and the skirmishers shall stretch out their hand against the army of 14 the Kittim. [When the soun]d [of the al]arm [is emitted], they shall begin to bring down among the slain. The whole band shall cease [e] the sound of the alarm, but the priests 15 shall keep blowing [the trumpets of the slai]n, and the ba[tt]le against the Ki[t]tim shall still be conducted: [they shall begin] to [fall down, those who are s]mitten before them.</p>
<p>[...] 9 [...] perversity [...]</p>		

9	[ולהשליך כול פגרו]יהמה
10	[וכול רוחי גורל]ו
11	[עולמים יחד ע]ם
12	[מלחמה]ו

The *vacat* in line 4 divides the text in two. The first part is very poorly preserved but the use of the first person plural (line 3) indicates that it may be a hymnic text. The verbal form *התקרב* occurs exclusively in the War Texts (1QM 17:11; 4Q491a 11 ii 20; 4Q493 line 7) but there is no clause similar to that of line 3 of fragment 13. In line 2, there occurs a rare word *תהלכה* “procession” which is not known anywhere else in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Hebrew Bible, it occurs only once, in Neh 12:31, where it belongs to a liturgical context.

The other section is slightly better preserved. The introductory formula *ו ענה* and *ואמר* in line 5, almost entirely in view, and two verbs in the imperative (*חזקו*, *אמצו*), expressing an exhortation to be strong and courageous, suggest this part is an encouragement speech. As Table 15 demonstrates, something similar can be found in 1QM 15:7.

The encouragement speech probably discusses godly intervention: lines 6 and 7 seem to describe God’s supremacy over all nations and his ability to redeem his own. Lines 8 and 10 seem to suggest that heavenly beings act together with humans. Line 12 confirms that the speech is related to war. These themes are also known elsewhere in the War Texts but no particular parallel to fragment 15 can be pointed to. Thus, the text in fragment 15 is one more example of what has already been demonstrated above: in the transmission process of the War Texts, hymns and speeches were not as stable elements as the battle instructions.

TABLE 15 Lexical similarities between 4Q491 fragment 15 line 5 and 1QM 15:7

4Q491 fragment 15 line 5	1QM 15:7
<p style="color: red;">[ו]ענה ואמר אליהמה חזקו ואמצו]</p> <p>5 [and] he shall speak up, saying to them, “Be strong and brave [...]</p>	<p style="color: red;">[ו]ענה ואמר חזקו</p> <p>7 all his brothers, and he shall strengthen [...]</p> <p style="color: red;">and he shall speak up, saying, “Be strong and brave [...]</p>

1.9 *Other Fragments*

There are 11 more fragments that are usually considered as belonging to 4Q491a. These fragments are small and some of them are more or less worn out. Table 16 introduces the observations that can be made on the content of these fragments.

TABLE 16 The contents of 4Q491 fragments 18, 22, 24–28, 31–33, 35

Fragment	Content
18	A few words preserved as complete, mainly known in the other War Texts as well (חלל, תקע); סוף is less common although it occurs once in 1QM 11:10 (partly reconstructed)
22	No complete words visible, probably forms of the roots עמד and רוע (also common in the other War Texts)
24	Under 10 complete words are preserved, many of them known in other War Texts as well (אלים, ממשלה, חרב). However, e.g., ממשלה כול האל[י]ם is a unique combination and תהלה occurs here for the only time in the preserved War Texts
25	A few very common words are visible; the combination ביד רשע is unique among the War Texts
26	A few very common words are visible
27	Only a few letters visible
28	Only a few letters visible
31	Only a few letters visible
32	Only a few letters visible
33	Only a few letters visible
35	The bottom margin is visible and a few very common words are preserved in the bottommost line

1.10 *Summary of 4Q491a*

Although the exact order of the fragments is not known, there are still some conclusions to be drawn on the basis of the scrutiny above. First, roughly speaking, the content of 4Q491a can be divided into two genres: the battle instructions and the hymns/speeches. The battle instructions seem to be reminiscent of each other in outline, and in addition they recall the instructive passages known in 1QM. In general, the battle instructions in 4Q491a and in 1QM seem to represent a somewhat stabilized form of text which was considered to be worth transmitting without making significant changes. However, the number

TABLE 17 1QM 14–17 and its parallels in 4Q491a (* denotes *vacats* in the text of 1QM)

Description of the Section	1QM	4Q491a	Degree of Parallelism
Rubric and thanksgiving hymn	14:2–3; 4–15	8–10, col. 1:17–E; col. 1:1–12	remote parallel? + close parallel
Hymn: War cry	14:16–18 (14:E–15:3)	8–10, col. 1:13–16	close parallel
Rubric and encouragement speech	15:4–16:1 *		
Rule that shall be carried out	16:3–		
Battle instructions (phase 1)	16:3–9 *	11, col. 2:1–12a /	close parallel/ remote parallel
Battle instructions (phase 2)	16:11–14	10, col. 2:8–14a	remote parallel
Rubric and encouragement speech (part 1)	16:15–17:3	11, col. 2:12b–18 /	genre parallel/ remote parallel
Encouragement speech (part 2)	17:4–17:9	10, col. 2:14b–17	remote parallel
Battle instructions (phase 3, rubric) (and thanksgiving hymn)	17:10–14 (17:15–18:8) *	11, col. 2:19–23	close parallel

of different phases of war seems to vary between manuscripts: in 4Q491a, there are at least four phases where instructions are given while in 1QM 16–17, there are only three.

In hymns and speeches, first and second person forms are generally used. Central themes that are discussed in practically every case are the presence of heavenly beings and the godly intervention in the war. However, the form and content of the hymnic passages varies. It seems that especially the encouragement speeches were not considered to be stable but they were used as a template for creative literary work. While the instructions were used to construct a stable framework for texts, the speeches were the place where scribes and redactors were able to introduce new ideas or to choose the hymns familiar to them, and perhaps made the text suitable for their own purposes within different contexts. A special case is the thanksgiving hymn in 4Q491a 8–10 i that is closely parallel to the hymn found in 1QM 14. This part of the text seems to be carefully transmitted and only minor changes were made to it. The changes were probably made in order to emphasize the special relationship between God and his people who are referred to as “we” in the text.

A considerable amount of textual similarity between 4Q491a and 1QM 14–17 – especially between the battle instructions and between the thanksgiving hymn in 4Q491a fragments 8–10/1QM 14 – indicate that these two texts did

not develop in complete isolation from each other. The most probable explanation for their mutual relationship is that 1QM rewrites the text that is known from 4Q491a. The anthological character of 1QM reflects collecting material and organizing it into units. In 4Q491a as well, anthological features can be distinguished. However, when comparing passages that are closely parallel to each other, the direction from 4Q491a towards 1QM is almost always easier to explain. Also, the scribe of 1QM seems to add some *vacats* that are not known in 4Q491a which indicates an aim to structure the text. What is noteworthy is that not everything in 4Q491a was considered to be worth transmitting: probably, the battle instructions were combined and the number of separate descriptions was reduced, and the hymnic parts of the text could be either omitted or radically rewritten.

The two scripts used in the manuscript indicate that 4Q491a was not written at one sitting: rather the manuscript was in process for a while. Also, what is clear is that the manuscript was not meant to be a showroom copy or a copy that would be easy to see and read aloud. It seems more like a literary-oriented manuscript where some already somewhat stabilized material is combined with traditions still finding their exact form and place – or traditions that were to remain unstable. What should also be noted is the cave where 4Q491a was found. In comparison to all the other Qumran caves, it can be said that Cave 4 includes a very wide and diverse collection of texts. Recently, Charlotte Hempel has suggested that this diversity can be explained by assuming that Cave 4 was “the learned hub of the Qumran elite who collected and transmitted a large array of learning and literature including Rule texts that need not necessarily have been practiced or shared with the membership at large.”¹⁵² The small size of the script and the unique nature of its content here and there indicate that 4Q491a may well have been a representative of the “eclectic and scholarly character of the content of Cave 4.”¹⁵³ The reason for omitting the Self-Glorification Hymn in 1QM might have been that it was already initially considered as an exploratory addition to the war material: it was written in a script different from other parts of 4Q491a and it was flagged with an exceptional scribal marking. Also, the hymn was possibly considered to be unconventional, especially for the audience which the author of 1QM has in his mind. In order to make the text accessible for the wider audience, he omitted some material considered to be idiosyncratic and, instead, added the links to the well-known “biblical” traditions.

152 Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 337.

153 Cf. Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 337.

2 4Q492 (4QM^b)

There are three fragments of leather – rather thick and reddish brown in color – that constitute manuscript 4Q492.¹⁵⁴ Two of these have preserved very few letters: in fragment 3, there are only two \aleph 's, the last letters of two different lines, and fragment 2, although containing a few more letters, has preserved only remnants of two lines as well. However, what are clearly visible are margins: in fragment 2, the top margin is seen above the preserved lines and in fragment 3 the left margin is visible. In comparison with the Dead Sea Scrolls in general, the top margin is large.¹⁵⁵

Fragment 1 is the largest fragment and contains remnants of 13 lines altogether. This largest fragment is 11 cm high and 11 cm wide while the other two are 3.5 cm high and 4 cm wide (fragment 2) and 6 cm high and 1.5 cm wide (fragment 3).¹⁵⁶ The script in these fragments is Herodian, similar to 1QM,¹⁵⁷ and dates to the second half of the first century BCE.¹⁵⁸

The arrangement of the fragments is not unambiguous. Since there are no material connections among the three fragments, finding their correct location is very difficult. That they belong to the same manuscript is clear since they all contain tears due to the ruling. According to Baillet, the text in fragment 2 may be a continuation to the hymn that begins at the end of fragment 1.¹⁵⁹ In that case, fragment 2 would belong to the left side of fragment 1, being the top of the following column. Fragment 3 clearly is the upper left corner of a sheet as Baillet already notes. He assumes that this fragment should be placed either to the right side of fragment 1 in which case it would be the top left corner of the column previous to that preserved in fragment 1 or to the left side of fragment 2 in which case fragments 2 and 3 would belong to the same sheet. In any case, for Baillet, it seemed clear that there was more than one column in this manuscript. As is easily demonstrated, the text of 4Q492 fragment 1 has clear textual parallels in 1QM. However, in this case, even 1QM did not help Baillet arrange the fragments since there is not much legible text in fragments 2 and 3 and the text in the best-preserved line – line 1 in fragment 2 – does not have any equivalents in 1QM. Thus, Baillet left the arrangement of the fragments open, and after him no one has presented any potential solutions.

154 Baillet, DJD 7:45.

155 Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 102–3. Tov notes that usually in the Qumran scrolls top margins are 1–2 cm in height (see p. 99) while that of 4Q492 is 2.5 cm.

156 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 20.

157 Baillet, DJD 7:20. See also Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 20; and Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 63.

158 Baillet, DJD 7:20; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 20, 41.

159 Baillet, DJD 7:49.

When comparing the text of 4Q492 to its parallels, it can be estimated that there is space for about 75 letters or spaces per line in fragment 1. The script is relatively small (letters are about 3 mm high) and neat¹⁶⁰ and does not significantly deviate from other 4QM manuscripts in which the average letter height is 2.75.¹⁶¹ According to Duhaime, the leather was probably already damaged when the lines were ruled.¹⁶² This may indicate that the leather was not originally very high quality and consequently the manuscript was scarcely meant to be a showroom copy. Instead, the manuscript might have been used for some kind of study purpose or scholarly work. This would also explain the exceptionally large spaces between lines (about 9 mm each) which may have been left in order to make it easy to read the manuscript.

The text of the manuscript is read as follows:¹⁶³

Fragment 1

	לגבורים כ]א	1
	לכסות א]רץ	2
	כבוד שול]	3
	צריכה וחרבך]תואכל ב]שר מ]ל]א]	4
	[וזה]ב בהיכלותיד ¹⁶⁴ vacat] צי"ן שמחי מאוד ¹⁶⁵]	5
	שעריך תמיד להביא אל]יד] חיל גוים ומלכיהם ישרתוך]השתחוו	6
	רגליך ילחכו vacat בנות עמי הבענה]ב]קול רנה עדינה]	7
	למחנכה וישראל למלכות עולמים vacat ואחר יאספו המחנה בלילה]	8
	[וב]בוקר יבואו עד מקום המערכה אשר נפלו שם גבורי כת]י]ים והמו[ן]	9
	מ]תו רוב חללי]ים לאין מ]קב]ר אשר נפלו שם בחר]ב]אל]	10

160 Note that there are no preserved scribal corrections in 4Q492.

161 Cf. Baillet, DJD 7:20; Abegg, "The War Scroll from Qumran," 63; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 20.

162 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 20. See also Abegg, "The War Scroll from Qumran," 63.

163 Duhaime, "War Scroll," 168.

164 When studying the photos, it seems that at the beginning of this line, all the letters are not aligned (or perhaps the first letters of the line might be smaller and almost interlinear; see PAM 44.018). However, this is not true in the original fragment which Jutta Jokiranta checked for me in the IAA Dead Sea Scroll laboratory in Jerusalem in September 2012. The impression results from the damage to the surface of the fragment. Another obtrusive issue at the beginning of this line is that there seems to be an ink trace above ה. This trace could be the top of a letter or a part of a supralinear letter. However, no letter exists in which that kind of sporadic stroke leaning to the right would appear. Therefore, the stroke was probably drawn by accident.

165 Here, Duhaime ("War Scroll," 168) reads מאוד and other editors agree. However, on the fragment, there are tiny ink traces visible after ט and these traces fit with ה, for example. ה comes to mind as a primary option since 1QM reads it at the corresponding points (מאדה in 12:13 and מואדה in 19:5), but there are other options as well. Thus, here, the word is read as מאוד.

part, lines 1–5a, is very fragmentary, and without finding any parallels to it, it would be very difficult to say anything about its content. However, the preserved words גבורים “mighty ones,” שלל “to seize,” צרים “foes,” and חרב “sword” lead thoughts to a battle context. The second part in lines 5b–7a is more legible: it clearly calls on Zion to rejoice (שמח). In this passage, Zion seems to have achieved an advantage over other nations whose wealth is now transferred to its ownership. In addition, these lines seem to describe a kind of reversal of roles: other nations’ kings shall serve Zion which has perhaps not always been the state of affairs. This song of joy continues in the third part, in lines 7b–8a, in which rejoicing cities are called בנות עמי “daughters of my people.” The fourth and last part of the text is reminiscent of battle instructions (נאסף and בוא in the imperfect), which are now seemingly related to the end of the battle: it is said that the mighty men fell (נפלו) and the multitude of the slain are dead (מתו), both verbal forms being in the perfect.

Although fragment 1 is somewhat tattered and the text is thus damaged in many places, it is still possible to recognize parallels to it. In 1QM, there are two passages that are closely reminiscent of it, 1QM 12:7–16 and 1QM 19:1–13. Tables 18, 22 and 23 below demonstrate the significant similarities between these passages and the possibility of reconstructing the missing parts of 4Q492 fragment 1 with the help of 1QM 19 and 12. Especially 1QM 19 is very closely parallel to fragment 1. The parallels also help describe the above-mentioned text passages in more detail. The first passage (in 4Q492 fragment 1, lines 1–5a) seems to follow some kind of poetic structure: God’s presence on the battlefield is described with parallelistic verses (line 1 of 4Q492, 1QM 19:1, 1QM 12:8b–9a) and his power is described through natural phenomena (rain, mist, rainstorm; line 2 of 4Q492, 1QM 19:2–3a, 1QM 12:9b–10a). Then the text moves on to discuss a valiant war hero who is encouraged by using various imperative forms (lines 3–5a of 4Q492, 1QM 19:3b–5a, 1QM 12:10b–13a). It is possible that this figure still refers to God since in the Hebrew Bible, God is often portrayed as a warrior (e.g., Isa 42:13, Job 16:14, Jer 20:11).¹⁶⁸ Only later does the viewpoint clearly change to Zion (line 5b of 4Q492, 1QM 19:5b, 1QM 12:13b).¹⁶⁹

The second (lines 5b–7a of 4Q492, 1QM 19:5b–6, 1QM 12:13b–15a) and third (lines 7b–8 of 4Q492, 1QM 19:7–8, 1QM 12:15b–16) passages were already quite

168 About the discussion on the identity of the war hero, see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 442–45. Although Fletcher-Louis himself ends up interpreting the “mighty one” as the royal messiah, he notes that the majority of the commentators have suggested the mighty one is God.

169 According to Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 196), there are different central figures in each hymn. In first hymn, the central figure is God of Israel, in the second one, it is Zion, and in the third hymn, “daughters of my people” are in the center.

well readable in 4Q492 but by comparison with 1QM passages it is revealed, for example, that the exhortation to rejoice consists of a threefold parallelism where, in addition to Zion, Jerusalem and the cities of Judah are also mentioned. To the fourth part, there is only one parallel passage, 1QM 19:9–14. At the end of 1QM 12, the text is badly damaged but it is clear that the text continues differently from 4Q491 fragment 1. It seems that in 1QM 12, the text continues with one more poetic passage (cf. lines 17–18 where nothing refers to battle instructions but “Jerusalem” and “Lord” seem to be again addressed) while 4Q492 fragment 1 and 1QM 19 continue very similarly, giving instructions for the morning after the battle. These instructions end with a thanksgiving hymn which is not preserved (cf. 1QM 19:13b–14 and lines 12b–13 of 4Q492 fragment 1).

In general, it can be noted that 1QM column 19 forms a very close parallel to the text of fragment 1 of 4Q492 – insofar as they can be compared despite their damaged nature. 1QM 12:7–16 is also lexically very close to 4Q492 fragment 1 but it seems to contain some additional words in comparison to 4Q492 (when fragment 1 is reconstructed according to 1QM 19), and, as already noted, after the three poetic parts of the texts 1QM 12 and 4Q492 continue differently while 1QM 19 and 4Q492 seem to follow a similar text. In addition, while in 4Q492 and in 1QM 19 the short suffixes occur (so that the second person singular masculine suffix is ן), in 1QM 12, the long forms (כה) appear.

In the following, all four text passages are discussed in more detail and compared to their parallels in 1QM. The differences are first introduced and different options to explain them are presented. Finally, the texts are analyzed as a whole and the plausibility of the explanations are evaluated.

2.1.1 The First Poetic Passage

Table 18 demonstrates the first poetic passage in all three of its preserved forms, showing the exact lexical parallels in two or all three manuscripts (either visible text or text that can be reconstructed in more fragmentary manuscripts). Red text indicates the lexical parallels between 4Q492 fragment 1 and 1QM passages and green text reflects the lexical parallels between two 1QM passages. Closer scrutiny demonstrates that, although the three passages are lexically very similar, there are also some differences between their texts. The very first difference is preserved between 1QM 19 and 1QM 12:8: in 1QM 19:1: the one who is said to be holy is “our majestic one” (אדירנו) while in 1QM 12 the one who is holy is the “Lord” (אדוני). It remains unclear whether 4Q492 fragment 1 reads one or the other of these options or something else. These two expressions are very similar in appearance and it is possible that one or the other of the scribes made a mistake. Another, perhaps even more plausible option is that the scribe of 1QM 12 wanted to simplify the more difficult reading אדירנו and

TABLE 18 The text of 4Q492 11–5a, 1QM 19:1–5a and 1QM 12:8b–13a

4Q492 fragment 1	1QM 19	1QM 12
<p>1 לַגִּבּוֹרִים כִּי־אֶ</p> <p>2 לְכַסּוֹת־אֶרֶץ</p> <p>3 כְּבוֹד־שׁוֹלָיִ]</p> <p>4 צָרִיכָה וְחֹרֶבֶן] תּוֹאבֵל בִּן־שֹׁר</p> <p>5 וְהָיָה בְּהִלְלוֹתֶיךָ תּוֹאבֵל בֶּשֶׂר] אֶ</p> <p><i>vacat</i></p>	<p>1 [גַּ]בּוֹרִים כִּי־אֶ קְדוֹשׁ אֲדִירֵנוּ וּמֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד</p> <p>2 אֲהֲנוּ וְצָבָא] 2 [ט]ל לְכַסּוֹת אֶרֶץ וּכְזוֹם</p> <p>3 רַבִּימִים לְהַשְׁקוֹת מִשְׁפַּט לְכָ[ל] 3 [וּשׁ]</p> <p>4 וְלֹ שְׁלֹלָה עוֹשֵׂי הֵיל תֵן יִדְכָה בְּעוֹרֵף אוֹיְבֶיךָ</p> <p>5 מֵלֵא אֲרִיצָה כְּבוֹד וְנִחְלָתָה בְּרַכָּה</p> <p>ה[מו] 5 [בְּ]הִלְלוֹתֶיךָ</p>	<p>8b לַגִּבּוֹרִים כִּי־אֶ קְדוֹשׁ אֲדוּנִי וּמֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד אֲהֲנוּ עִם קְדוּשִׁים גְּבוּרֵי] צָבָא</p> <p>9 וְגִבּוֹר הַמִּלְחָמָה] בְּעִדְתָּנוּ יִצְבָּא רֹחֵנוּ עִם צַעֲדֵינוּ</p> <p>10 וְזִכְרוֹם רַבִּימִים לְהַשְׁקוֹת מִשְׁפַּט</p> <p>11 שְׁלֹלָה עוֹשֵׂי הֵיל חֵל</p> <p>12 תּוֹאבֵל בֶּשֶׂר אֲשַׁמָּה מֵלֵא אֲרִיצָה כְּבוֹד וְנִחְלָתָה בְּרַכָּה הַמּוֹן מְקַנָּה</p> <p>וְהָיָה בְּהִלְלוֹתֶיךָ</p>
<p>1 for the mighty ones. F[or ...]</p> <p>2 covering the e[arth ...]</p> <p>3 glorious [...] Seize [...]</p> <p>4 your foes, and [let] Your sword</p> <p>[devour f]esh. F[il] [...]] [... and go]ld in your [pa]laces. <i>vacat</i></p>	<p>1 [...] for the migh]ty ones. For our majestic one is holy, and the glorious king is with us. And the ho[st ...]</p> <p>2 [...] mis]t covering the earth; like a rainstorm watering with judgment all[...] 3 [...] Seiz]e your plunder, (you who do worthily! Put your hand upon the neck of your enemies and your fo[ot ...] 4 yo[ur foes,] and let your sword devour flesh. Fill your land (with) glory, and your inheritance (with) blessing; a mu[ltitude ...] 5 [...] in your palaces.</p>	<p>8b for the mighty ones. For the Lord is holy, and the glorious king is with us, together with the holy ones ... [...] the host of angels (is) among our numbered men, 9 the mighty one of wa[r] (is) in our congregation, and the host of his spirits is with our foot-soldiers and our horsemen, [...] like] rain clouds and like mist covering the earth, 10 like a rainstorm watering (with) judgment all its products. Arise, mighty one! Take your captives, glorious man! Seize 11 your plunder, (you) who do worthily! Put your hand upon the neck of your enemies and your foot upon the piles of the slain! Smite the nations, your foes, and let your sword 12 devour the guilty flesh. Fill your land (with) glory, and your inheritance (with) blessing; a multitude of cattle in your fields; silver, and gold and precious 13 stones in your palac[e]s.</p>

thus, changed it to אֲדוּנִי.¹⁷⁰ In any case, it is probable that it was the scribe of 1QM 12 in particular who is responsible for the change here; it is soon demonstrated that elsewhere as well, he seems to make additions here and there to the text that is known in 1QM 19 and 4Q492.

Table 19 demonstrates that in lines 12:8–9, there is a fourfold parallelism that consists of words denoting God and his hosts (in red) and words denoting the human forces (in green).¹⁷¹

TABLE 19 The structure of 1QM 12:8b–9a

1QM	Text
12:8b α	וּמֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד אֲתָנוּ עִם קְדוּשִׁים
12:8b β	גְּבוּ [] צְבָא מְלָאכִים בְּפִקּוּדֵינוּ
12:9a α	וּגְבוּר הַמְּלָחָה [מֵה] בְּעֵדָתָנוּ
12:9a β	וּצְבָא רוּחֵינוּ עִם צְעֵדֵינוּ וּפְרִשֵׁינוּ

However, there are some words that seem to be superfluous: at the end of the first verse, קְדוּשִׁים probably refers to angels,¹⁷² and as such, it breaks the parallelism. Similarly, גְּבוּ [], which is often reconstructed as גְּבוּרִים, seems to refer to the earthly army and is also problematic in terms of parallelism.¹⁷³ Furthermore, in 4Q492 and 1QM 19 the whole clause that includes these expressions seems to be missing.¹⁷⁴ Without all these words, there is only a brief twofold parallelism left: וּצְבָא רוּחֵינוּ עִם צְעֵדֵינוּ וּפְרִשֵׁינוּ / וּמֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד אֲתָנוּ.

There are at least two options to explain this difference: One is that the authors of 1QM 19 and 4Q492 refer here just briefly to some commonly known hymn that is more extensively quoted in 1QM 12. However, this is difficult to verify since there is no external evidence of or no model for this kind of hymn. A more plausible explanation is that the author of 1QM added the clause

170 One of the standard approaches in text criticism is the case of simplification, i.e., the more difficult reading is earlier. Cf. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001), 302–5.

171 Cf. also Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 279 n. 107.

172 Davies, *1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran*, 102.

173 Cf., e.g., Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 317.

174 See Baillet's reconstruction of 4Q492 (Baillet, DJD 7:45) and Yadin's reconstruction of column 19 (Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 374).

between two verses known in 4Q492 and 1QM 19.¹⁷⁵ Concerning the content, the additional clause emphasizes the divine participation in the war: “we” are “with the holy ones,” and the “glorious king” is paralleled with the “host of angels.” Also, “we” is further defined as a “congregation” and “numbered men,” which makes this group seem more organized. Without the addition, the hymn concentrates on God as a war hero who is promised to be with the troops and encouraged to arise and win, while in the addition the role of the angels is emphasized and the “we” group gets more attention. An intentional aim to emphasize these may be a motivation behind the addition as well. Many of the words of the additional clause also occur in the preceding passage in 1QM, namely the text in lines 1–6 (cf. מלאכים, קדושים, פקד, צבא) and thus it can be argued that the clause was composed on the basis of the preceding passage, which formed a new context for this hymn and to which the author wanted to link the text. This, however, remains uncertain because it is not known whether this passage was part of the text of 4Q492, and the beginning of 1QM 19 is not preserved either. However, the whole line *vacat* in 1QM 12:6 leads to the hypothesis that the text passage that is parallel to 4Q492/1QM 19 and the passage before it probably come from different sources.

Another significant difference appears in line 12 of 1QM 12 where the text reads *בשר אשמה* “guilty flesh” while 1QM 19 and 4Q492 have at the corresponding point just *בשר* “flesh.” This point belongs to the text part which consists of six exhortations, all beginning with a verb in imperative form (cf. 1QM 12:10b–12a). In Table 20, these imperative forms are marked in red and the objects, all containing a second person pronominal suffix, are marked in green.

TABLE 20 The structure of 1QM 12:10b–12a

1QM	Text
12:10bα	קומה גבור
12:10bβ	שבה שביכה איש כבוד
12:10bγ–11aα	ושול שללכה עושי חיל
12:11aβ	תן ידכה בעורף אויביכה ורגלכה על במותי חלל
12:11b–12aα	מחץ גוים צריכה וחרבכה תואכל בשר אשמה
12:12aβ	מלא ארצכה כבוד ונחלתכה ברכה

175 Cf. Schultz, who interprets the clause *עם קדושים גבו*] [צבא מלאכים בעדתנו וגבור] as an addition; see *Conquering the World*, 279.

The table shows that mostly the verses loosely follow a similar structure: the imperative form usually takes one or two suffixed objects. In lines 12:11b–12aα, however, there is an exception: an imperative form and its object are followed by another verb, in imperfect (תואכל; jussive in meaning). This exceptional sentence is also the one where the difference appears. In addition to the verbal form atypical in its context, the agent is not the war hero as in the other sentences but “his sword” that may devour flesh or guilty flesh. For all this, it is difficult to gauge whether there was any conscious structure used to which אשמה would either belong or not.¹⁷⁶ Davies suggests אשמה is an addition with which the author of 1QM 12 makes the picture of the enemy more biased.¹⁷⁷ This is one option to explain the difference – and perhaps the exceptional sentence made it easy to place the addition particularly where it is. In 1QM, אשמה occurs most often in the columns which form the context of the battle cry in 1QM 12.¹⁷⁸ Therefore, another option could be that, by adding אשמה, the author of 1QM 12 aimed to link the text more clearly to its present context. Also, the two explanations are not mutually exclusive.

At the end of the first hymn, the war hero is urged, again using a parallelistic structure, to fill his land with glory and his inheritance with blessing. In practice, this abundance means “a multitude of cattle in your fields” and “silver and gold in your palaces.” In 1QM 12, silver and gold do not seem to be enough and the author also enumerates אבני הפך “precious stones.”¹⁷⁹ It is clear that at least אבני הפך is something added in comparison to 4Q492 since there, the palaces follow directly after gold. The word “silver” is not preserved either in 4Q492 or in 1QM 19 and in 1QM 12 it is written above line 12, just before gold. However, it can be plausibly reconstructed in 4Q492 and 1QM 19, unlike אבני הפך.¹⁸⁰ What

176 Elsewhere in M texts, אשמה is often related to the slain or to corpses (4Q491b fragments 1–3, line 13; 4Q491a fragment 11 column 2 line 23; 1QM 6:17; 1QM 14:13) where it seems to be linked with known rules of purity. Sometimes it occurs as denoting a more general phenomenon, iniquity which is to be annihilated (1QM 11:11, 13:15) and once it is linked with Belial (1QM 13:4). All in all, אשמה always denotes something negative.

177 Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 32, 103. According to Davies, אשמה emphasizes the “ethical” qualities of the two sides of the battle. See also Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 212, 216–17) who argues that adding the word אשמה is a “theological” addition which emphasizes that those who die by the sword die for their sin.

178 Five of the six occurrences of אשמה in 1QM are in columns 11–14.

179 Cf. Isa 54:12 where אבני־הפך are mentioned.

180 Cf. Baillet (DJD 7:45), who reconstructs silver and gold in lines 4–5 of 4Q492 fragment 1. However, there is no consensus reached in this case: Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 349) reconstructs both silver and gold and precious stones in 1QM 19 line 5; and Eshel and Eshel (“Recensions of the War Scroll,” 352) argue that the fact that in 1QM 12, “silver” is inscribed between the lines “might point to the possibility that this word was inserted from another source,” i.e., not from 4Q492/1QM 19.

should also be noted is that אבני הפץ seems disconnected relative to the balanced parallelistic structure: as Table 21 shows, the second parts of the parallelism contain similar numbers of syllables, the first parts differ from each other as regards their length. This might indicate that אבני הפץ was something extra.

TABLE 21 Parallelism in 1QM 12:12b–13a

First part of parallelism	Second part of parallelism
המון מקנה	בחלקותיכה
כסף וזהב ואבני הפץ	בהיכלותיכה

But if אבני הפץ is an addition in 1QM 12, where does it come from? It is a quite rare expression in general; in the Hebrew Bible, it occurs only once, in Isa 54:12. This chapter of Isaiah calls on Jerusalem to rejoice – just as the part in 1QM 12 that follows the mention of אבני הפץ (lines 13b–16). In the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, אבני הפץ occurs almost exclusively in 1QM: once here in column 12 and three times in column 5.¹⁸¹ On the basis of this information, three possible explanations for adding אבני הפץ in 1QM 12 present themselves: 1) the author wants to relate the text to Isaiah and thus adds elements from Isa 54; 2) the author wants to link the text more clearly to the present context and adds elements from the first parts of 1QM; 3) the author wants to do both. Also, it is possible that the author did not consider gold and silver to be enough for his purposes but wanted to add the precious stones which possibly bore some cultural significance in the author's social context. However, this assumption is difficult to verify. Instead, the next parts of 1QM 12 and its parallels will show that the possible links between Isaiah and 1QM 12 are not limited to here and that the second option, connecting the text more clearly to the 1QM context, is also relevant from the point of view of the following text passages.

2.1.2 The Second and the Third Poetic Passages

The next two text passages can be discussed together, especially because in 1QM 12 and 19 they are not separated by *vacats*. Table 22 introduces the three versions of these passages. Again, red indicates the lexical parallels between 4Q492 fragment 1 and 1QM passages and green reflects the lexical parallels between the two 1QM passages.

¹⁸¹ In addition to these, cf. only 4Q525 3 iii 3.

TABLE 22 The texts of 4Q492, lines 5b–8a; 1QM 19:5b–8 and 1QM 12:13b–16

4Q492	1QM 19	1QM 12
<i>Second poetic passage</i>		
<p>5b צִיּוֹן שְׂמַחַי מְאֹד־וּ 6 שְׁעָרֶיךָ תָּמִיד לְהִבְיָא אֵלַי [יָד] חֵיל גוֹיִם וְמַלְכֵיהֶם יִשְׂרָתוּךָ וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ 7 רְגְלֶיךָ יִלְחָבוּ <i>vacat</i></p>	<p>5b צִיּוֹן שְׂמַחַי מוֹאדָה וְהִגְלָנָה כּוֹל עָרֵי יְהוּדָה [] 6 חֵיל גּוֹיִם וּמַלְכֵיהֶם יִשְׂרָתוּךָ וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לָךְ [כּוֹן] 7 [מַעֲנִי]ךָ</p>	<p>13b צִיּוֹן שְׂמַחַי מוֹאדָה וְהוֹפִיעֵי בְרִנּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם וְהִגְלָנָה כּוֹל עָרֵי יְהוּדָה פְּתַח־יָדְךָ תָּמִיד לְהִבְיָא אֵלַיךָ חֵיל גּוֹיִם וּמַלְכֵיהֶם יִשְׂרָתוּךָ וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לָךְ כּוֹל מַעֲנִיךָ וְעַפְרָךְ 15 רְגְלֶיךָ יִלְחָבוּ</p>
<p>5b Zion, rejoice greatly [...] 6 your gates continually, so that may be brought to [you] the wealth of the nations. Their kings shall serve you and [shall bow down ...] 7 they shall lick from your feet. <i>vacat</i></p>	<p>5b Zion, rejoice greatly! Be glad all you, cities of Ju[dah! ...] 6 [...] the wealth of the nations! Their kings shall serve you, [al] [your oppressors] shall bow down before you,</p>	<p>13b Zion, rejoice greatly! Shine forth in jubilation, Jerusalem. Be glad, all you, cities of Judah! Open 14 your gate[s] continu- ally, so that through them may be brought to you the wealth of the nations! Their kings shall serve you, all your oppressors shall bow down before you and 15a [lick] the dust [from your feet]</p>
<i>Third poetic passage</i>		
<p>בְּנוֹת עַמִּי הִבְעֵנָה [בְּ] קוֹל רִנָּה עֲדִינָה] 8 לְמַחְנִיכָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְמַלְכוּת עוֹלָמִים</p>	<p>7 [] בְּנוֹת עַמִּי הִבְעֵנָה בְּקוֹל רְנָה עֲדִינָה עֲדֵי כְבוֹד וּרְדִינָה [יָנָה בְּמַלְכוּת 8 [] לְמַחְנִיכָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְמַלְכוּת עוֹלָמִים <i>vacat</i></p>	<p>15b בְּנוֹת עַמִּי צְרַחְנָה בְּקוֹל רְנָה עֲדִינָה עֲדֵי כְבוֹד וּרְדִינָה בְּ[מ] [לְ]כוֹת [] 16 [] וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְמַלּוּךְ עוֹלָמִים <i>vacat</i></p>
<p>Daughters of my people, burst [into] a voice of jubilation! Deck yourselves [...] 8 to your camps and Israel for an eternal</p>	<p>7 [...] Daughters of my people, burst into a voice of jubilation! Deck yourselves with glorious ornaments! Have do[mi]nion over the kingdoms of 8 [... to] your [camp]s and Israel for an [et]ernal dominion. <i>vacat</i></p>	<p>15b Daughter]s of my people, shout with a voice of jubilation! Deck yourselves with glorious ornaments! Have dominion over [the ki]n[gdoms ...] 16 [... I]srael (in order) to reign forever. <i>vacat</i></p>

At the beginning of the song, 1QM 12 again includes more text than 4Q492 and 1QM 19: not only are Zion and Judah urged to rejoice, but also Jerusalem. It may be noteworthy that Zion and Judah are rare words in 1QM: in addition to column 12, Judah occurs only once (see 1:2) and Zion nowhere else. In contrast, Jerusalem is a bit more frequent – five occurrences altogether – and it occurs again in 1QM 12:17, right after the end of the part that is parallel to 4Q492 and 1QM 19. This may mean that by inserting it into line 13 the author of 1QM 12 wanted to link the hymn more clearly to its current context. What should also be noted is that in the Hebrew Bible, Zion and the cities of Judah occur together every now and then in the Psalms (e.g., Ps 48:11, 69:35, 97:8) but more often, Zion and Jerusalem are paralleled, especially in Isaiah (e.g., 2:3, 4:3, 10:32, 31:9, 37:22, 52:1–2, 62:1, 64:10; cf. also Psalms, Lamentations, Twelve Minor Prophets). In Isaiah, there is also one verse in which all three occur together. Isa 40:9 reads:

על הר־גבה עלי־לך מבשרת ציון הרימי בכח קולך מבשרת ירושלם הרימי אל־תיראי
אמרי לערי יהודה הנה אלהיכם:

Get you up to a high mountain, O Zion, herald of good tidings; lift up your voice with strength, O Jerusalem, herald of good tidings, lift it up, do not fear; say to the cities of Judah, "Here is your God!"

Thus, it is quite possible that the author of 1QM 12 wanted to make a link here to wordings known in Isaiah.

In the third part of the text, there are no more additions but some differences between 4Q492/1QM 19 and 1QM 12 still occur. In line 15 of column 12, the cities are called to rejoice by using the verb צרח while in 1QM 19 and 4Q492, this is expressed with the verb נבע (*hiphil*). The verb צרח is rare and occurs only a few times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls (1QH^a 11:33; 4Q418 fragment 69, column 2, line 7) and in the Hebrew Bible (Isa 42:13, Zeph 1:14).¹⁸² Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel have noted that in the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a), the use of the verb צרח is secondary in comparison to the verb צווח in the Masoretic text of Isaiah (42:11). On the basis of this, they conclude that צרח in column 12 is also secondary to נבע in column 19.¹⁸³ Thus, the difference can be explained

182 נבע is not common either but it still occurs more often than צרח: 11 times in the Hebrew Bible and 11 times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, mostly in *hiphil*.

183 Eshel and Eshel, "Recensions of the War Scroll," 353. According to Eshel and Eshel, the one who first demonstrated that the usage of צרח is secondary in Isa 42:11 was

by supposing that, again, the author of 1QM 12 acted with the text of Isaiah in mind, this time Isa 42:11 where different places are the actors (e.g., towns and villages) – just as in 1QM 12 the towns are the actors (daughters of my people refers here to affiliated towns of the city).¹⁸⁴ This suggestion is very difficult to verify, but since this is not the only possible link to the text of Isaiah and since it is as difficult to find other explanations for this difference, it can be considered at least as possible.

In line 16, 1QM 12 reads למלוך עולמים “to reign forever,” using a verbal form, while in 1QM 19 and 4Q492 there is a substantive, למלכות עולמים “eternal dominion.” Unfortunately, the whole clause is not preserved in any of the three texts. The fullest reconstruction that can be made is למחניכה [...] ורדינה במלכות עולמים (in order) to reign forever.”). Evidently, the cities are urged to rule over other kingdoms – which fits together with the idea of other people’s kings serving Zion already introduced in 14b–15a. But after that it is difficult to figure out what the content of the final clause was and whether Israel is now the one who reigns or the one who is reigned over. It is possible that this vagueness was already present in the text before it was partly damaged and the author of 1QM 12 now tries to make it clearer. However, due to the fragmentariness of all texts at this point, explaining the difference must remain speculative.

2.1.3 The Fourth Passage

The fourth text passage, preserved both in 4Q492 and 1QM 19, which discusses the morning after the battle and is reminiscent of battle instructions known in 1QM 15–17 and in 4Q491a, is not parallel to 1QM 12, which continues, instead, with one more hymn. However, the morning after the battle is discussed later in 1QM, in column 14 lines 2–4. Table 23 shows that, while 1QM 14:2–4a is not closely parallel to 4Q492/1QM 19, it still shares many lexical elements with them and the main structure of the texts is similar.

First, instructions to return to the camp overnight are given; second, the soldiers are urged to return to the place of the battle line in the morning and it is stated that the place is the one where the slain of the enemy fell; and third, the soldiers are urged to praise the God of Israel there. At the same time, while in

Harry M. Orlinsky, “Studies in the St. Mark’s Isaiah Scroll II,” *JNES* 11 (1952), 153–56. Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 213, 216) argues as well that נבע is substituted for צרך in 1QM 12.

184 Hanna Vanonen, “בת” (daughter), in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten, Band I*, ed. H.-J. Fabry and U. Damen (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011), 548–52.

4Q492/1QM 19 the enemy is further defined as the “mighty men of Kittim,” the “multitude of Ashur,” and the “army of all the nations,” in 1QM 14 the enemy is just an enemy. Also, whereas 4Q492 and 1QM 19 mention the “chief priest,” the “chiefs of the lines,” and the “numbered men,” in 1QM 14 no special attention is paid to their own military personnel. What is distinctive in 1QM 14 is that the focus is on making oneself ritually clean after battle – a theme that is not taken notice of in 4Q492/1QM 19. However, despite these differences, it seems clear that a common pattern of the morning after the battle is expressed, albeit in modified form, in these passages.

Between the hymn in column 12 and the instructions in column 14, there are blessings and curses and at least one thanksgiving hymn. This section, beginning at the end of column 12 and continuing as far as line 14:1 has been considered to be a later interpolation in 1QM. Among others, Duhaime has suggested this and argued for his proposal by referring to the comparison between columns 12–14 and 19.¹⁸⁵ Duhaime notes that the text passages from columns 12 and 14 “follow each other without interruption in column 19,”¹⁸⁶ and thus he concludes it to be probable that lines 12:17–14:1 form an interpolation.¹⁸⁷ The content of lines 12:17–14:1 gives further arguments for this interpretation: the commander of light (שר מאור) occurs only here in 1QM,¹⁸⁸ and Belial is discussed more extensively than in any other 1QM column. In addition, although it seems that Belial and the commander of light are on opposing sides, there

185 Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 44. Duhaime refers here to Jürgen Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in Qumran und im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), who already earlier suggested that 1QM 13 is an interpolation. In his article, Duhaime argues that lines 13:9b–12a are an addition in the text of column 13. According to him, this is indicated by the duplication of a clause in lines 9b–10a and 12b (ובגורל אמתכה נשמ / ובגורל אור הפלתנו לאמתכה) and also by the fact that without lines 9b–12a, the surrounding text could still be read as a coherent hymn. In addition, Duhaime argues that lines 9b–12a introduce new terms and give the text a “dualistic tone” that otherwise is not there. However, the addition that promoted the idea of the commander of light was not readily acceptable since the idea of a heavenly mediator may have been seen as conflicting with the idea that God himself participated in the war and there was no need for any intermediators between God and his people. This conflict was the reason why lines 9b–12a were “bracketed” – as Duhaime puts it – by lines 1–6 and 13b–16 in which God himself is the opponent of Belial. See Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 44–46.

186 Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 44.

187 Davies concludes as well that column 13 existed as an independent fragment before being included in the composition of 1QM. However, in Davies’ theory, column 14 was also an originally independent fragment. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 123.

188 However, some scholars have identified the prince of light with the character that occurs in column 17:6–7. See van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 152.

4Q492	1QM 19	1QM 14
<p>8ב ואחר יאספו המחנה בלילה] 9 [וב]בוקר יבואו עד מקום המערכה אשר נפלו שם גבורי בת[ים] והמו[ן] 10 מ[תו] רוב הלל[ים] לא[ן] מ[קב] אשר נפלו שם בה[ר]ב[א]ל] 11 [והלויים] המערכות] 12 [יחד בעומדם על הלל[ים]] א[ת] אל שראל ו] 13 [ללא עליין ו] ל[] [] [] ל[] [] [] []</p>	<p>8b ואחר יאספו המחנה בלילה] 9 ובבוקר יבואו עד מקום המערכה אשר נפלו שם גבורי בתים והמונים והלויים 10 הנקהלים אמר 11 נפלו שם בחרב אל וגשש כוחן הרב אשר 12 מלחמה וכל אשר המערכות ופקודיהם] 13 [על[ח] לל[ח] בתים והללו שם את אל[ה] 14 [] [] [] []</p>	<p>2 ואחר העלותם מעל החללים לבוא המתנה ידנו 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 ורוממו שמו בידח שמחה וענו ואמרו</p>
<p>Then they shall gather (to) the camp, at night [...] 9 [In the] morning they shall come to the place of the line, where the mighty men of the Kittim had fallen, and the multitude of [...] a large number of slain were [dead with no burial], they who had fallen there by the sword of God. 11 [...] and the Levites [...] and all the chiefs of the lines [...] together where they stand, beside the slain [...] the God of Israel [...] 13 [...] to God (the) Most High and [...] [...] [...]</p>	<p>9 [(to) the ca]mp, [at] n[ight] to rest until the morning. In the morning [...] they shall come to the [p]lace of the line 10 [...] the mi]ghty men of Kittim, the multitude of Ashur, and the army of all the nations [a] ssembled (to see) if [...]... slain 11 [...] had fallen there by the sword of God. There, the chi[ef] priest shall draw near [...] [...] 12 [...] of] the war and all the chiefs of the lines and [their] numbered men [...] 13 [...] bes] ide [the s]lain of the Kittim.] They [shall p]raise there th[e] God of [...] 14 [...] [...] [...]</p>	<p>2 When they have departed from the slain to enter the camp, they shall all sing the hymn of the return. In the morning they shall clean their garments and wash themselves 3 of the blood of the guilty corpses. They shall return to the place where they had taken position, where they had arrayed the line before the slain of the enemy had fallen. They shall bless there 4 all together the God of Israel and they shall exalt his name in a joyful community. They shall speak up, saying, (continues)</p>

occurs hardly any vocabulary concerning warfare in column 13. A day of battle is mentioned once (line 14) but in this expression, the author uses the unusual word קרב. In addition to this, קרב occurs only once in 1QM (line 1:9),¹⁸⁹ while the more familiar word מלחמה occurs in every 1QM column except for 13. These thematic and lexical features do not diminish suspicions that lines 12:17–14:1 would be an interpolation. In addition, what may also be noteworthy is that in column 13 there seem to be fewer references to the texts known from the Hebrew Bible than in columns 10–12 and 14. Instead, in column 13, there are many references to other columns of 1QM (cf. 13:1a and 15:4; 13:1b and 14:4, 16:6; 13:7 and 12:7; 13:12 and 15:10; 13:13 and 10:8; 13:14 and 1:9), which might indicate the author had some 1QM material at hand.

All in all, it seems likely that the text material in 1QM lines 12:17–14:1 is an interpolation, probably created in order to introduce a new character, the commander of light, and to emphasize the contraposition of this heavenly figure and Belial. One reasonable option is that this interpolation was formed on the basis of the text preserved in 1QM 14 and in 4Q491a fragments 8–10. First, there seem to be structural similarities between columns 13 and 14: Both start with a rubric (13:1–2a, 14:2–4a) unlike the hymns in the previous three columns (10–12). After the rubric, column 13 (2b–6) continues with praising God with blessings (and cursing Belial) and column 14 (4b–8a) with a hymn praising God. These two sections begin by calling God the “God of Israel” (13:1b; 14:4a) – an expression that is rare in the Hebrew Bible – and God is referred to in the third person. Finally, both columns end with the hymns addressing God in the second person (13:7–17, 14:8b–15). In addition to this, especially passages 13:7–9a and 14:8b–15 (excluding the passage concerning Belial and his lot in lines 14:9b–12a)¹⁹⁰ share many terms. Table 24 demonstrates these similarities.

2.1.4 Summary

On the basis of the analysis above, it seems clear that of the three main texts that were compared – 4Q492 fragment 1, 1QM 12:7–16 and 1QM 19 – the latest one is 1QM 12: the author of 1QM 12 added clauses to the text known in 4Q492/1QM 19 and also made some changes in it. The number and richness of the additions make it unlikely that the additions were unintentional; rather it is plausible that they were made on purpose.¹⁹¹ At least three possible motiva-

189 In the Hebrew Bible, this word occurs most often in the expression “the day of the battle” as in 1QM 13: see Job 38:23, Ps 78:9, Zech 14:3. However, see also Dan 7:21 and Ecc 9:18.

190 Note also that after lines 13:7–9a there comes a description of the prince of light and Belial. Lines 14:9b–12a are also focused on Belial and his lot but the prince of light is not mentioned.

191 Cf. also Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 216.

TABLE 24 Lexical similarities between 1QM 13:7–9a and 1QM 14:8b–15

1QM 13	1QM 14
<p>7 וא[ת]ה אל אבותינו שמכה נברכה לעולמים ואנו עם [] ל[] וברית [כ]רתה לאבותינו ותקימה לזרעם 8 למוע[ד]י עולמים ובכול תעודות כבודכה היה זכר [] כה בקרבנו לעזר שארית ומחיה לבריתכה 9 ולס[פר] מעשי אמתכה ומשפטי גבורות פלאכה</p>	<p>ואנו שא[רית] ברוך] שמכה אל החסדים השומר ברית לאבותינו ועם 9 כול דורותינו הפלתה חסדיכה לשא[ר]ית [בממשלת בליעל ובכול רזי שטמתו לוא הדיחונ[ו] 10 מבריתכה ורוחי [ח]בלו גערתה ממ[נו] ובהתרשע אנ[שי] ממשלתו שמיתתה נפש פדותכה ואתה הקימותה 11 נופלים בעוזכה ורמי קומה תגד[ע] לכול גבוריהם אין מציל ולקליהם אין מנוס ולנכבדיהם 12 תשיב לבו וכול יקום הבלי[הם] א[י]ן</p> <p>ואנו עם קודשכה במעשי אמתכה נהללה שמכה 13 ובגבורותיכה נרוממה ת[] עתים ומועדי תעודות עולמים עם מ[בו] א יומם ולילה 14 ומוצאי ערב ובוקר כיא גדולה מ[חשבת כבו] דכה ורזי נפלאותיכה במרומי[כה] ל[ה] רי[ם] לכה מעפר 15 ולהשפיל מאלים vacat</p>
<p>7 Y[o]u, O God of our fathers, we bless your name for ever! We are a people [...] ... [...].... You have [est]ablished a covenant with our fathers and confirmed it with their descendants 8 through the appointed ti[me]s of eternity. In all your glorious fixed times there was a memorial of your [...] in our midst for the help of the remnant and the preservation of your covenant, 9 and to re[count] your truthful works of truth and the judgments of your wonderful might</p>	<p>We are the remna[nt.... Blessed be] your name, O merciful God, you who keep the covenant with our fathers and with 9 all our generations! You have shown through wonders your mercy for the remna[nt ...] during the dominion of Belial.</p> <p>With all the mysteries of his hatred, he has not drawn [us] away 10 from your covenant; you have driven his spirits of [des]truction away from[us. When the me]n of his dominion [were acting wickedly], you kept the soul of your redeemed. You have raised up 11 the fallen by your vigor, but the (men) of high stature you have hew[en] down....] For all their mighty men there is no savior, for their swift ones there is no refuge. To their nobles 12 you render contempt. All [their] creatures of vanity [... no]thing.</p> <p>We, your holy people, because of your truthful works, shall praise your name, 13 and because of your might, shall exalt ... [...] epochs and appointed times of the everlasting fixed times, with the ar[ri]val of the day and night, 14 and the departures of the evening and morning. For great is your [gloriou]s p[lan]. The mysteries of your wonderful acts are in [your] heights to r[ais]e up to you those from the dust 15 and to bring low among the divine beings. vacat</p>

tions have appeared: the additions and changes could be made 1) in order to fit the text better to its present context, 2) in order to link the text more closely to some “biblical” ideals, or 3) in order to implant some new ideas or to emphasize or to clarify some ideas already presented in the text. As is soon explicated, these three options are not mutually exclusive.

All the additions can be explained by the author’s aim to link the text more clearly to its present context. Especially the largest additions in lines 12:8b–9a and 12:13b contain vocabulary that is also known in the near context. Furthermore, the shorter additions in lines 12:12a and 12:12b–13a can be explained as repeating the terminology known elsewhere in 1QM, but in these cases the references must be sought in the wider context of the scroll. The additions in lines 12:12b–13a and 12:13b and the change in line 12:15 can also be explained by the influence of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40–55), especially its text as it was found at Qumran (1QIsa^a). This explanation can easily be linked to the previous one: since the hymns are now preceded by 1QM columns 10–11, columns full of “biblical” references, it is possible that the author wanted to increase the links to “biblical” texts in the hymns. As noted above, 1QM seems to reflect similar tendency when transmitting the material from manuscript 4Q491a. The reason for this may be that the author of 1QM had a different audience in his mind; he wanted to avoid any impression of experimentation and instead, to show the war material in continuation with the well-known “biblical” traditions.

If the additions and changes are scrutinized from the contentual point of view, they can be explained by the author’s aim to emphasize the role of the angels, to further define the “we” group, to make the image of the enemies more biased and possibly to clarify the role of Jerusalem and Israel. It should be noted that apart from the last-mentioned one, all these motivations were also discerned when the author’s work with manuscript 4Q491a was analyzed above. The ongoing discussion of the role of the angels is also reflected by 1QM 13 which probably was a late part of the composition of 1QM. Thus, it is well possible that, for example, adding column 13 in its present context inspired the addition in lines 12:8b–9a. In this case, the first and the third explanation blend in with each other.

All in all, although it is not possible to determine conclusively why each of the additions and changes was made, most of the explanations seem to return to the first explanation, the aim to link the text to its present context. The material shows clearly that the hymns known in 4Q492/1QM 19/1QM 12 and the instructions known in 4Q492/1QM 19/1QM 14 were transmitted both without the text material now known in column 13 between them and with it. It would actually be surprising if transmitting a hymn to different contexts would not lead to any modifications. Interpreting 1QM 13 as an interpolation also gives

a reason for having the hymns of 4Q492/1QM 19/1QM 12 twice in 1QM: a well-known framework was used in order to incorporate new material.

What should also be noted is that while the analysis above demonstrates that the text in 1QM 13 is probably later material in considering the development of 1QM to its present form, at the same time, 4Q495 fragment 2 (cf. Chapter 5 below) is probably a close parallel to 1QM 13 lines 9b–12a, the passage where the commander of light appears. This indicates that the commander of light was not a completely unique idea but was copied during the second half of the first century. However, what can be noted is that the material that was not completely stabilized often seems to concern angels (cf. e.g., the material in column 13 which sometimes occurs between hymns and instructions and sometimes not and the discussion on the so-called Self-Glorification Hymn in Section 1.2 and Section 1.5 above). Perhaps the idea with the communion between human and divine beings was a theme that was thought to allow if not even call for a creative work.¹⁹²

Some observations can also be made just by comparing 4Q492 fragment 1 and 1QM 19. They seem to preserve similar text but in 4Q492, there are some *vacats* that do not occur in 1QM. What may be noteworthy is that in the end part of the text, the additions and changes made in 1QM 12 are located near these *vacats*, 1–3 words before or after them. This leads to the hypothesis that the large space between the lines and the added *vacats* in 4Q492 may indicate that it was some kind of working copy in which the text was written in order to sketch the places for forthcoming changes and additions.¹⁹³ As noted at the

192 The interest in angels was strong in late Second Temple times in general and the Dead Sea Scrolls are no exception. Several Qumran texts reflect the idea that human beings can reach the communion with angels in this world and to act together with them. About this, see e.g., Cecilia Wassen, “Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings: Origins, Development and Reception*, ed. F.V. Reiterer, T. Nicklas, and K. Schöpflin (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 499–523 (515, 519) who mentions examples from, e.g., 1QS, 1QH^a and 11Q14, and Peter Schäfer, “Communion with the Angels: Qumran and the Origins of Jewish Mysticism,” in *Wege mystischer Gotteserfahrung. Mystical Approaches to God*, ed. P. Schäfer, *Schriften des Historischen Kollegs* 65 (München: Oldenbourg, 2006), 37–66 (64). In the War Texts, this idea is present as well and the communion between human and divine is an intrinsic part of the warfare (see also 4Q491a, 4Q493). In addition, the idea of God fighting with and for his people was important and the supremacy of God was not to be threatened (about this, cf. also Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 55–56). These viewpoints are clearly visible in 1QM 13 where the angelic character, the commander of light is introduced and almost right after that, the power of the angels is called into question and God’s supremacy is emphasized (see line 14: “Who, be he an angel or a commander, is like the help of ... [...].”

193 It must be emphasized that this is a hypothesis; there is no clear evidence that ancient scribes worked like this. However, since there is so little evidence preserved in general,

beginning of this chapter, the leather of the manuscript was probably of low quality. Perhaps the manuscript was an interim copy in the process where the text known in 1QM 19 was transmitted in the new context in 1QM 12.¹⁹⁴

3 Summary of 4Q491a and 4Q492

Both 4Q491a and 4Q492 contain some amount of relatively well-preserved text material that can be defined as closely parallel to some parts of 1QM. Manuscripts show that the battle instructions known especially in 1QM 16–17 and the hymns known in 1QM 14 and 12/19 were quite well stabilized, although while transmitting them it was still possible to make changes. By contrast, especially the encouragement speeches and those hymns that discussed divine beings and their participation in the war were not considered to be stabilized – especially the speeches were open to rewriting and even replacement and they were used as a template for a creative literary work. While 1QM is a manuscript that clearly aims to gather and organize text material, 4Q491a and 4Q492 were probably targeted at a smaller and more exclusive group of people and were used while studying the tradition and testing different ideas.

conjectures of this kind must be allowed in order to further the scholarly discussion. When the study in the field of manuscript studies advances, this hypothesis can be re-assessed.

194 Note that in the case of S manuscripts, it is suggested that 4QTestimonia (4Q175) may have played a similar role in relation to 1QS as 4Q492 is here suggested to play in relation to 1QM. Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 22) notes that in DJD 5 (p. 58), John M. Allegro suggests that the scribe of 1QS also copied 4Q175; see also Eibert 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. S.M. Paul et al., VTSup 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 439–52. Tigchelaar (“In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” 452) has further suggested that this scribe may have composed the text in 1QS 9:3–11 on the basis of 4Q175 or, alternatively, compiled the biblical quotations of 1QS into 4Q175. If the first option is true, the process reminds us of what is hypothesized here of 4Q492 and 1QM – although the theory introduced here does not necessarily presuppose one and the same scribe for 4Q492 and 1QM. Note, however, the critical comments concerning Tigchelaar’s suggestion introduced by Jutta Jokiranta (“What is ‘Serekh ha-Yahad (S),’” 628–30).

4Q491b (4QM^{a/b}) and 4Q493 (4QM^c): Unestablished War Visions

In this chapter, relatively well-preserved manuscripts that do not have close textual overlaps with other War Text material but that, from a thematic point of view, clearly represent War Texts, are put under close scrutiny. As in the previous chapter, the content of the manuscripts is assessed both as it is and in comparison with parallel material.

1 4Q491b (4QM^{a/b})

As already noted, in this study the manuscript that is called 4Q491b includes (Baillet's) fragments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23 of 4Q491.¹ From a physical perspective, the manuscript is reminiscent of 4Q491a: the script is either Hasmonean or early Herodian, the line height is relatively narrow, about 4 mm, and the letters are small, about 2 mm high.² The skin is of average thickness and light beige in color. No complete columns have been preserved but there are some margins visible.

Abegg notes the fact that fragments 1, 2 and 3 – which Baillet has joined together although there is no material connection between them³ – seem to form an ensemble in which a line could contain over 130 letters or spaces.⁴ This is a very unusual line width within the Dead Sea Scrolls,⁵ and thus Abegg doubts whether the lines of 4Q491b 1–3 can be so long.⁶ However, Abegg

1 On dividing the manuscript 4Q491 in two, see Section 1.1 of Chapter 2 above.

2 Baillet, DJD 7:12; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 3, 12.

3 Baillet, DJD 7:13–14. Baillet notes that fragment 1 consists of five pieces and fragment 2 of seven pieces. According to him, it seems certain that all these pieces form a coherent unity although the lines of the manuscript become very long. However, the location of fragment 3 is uncertain for Baillet.

4 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 35.

5 Cf. Abegg's (“The War Scroll,” 36) list of line widths in some non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. Abegg also notes that 5QDeut is the only known Biblical scroll which has quite long lines – and they contain about 83–88 letters or spaces per line.

6 Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 36) remarks, for example, that the estimate of the line width is based on “the often-conjectural joins of thirteen fragments.”

accepts Baillet's joins for the purpose of his dissertation since lines 8 and 18 can be plausibly reconstructed with the help of 1QM 7 (line 6 and lines 9–11).⁷ Duhaime, similarly, follows Baillet's edition and reads fragments 1–3 together. According to him, the contents of fragments 1 and 2 are so similar that they must belong together. Fragment 3, by contrast, is a bit different as regards the content, but it also shares terminology with fragment 1, and fragments 1 and 3 both represent the upper part of the manuscript.⁸ In addition, Duhaime argues that there are some material reasons to join fragments 2 and 3:

... one may even wonder if the spot at the left of line 7 on fragment 3 is the remains of the bottom part of a ζ , the upper part of which is to be read at the beginning of the corresponding line of fragment 2.⁹

Yishay edits fragments 1, 2 and 3 separately¹⁰ but remarks that they deal with common issues.¹¹

All in all, scholars have previously argued for the unity of fragments 1–3 mainly on the basis of the content. However, there are further material arguments to bring forward. Although this ensemble consists of three different fragments and 13 different pieces, the fragments do not include distant joins. All fragments are inscribed in a dense script: there are numerous lines and a considerable amount of text in each line – and this already leads one to think that the fragments may belong together. When they are read in conjunction with each other, it can be observed that the space between the lines does not vary, which supports joining them as one manuscript. Also, the right margin is in view and seems to be fairly straight. Considering all this, there is no particular reason to call Baillet's arrangement of the fragments into question.

In the following, the best-preserved fragments of 4Q491b are discussed one by one. The fragments are presented in numerical order, according to the numbers Baillet gave them. The main focus is on the best-preserved fragments 1–3.¹²

7 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 36.

8 Duhaime, "War Scroll," 142.

9 Duhaime, "War Scroll," 142.

10 Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 29, 49–50, 68.

11 Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 26.

12 An earlier version of the analysis of fragments 1–3 was published in an article called "Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of the S and M Documents" by Jutta Jokiranta and me; see *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries*, 11–60. Although the article was a joint project, I wrote the original version of the section discussing 4Q491b independently.

6 וזה הַסֵּרֹךְ בַּחֲנוּתָמָה וְבַּ [וּבַח] לִיקוּתָמָה מִ [מִיָּמִים סְבִיבָה מְחוּץ]¹⁶ ◦
 [וְאִשָּׁה וְנָעַר זַעֲטוּט וְכוּל אִישׁ מִנּוּ] גַּע
 7 הַמַּעַר [כֹּה וְאִנְשֵׁי הַחֲרָשׁ] וְהַ [מְצַ] רֶף וּפְקוּדִים לֵהִיּוֹת הִנֵּן [מִמֶּנּוּ]¹⁷
 [סִיאִיָּהֶם לְמַשְׁמֵרוֹתָמָה בֵּן] ◦ [הַמַּעֲרָכָה עַד שׁוֹבְמָה vacat וְאֵלֶּפִים אִמָּה יֵהִיָּה
 בֵּין הַ] מַחֲנוֹת
 8 עָרוּה לֹא יִרְאֶה סְבִיבוֹתֵיהֶם [הַ] וְבִצְאָתָמָה לַעֲרוֹךְ הַמַּלְחָמָה [לֵהֵכֵן] גִּיעַ [אֹיִב]
 מֵהֶמָּה פְטוּרֵי [ם] [עֲאִיָּהֶם] בַּגִּ [ו] לֵל לְשִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂבֵּט¹⁸ לְפִיא פְקוּדֵיו לְדַבֵּר יוֹם]
 9 הַיּוֹם הַהוּאָה מְכוּל שְׁבִטֵיהֶם [י] אֶצְאוּ מִחוּצָה לְמַחֲנוֹת אֶל בֵּית מִן [עַד] י [צָאוּ
 אֵלֵיהֶם הַ] כֹּהֵנָה [יָ] ם וְהַלוֹיִי [י] ם וְכוּל שְׂרֵי הַמַּחֲנוֹת vacat וְעִבְרוּ שָׁמָּה לְפָנָי]
 10 לְאֵלֶּפִים וְלִמְאוֹת וְלַחֲמָשִׁים וְלַעוֹשֵׁי [ר] וְתָּ וְכוּל אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵהִיָּה [בְּלִי] לָה
 הַהוּאָה לִן [א] יב [א] אֶתְמָה לְ [מ] לַחֲמָה כִּיא מְלָאכִי קוּדֵשׁ בְּמַעֲרָכוֹתָמָה יֵהֵךְ [ד]

- 16 Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 142) reads here] ◦ מִ [חוּץ while Baillet (DJD 7:13), Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 45), and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 970) read] ◦ מְחוּץ and Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 68) reads] מְחוּץ. Of these three options, the second one seems to be best equivalent of what can be seen in the fragment. The letters ו and פ are clearly visible on the small piece of fragment 2, and before them there is one vertical stroke which could well be the left vertical stroke of ח. After the word חוּץ, there is a space and perhaps, just before the left edge of the fragment, there was an ink trace that has practically entirely faded away. As regards מ before חוּץ, the question is whether the small piece of fragment 3 should be placed in the immediate vicinity of fragment 2 or not. In Baillet’s arrangement of fragments, which is followed here in all the other cases, there seems not to be space for additional letters between מ and ח and thus, the brackets in Duhaime’s reading seem to be needless. Thus, here, the brackets are deleted and a space is added between חוּץ and the following unidentified letter.
- 17 Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 29) reads here [הַמְּ] instead of Duhaime’s (“War Scroll,” 144) אֲנִיָּשִׁי. After לֵהִיּוֹת, only the bottoms of the following two letters are visible but there are some considerations that support Duhaime’s reading. Of the letter that is interpreted to be either נ or מ, the bottom stroke is parallel to the line: in the case of מ, the stroke usually goes below the line so נ seems to be the more probable option. However, נ is not the only option: פ can also be considered (cf., e.g., the פ in line 12). Therefore נ should absolutely be marked with °. As regards the letter that is interpreted to be either א or ה, the left leg that seems to curve slightly to the left at the bottom of the line indicates that in this case, Yishay’s reading – ה – is the more probable interpretation. However, again, it is not the only option: ת should also be considered. The left leg of the first character curves more to the left than what is expected for ה, although perhaps less than might be expected for ת. Again ◦ is absolutely needed. Finally, here, Duhaime’s reading is corrected from] אֲנִיָּשִׁי [to] הִנֵּן [.
- 18 It can clearly be seen that there is an interlinear ו before שְׁבֵט (cf. Baillet, DJD 7:13; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 38; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 970; Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 49; Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, 133). Perhaps this is some kind of typo of Duhaime since in his edition, there is no interlinear ו here (Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 142) but between the words] מַהֲמָה [and פְטוּרֵי [ם] there is, and it clearly does not belong there. Thus, here, Duhaime’s edition is corrected in this respect: the interlinear ו between the words] מַהֲמָה [and פְטוּרֵי [ם] is removed and added before שְׁבֵט.

- 11 [ובע]לוֹת המערכה הנצבה למלחמת היום ההוא לעבור לכוּן [ה] [מל] חֲמָה יעמדו שלוש מערכות מערכה אחר מערכה ורוח שימו בין המערכות]
- 12 [ויצאו] חֲלִיפֹת למלחמה אלה אנשי הַ [בִּינִי] יֵם¹⁹ ולעומתמה אנשי [המע]רְכוֹת ואם אורב ישימו למערכת שלוש מערכות אורבים יהי [מרח] אֶק ולוא יקוּ [מו]
- 13 [המלחמה וחצוצרות התר] וְעָה [יש] מְוָעוּ ואנשי [להפי]ל בחללי האשמה ואחר יקום הַאֲ [ו] רֵב²⁰ ממקומו וסדר־גַּמְעִים²¹ הוא [את מער] כְּוֹתִי[?]]
- 14 והמאסף מימין ומשמאל ובא [חור ובפנים א] רְבַעַת הַרוּחוֹ [ת] ׀ בְּמִלְחָמוֹת כלה והיו כול המערכוֹ [ת] הנגשות למלחמת הַאֲ [ו] יב
- 15 אחד המערכה [הר] אִישׁוֹנָה [ת] צא למלחמה [והשנית עומ] דת [המה על מעמדמה עם מלא עונתם הראישונים ישובו וק] [מו]
- 16 הַשְּׁנִית [ת] בְּעַ [ר] אֶךְ המלחמה ומלאה המ[ע]רְכָה השנית את עונתָה וְשָׁבוּ ועמדו על מעמדמה]
- 17 והש[לישית] וְהַלְוִיִּים ואנְ [שי הסר] דָּ והכוהנים בכול עת הַמְרִיעִים בחצוצרות]
- 18 ואבנט ב [מג] בְּעוֹת [כ] יָא [אלה בגדי מל] חמה
- 19 ככול הסדר [ש]רֵי המחנות [ל] ׀ ׀
- 20 לְ [כֹל] [ל] ׀ ׀ מְלֹא לְכֹלָתָּ

- 19 Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 144) reads here [הביני] ׀ while Baillet (DJD 7:13), Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 38) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 970) read הַ [בִּינִי] יֵם and Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 29) reads הַ [בִּינִי] ׀. In digital photo B-366997, there is no trace of ה left but in PAM 42.474, a straight vertical stroke after אַנְשֵׁי is visible and so ה actually should be marked outside the brackets as most of the editors suggest. Here, Duhaime’s edition is corrected in this respect.
- 20 Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 144) reads here הַ [אֲו] רֵב while Baillet (DJD 7:13), Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 38), and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 970) read הַאֲ [ו] רֵב. In digital photo B-366995, one can distinguish a really tiny ink trace, the remnant of the top left of the letter, just before the rift between the two pieces of fragment 2, and therefore, here, Duhaime’s reading is corrected to be more reflective of what is seen on the fragment – although the identification of the letter must remain very uncertain.
- 21 With different ways of marking, all the editors’ intent is to show here that there are two unintentional letters that have been corrected (see Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 144; Baillet, DJD 7:13; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 38; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 971–2; Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 49; Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, 133). Baillet explains his own reading as follows: “After וסדר, the scribe first put מע (beginning of מערכות), then added ג above the line, corrected מ to ׀ and added הוּא (followed by אַת?) by drawing ה to the left of ע which he did not delete. In the end, we read הוּא גַּם” (see Baillet, DJD 7:15; translation from French to English by Hanna Vanonen). This explanation is plausible since the letter after וסדר does not resemble any known letter: it is too small to be a final *mem* but on the other hand, the continuous stroke does not fit a medial *mem* (cf. Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 5). Thus, it could well be a corrected letter as Baillet suggests. Duhaime also saw an interlinear ג but for some reason, he has marked it earlier in this line after the verbal form יקום. Thus, here, the reading is corrected to follow Baillet’s way – and actually, Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 144 n. 25), too, advises the reader to consult Baillet’s edition.

In fragments 1–3 of 4Q491b, the first four and a half lines form the first unity ending with a *vacat*. These lines are quite fragmentary but it seems clear that no clear textual parallels to this section occur elsewhere in the War Texts. Instead, in fragments 1–3 of 4Q491b, there are some unique ideas and terminology. First, in line 1, the mention of the biblical character Korah does not occur anywhere else in the War Texts.²² Because both Korah, included among the sons of Esau, and Korah, son of Izhar, who are known in the Hebrew Bible, are described as rebellious (cf. Gen 36, Ob 1:18, Mal 1:3, and Num 16), and since the New Testament also knows Korah as rebellious (Jude 1:11), it is reasonable to interpret him and his congregation as representing adversaries in fragments 1–3 of 4Q491b as well.²³ The “commander (שׂר) of his angels” (line 3) – another unique expression – could belong to any side since for example in 1QM, there are angels (מלאך) both on God’s side (cf., e.g., 7:6, 10:11, 12:1, 4, 8) and on his adversaries’ side (cf., e.g., 13:11, 12). Since it probably belongs to the same sentence with the following expression “so that they have a mighty hand” which seems to be some kind of promise, it is more plausible to interpret it as denoting God’s angels.²⁴ Due to the fragmentary nature of the text, not much can be said about this.

In the middle of line 3, there is some kind of change in vocabulary: Duhaime notes that while the first part of the line speaks about heavenly personages, the last part seems to concentrate on worldly troops with mounts and horsemen.²⁵ On the other hand, these kinds of terms occur in harmony, for example, in 1QM 12 where the terms המלחמה גבור (“the mighty one of war”) and צבא רוחיו (“the host of his spirits”) are followed by a term like פרשינו (“our horsemen”) (cf. 1QM 12:9). Thus, the terms that perhaps seem to belong to different contexts do not have to be in contradiction in fragments 1–3 line 3 either. In line 4, it seems that the victorious end of the war is described: the hand of God will strike so that there will be an eternal destruction, atonement will be extracted and everlasting joy will prevail. Although this part of the text does not seem to be a close textual parallel to any passage elsewhere in the War Texts either,

22 However, this is not the only time when Korah is mentioned the Dead Sea Scrolls, see 4Q423 5 1.

23 Cf., however, the Korahites who are described in the Hebrew Bible as singers (2 Chron 20:19) and gatekeepers in the temple (1 Chron 9:17–19) and to whom 11 psalms are attributed (Pss 42, 44–49, 84–85, 87–88).

24 Like the word מלאך, the word שׂר is also used in 1QM in connection with both sides of the battle: in 1QM 13, there is the “commander of light” (see 13:10) whereas in 1QM 17 the “commander of the dominion of wickedness” occurs (see 17:5–6).

25 Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 461.

there are many sections in which similar ideas come out in 1QM (see, e.g., 1QM 1:4–9, 14–15; 13:1–3).

The next section marked with *vacats* extends from line 5b to line 7a. However, as Duhaime has suggested, line 6 seems to be the beginning of a longer section, *הסרך בחנותמה* “the rule in their encampments,” which extends to the end of fragments 1–3.²⁶ Duhaime links line 5b to the previous section,²⁷ but it does not seem to fit there easily: the content of the text, the prohibition against going towards the lines of the enemy, could even be linked better with the rule observed in the camps than the description of the end of the war. According to Duhaime, lines 1–5 form the end of the speech concerning the leaders of the congregation;²⁸ in that case, line 5b could describe the situation right after the speech before moving on to the next topic. It is, however, not possible to establish this with complete certainty. Also, one possible option would be to interpret line 5b as an addition, formed in order to link the speech with the following rule, “the rule (to observe) in their encampments” (line 6).

The rule to be observed in the encampments seems to begin with some restrictions: although the text is partly damaged, it gives the impression that women, children and the disabled are prohibited from doing something, perhaps going to the battlefield or probably even to the battle camps – here, the camps seems to be in focus while later, from line 9b onwards, attention is paid to the battlefield and yet another group of people is excluded (cf. line 10). In line 7 – after women, children and the disabled are dealt with – something is said about the position of the craftsmen, the smelters and some appointed people in the war. The text is again much damaged but one can guess that the tasks of these groups are also related to the camps.

The next section reaches from line 7b to line 9a. Its text concentrates on taking care of the purity of the camp and the daily duty and gathering to the house of meeting, all probably issues that are related to the preparations for the war and the camps. From line 9b onwards, the text continues without any preserved *vacats* and moves on to discuss the strategy on the actual battlefield. In this strategy, setting up an ambush is a central part (cf. lines 12b–13) while in 1QM it is mentioned just in passing (cf. 1QM 9:17) and elsewhere in the War Texts it does not occur at all. In addition, the text seems to outline a three-phased structure of the battle (cf. lines 15–17). At the preserved end of

26 Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 462.

27 Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 461.

28 Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 460. However, Duhaime adds a question mark after his definition for lines 1–5: “Discours au sujet des princes de la congrégation (?)”.

the text, the war garments are briefly discussed (line 18). In line 19, some kind of concluding clause is given: according to this rule, the destruction is fulfilled.

What is also noteworthy from the material point of view is that there are small hyphens written at the right edge of fragment 1. Especially in lines 1, 6, 14 and 18 they are clearly visible but Tov recognizes these hyphens also at the beginning of lines 4, 16 and 19.²⁹ According to Tov,³⁰ they are to be interpreted as section markers and when scrutinizing the text, at least the hyphens in lines 1, 6, 14, 16 and 19 seem to be at the beginning of a new part or section. Although especially the one in line 18 does not fit this interpretation, explaining the hyphens as section markers is the most plausible solution. Another one would be to consider them just ink blots but since some of them are very clearly visible, this interpretation does not do justice at least for all of them.

Tov notes that the majority of section markers of this kind “were probably inserted after the writing was completed.”³¹ Thus, they may represent the way a later individual or group structured the text. As such, the hyphens may indicate that the text in fragments 1–3 was a subject of study or rewriting.

This scrutiny already touches on the fact that there are some textual and thematic links between 4Q491b and 1QM. In Table 25, those texts of 1QM that have most in common with 4Q491b 1–3 are gathered together and the words and expressions in common are colored red.³² In addition, in fragments 1–3, words and expressions that do not occur at all in 1QM are colored green in order to demonstrate that while there is much in common with fragments 1–3 and 1QM, there are also many differences between them.

In 1QM, there is no rule for encampments³³ although many other units are named as rules (cf. 1QM 2:16–3:11 the rule of the trumpets; 3:13–4:8 the rule of the banners of the whole congregation; 4:9–14 the other rule of banners; 5:3–9:9 the rule for arranging the divisions; 9:10–17 the rule for changing the order; 16:3).³⁴ However, many of those regulations that belong to the rule for encampments in 4Q491b occur in 1QM in other rule sections, especially in

29 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 184.

30 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 180.

31 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 180. Note also Duhaime who suggests that in line 4 the hyphen indicates some kind of sense division (but he also argues that lines 1–5 form one section of the text). See Duhaime, “Étude comparative de 4QM^a fgg. 1–3 et 1QM,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 459–72 (461).

32 These links have also been found and analyzed by Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 459–72.

33 The verb חָנַף “to camp” occurs twice in 1QM, in 1:3 and 15:2. In the first of these occurrences, the Sons of Light encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem. In column 15, it is not absolutely clear who is encamping but probably it is the lot of God that is called to encamp opposite the king of the Kittim and the army of Belial.

34 Cf. also Alexander, “Rules,” 799.

TABLE 25 The text of 4Q491 1–3 and 1QM 3:4b, 5:16, 7:9b–12

4Q491 fragments 1–3	1QM 7	1QM 3 and 5
[קוש משבט]	1 קורה ועדתו לב	3b ועל הצצרות אנשי 4a השם
[לים לימש] פט לאות]	2 לעיני כול קהל ל	{ יכתובו } ראשי אבות העדה
[ממה לרשות יד] ב[מלחמה] קזה ולרכב ולפר' שים	3 ושר מלאכיו עפ]	בהאספם לבית מועד יכתובו תעודות אל לעצת קודש
[יס]	4 יד אל תגוף [] ש] מהת לכלת עולמים [] לפצרו בעדכמה] כול נשן יאי]	16 ובעמוד ה] יסדרו שבע
[קודשו ב'ש' עולם] ואחר']	5 קודשו ב'ש' עולם []	המערכות מערכה אחר
[הגשיא'ים] צ] ב] א' ילכו למערכות האויב []	6 וזה הס'ד' בחנותמה וב' וכתה] לקותמה מן]	מערכה 17 ו'הות]
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	7 המער' כה ואנשי חרשן] וה] צ] ופקודים להיות ה']	אל לעצת קודש
[ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	8 ערה לוא יראה סביבותיהמ] ובצאתמה לעיר המלחמה [לרכ]	3b וכול נער זעטוט ואשה לוא יבואו למחנותם בצאתם 4 מירושלים ללכת
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	9 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	חגר או איש אשר מום עולם בכשרו או איש מונגע בטמאת 5 בשרו כול אלה לוא ילכו אתם למלחמה כולם יהיו אנשי נבט
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	10 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלחמה ותממי רוח ובשר ועתודים ליום
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	11 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	נקם וכול 6 איש אשר לוא ידה טהור
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	12 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	ממקורו ביום המלחמה לוא יד אתם כיא
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	13 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	14 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	15 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	16 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	17 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	18 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	19 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	20 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	21 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	22 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	23 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	24 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	25 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	26 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד
[מע'] א'ה' למשמרותמה ב]	27 ואלפים אמה יהיה בין ה] המתנות	מלאכי קודש עם צבאותם יחד

TABLE 25 The text of 4Q491 1–3 and 1QM 3:4b, 5:16, 7:9b–12 (cont.)

4Q491 fragments 1–3	1QM 7	1QM 3 and 5
° [11 [ובע]לות המערכה הנצבה למלחמת היום ההואה לעבור [בן] [ורוח יהיה 7 בין כול מחניהמה למקום היד
] כול בין	12 [המערכות] [ויצאו] [הלפות למלחמה אלה אנשי ה] [בני] [ם ולעומתמה אנשי] [המע]	כאלפים באמה וכול ערות דבר רע לוא
] ק	13 [המלחמה וחוצרות התר] ועה [יש] מועז ואנשי] להפיל [בחללי האשמה	ראה סכיבות כול מחניהמה <i>vacat</i>
] ם	14 והמאסף מילוק ומשמאול ובא] חור ובפנים א] רבעת הרוח]ת [9b ויצאו מן השער החיזון אל בין
] המה	15 אחד המערכה] הר] אִישׁוֹנָה ת] צא למלחמה] והשנית עומ] דת [המה	10 כוהנים מבני אהרון
] על מעמדמה עם מלא עונתם הראישונים ישוּבו וק]מו	16 השנ] ית	לובשים בגדי שש לבן כתונת בד ומכנסי
] על [בָּע]ר] הַיָּד המלחמה ומלאה המ[ע]ר]כה השנית את עונתה ושבו וע[מדו על	17 מעמדמה] [הש] לישית	בד וחוגרים באבנט בד שש משוור תבלת
] ו]הליינים ואנ]שי הסר]ך	18 והכוהנים ככול עת ה'מריעים בתצורתה]	11 וארגמן ותולעת שני וצורת ריקמה
] מג]בָּעוֹת]	19 וּבֹנֵט ב]ד	מעשה חושב ופרי מגבעות בראשיהם
] שרי המתנות]	20 ככול הסדר]	בגדי מלחמה ואל המקדש לוא
] מִלְאִי ° ° [לכלת] [ל' כול]	12 יביאום

TABLE 25 The text of 4Q491 1–3 and 1QM 3:4b, 5:16, 7:9b–12 (cont.)

4Q491 fragments 1–3	1QM 7	1QM 3 and 5
<p>1 Korah and his congregation ... [...] judgement [...] 2 In the sight of the whole assembly ... [...] ... [...] judgement as a sign [...] 3 and the commander of his angels with their [...] so that they have a mighty hand [... in the] battl[e ...] [...] ... for the mounts and the horse[men ...] [...] [...] 4 The hand of God will smite [...] ... [...] for the everlasting destruction [...] ... they shall atone on you[r] behalf [...] all the prin[ces of ...] their [...] ... and in ... [...] 5 his holiness in everlasting[i]o[y] [...] vacat After ... [...] the congregation and a[l]l the prince[s ...] h[os]t shall go towards the lines of the enemy [...] 6 This is the rule (to be observed) in their encampments and in [... and in] their [di]visions ... [...] ... the surrounding, on the outside ... [...] No woman or young boy or a man stricken ...] 7 [the li]ne. The crafts-men [and the] sm[el]ters and those appointed to be ... [...] ... [...] their [...] ... to their stations in [...] ... the line until they return. vacat There shall be two thousand cubits between the [camps ...] 8 nakedness shall not be seen in their surroundings. When they march out to set up the battle [to humiliate [the enemy ...] among them set free by [ot] for each tribe, according to its numbered men, for the daily duty. [...] 9 (On) that day, from all the tribes, they [shall m]arch out of the camps towards the house of meet[ing ... shall] march out towards them the [priest]s, the Lev[i]tes, and all the camp commanders. vacat There they shall pass in front of [...] 10 to the thousands, the hundreds, the fifties and the te[n]s. Any man who will not be [... on] that [mi]ght [shall] no[t] come out with them to the [b]attle, for the holy angels</p>	<p>7:3b No young boy or woman shall enter their camps when they leave 4 Jerusalem to go to battle until their return. Neither lame, nor blind, nor crippled, nor a man in whose flesh there is a permanent blemish, nor a man stricken by some uncleanness 5 in his flesh, none of them shall go to battle with them. They shall all be volunteers for war, perfect ones of spirit and flesh, and ready for the Day of Vengeance. Any 6 man who is not purified from a (bodily) discharge on the day of battle shall not go down with them, for the holy angels are together with their hosts. There shall be a distance 7 between all their camps and the place of the hand two thousand cubits or so. No indecent nakedness shall be seen in the surroundings of all their camps. vacat</p>	<p>3:3b On the trumpets of the men of 4a renown, chiefs of the fathers of the congregation when they gather in the house of meeting, they shall write "Fixed times of God for the holy council."</p>

TABLE 25 The text of 4Q491:1–3 and 1QM 3:4b, 5:16, 7:9b–12 (cont.)

4Q491 fragments 1–3	1QM 7	1QM 3 and 5
<p>(are) togeth[er] within their lines [....] 11 [When] the line standing ready [de]parts for the battle of that day, to proceed towards al[...] ... the [bat]tle three lines shall stand, one behind the other. They shall set a distance between the lines [....] 12 [They shall march out] in turns to the battle. These are the s[kirmishe]rs, and close by them the [....] men [... the li]nes. If they set up an ambush for a line, three lines shall[1 be] in ambush [from a]far, and [they] shall not burst [out ...] 13 [...] the battle. The trumpets of ala[rm ...] they [shall he]ar. The men [... to bring] down among the slain of guiltiness. Then the a[m]bush shall burst out from its location and shall array its [li]nes as well [....] 14 The gathering (on) the right and (on) the left, on the r[ear] and on the front, the f]our direction[s ...]m in destructive battles. All the line[s] which have drawn near for the battle (against) the ene[my] shall be [...]</p> <p>15 together. [The f]irst line shall ma[rch] out for the battle], while the second stan[ds,] they [...] to their own position. When they have fulfilled their portion, the first ones shall withdraw, and [...] shall r[ise]....]</p> <p>16 The seco[nd] one [...] by dr[aw]ing up the battle (order). The second [i]f]ine shall fulfill its portion, withdraw and st[and] on its position....]</p> <p>17 The th[ird] ... and] the Levites and the me[n of the ru]le. The priests shall continually blow the trumpets [...] 18 a li[nen] girdle [... tur]bans [...] sin[ce] these (are) wa[r] garments [...] 19 According to all (this) rule [...] the commanders of the camps [...] 20 ... [...] all [...] ... they shall fulfill for the destruction of [...]</p>	<p>7:9b then shall march out, from the middle gate towards the space between the lines, seven 10 priests from the Sons of Aaron, dressed with garments of white byssus: a linen tunic and linen breeches, girded with a linen girdle, twisted byssus in violet, 11 both purple and scarlet, with a many-colored design, a skillful work, (wearing) turban head-dresses on their heads. (These are) war garments; into the sanctuary they shall not 12 bring them.</p>	<p>5:16 When standing ... [...], they shall array the seven lines, one line behind the other.</p> <p>17 A distance [...] th]irty cubits in which shall stand the me[n ...]</p>

the rule for arranging the divisions in lines 5:3–9:9. The closest resemblances between fragments 1–3 and 1QM are in this rule section: for example, both fragments 1–3 lines 6b–11 and 1QM 7:3b–7 include the regulations concerning purity. However, there are differences in order: Both texts start with prohibiting women and children (in 4Q491, or children and women in 1QM) from coming into the war encampments. 1QM continues by enumerating what is required of the soldiers: they cannot be lame, blind, crippled, disabled or bodily impure. The exclusion of the last-mentioned group is validated by saying that the angels are present in the encampment. At the end, there is a regulation for the distance between camps and the latrine. In 4Q491b fragments 1–3, similar instructions are given but after the regulation concerning the exclusion of women and children, something else about the craftsmen and the smelters follows. אנשי ההרש והמצרף are not directly mentioned in 1QM but, for example, the word הרש occurs many times when describing the war equipment and its manufacture (cf., e.g., 5:6–11). According to Duhaime, the mention of craftsmen and smelters in 4Q491b belongs to the list of those who do not join the troops.³⁵ This is possible but the preserved text does not say it unambiguously. It is equally possible that in bringing up craftsmen and smelters the focus was on their duties in the camps, not on their exclusion from the battlefield. After the *vacat*, in line 7b, the regulation for the distance between camps and the latrine follows.

In her dissertation, Johanna Dorman makes a similar suggestion to that made above when describing the contents of fragments 1–3: in 4Q491 there is a disconnect between the war camp and the battlefield. The requirements presented in 4Q491 lines 6–7a concern those who enter into the war camp (no women, children, afflicted men, nor the possibly physically disabled; i.e., not those who have no physical competence to participate in the battle), and the stricter requirements in line 10b concern those who participate in the actual battle (no men who are unclean by their seminal emission; i.e., the focus is now on ritual purity). The angels are clearly present on the battlefield.³⁶ In contrast, when the similar requirements are presented in 1QM, the camp and the battlefield are not clearly separated as in 4Q491b. Therefore, in 1QM there was no hindrance from moving the regulation of the latrine and its distance from the camp to the end of the list of excluded persons and after mentioning the angels (see 1QM 7:6–7). In 1QM, angels are thus potentially understood to be present both on the battlefield and in the camps, whereas in 4Q491 the angels

35 Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 460.

36 Johanna Dorman, “The Blemished Body: Deformity and Disability in the Qumran Scrolls” (PhD diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2007), 171–72.

are on the battlefield only. Following Dorman's lead, it could be argued that, in 1QM, the idea of the presence of angels is expanded, which is in line with the fact that 1QM lacks the notion (present in 4Q491b line 9b) of soldiers going to the house of meeting – which probably refers to the tent of meeting³⁷ – before going to the battlefield. In 1QM, the whole camp served as the tent of meeting and the presence of angels was not limited to the battlefield only. However, 1QM still recognizes that purity on the day of the battle is of special importance (7:6, excluding a man with emission), followed by the mention of the angels.

The trumpet list in 1QM 3 seems to represent a vision somehow similar to 4Q491b fragment 1–3. In lines 3:3b–4, the mention of the “house of meeting” probably explains the term “men of renown”; these men are described as “chiefs of the fathers of the congregation when they gather in the house of meeting.” The trumpet list does not necessarily say much about the war that was envisioned by its author(s) but it is perhaps noteworthy that in this list too, the house of meeting is mentioned before the trumpets of the camps and the trumpets that are related to the battlefield while the trumpets that are mentioned before the house of meeting seem to be related to drafting different groups (in preparation for the war). Thus, in both contexts, the house of meeting seems to be related to the transition from preparations to the actual battle. The fact that 1QM seems to have preserved several war visions can be explained by its anthological nature: its aim was to gather and arrange the material concerning war.

While the text in lines 6–10 seems to describe the preparations for the war, from line 11 onwards, the viewpoint is channeled onto the battlefield, and first, the alignment of the soldiers is in focus. This is also described in the fragmentary

37 In 1QM, *בית מועד* the “house of meeting” occurs in line 3:4b, in the middle of the list of the trumpets. These two, the one in 4Q491b fragments 1–3 and the other in 1QM, are the only occurrences of *בית מועד* in the preserved Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Hebrew Bible, *בית מועד* occurs in Job 30:23 (כִּי יָדַעְתִּי מָוֶת תִּשְׁיַבְנִי וּבֵית מוֹעֵד לְכָל־חַי) / “I know that you will bring me to death, and to the house appointed for all living.”) and this is why it is sometimes interpreted to be related to burial rites. However, in 1QM and especially in 4Q491b, the term seems to refer to a concrete place which is outside the camps (cf. 4Q491b fragments 1–3, line 9). Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 268) suggests that in 1QM, *בית מועד* denotes a concrete communal assembly place. This interpretation remains a bit vague. According to Dorman (“The Blemished Body,” 161), *בית מועד* is an “equivalent of the more known *אהל מועד*, ‘the tent of meeting.’” Thus, *בית מועד* might be a euphemism for a tent of meeting that dare not be called *אהל מועד*. The *בית מועד* seems to serve as a transition from the preparations to the actual war where, according to 4Q491b, even more severe purity requirements were needed, and visiting the tent of meeting before that fits well into this big picture.

end of 1QM 5, which is a part of the rule for arranging the divisions. This rule of 1QM starts with quite a long description of weapons (5:4b–14) which is surrounded by the explanation of how the soldiers are aligned (5:3–4a, 16–18). What is common between fragments 1–3 and 1QM 5:16–17 is that the battle lines are said to stand one after the other and there shall be a distance, probably between the lines. However, while in 1QM there are seven battle lines, in fragments 1–3 there are three of them. This division into three is shown again later in fragments 1–3: from line 15 onwards, it is gone through how each of the three lines “fulfills its portion” by turns (1–3:15, 16, 17). Although in 4Q491b fragments 1–3 the number of battle lines is different from 1QM, there are many similarities between the texts: as in 1QM there are different kinds of soldiers in fragments 1–3, probably at least the skirmishers (1–3:12), and as in 1QM the battle is directed with trumpets (1–3:13).

In lines 12–13, there are some directions for arranging the ambush (אורב) and executing it. The term אורב occurs only once in 1QM, in line 9:17.³⁸ Unfortunately, again, not much can be concluded from these passages:³⁹ due to the fragmentary nature of the end of 1QM column 9, it even remains unclear whether these two can be said to be parallels. What is clear is that there are things connected to the ambush in 4Q491b fragments 1–3 that do not occur in 1QM: executing the ambush is linked with bringing down the slain of guiltiness – an expression that does not occur as such in 1QM. In addition, in fragments 1–3, line 14, it is described how the soldiers are grouped in four directions, and this does not occur as such in 1QM either.

At the end of the preserved text of fragments 1–3, the Levites and the priests are brought up and the garments of the priests are described. This description is known in 1QM as well, in lines 7:9b–11. There, it precedes the actual acts of war while in fragments 1–3 it seems to follow them. The comparison between the contents of these descriptions is difficult since the end of fragments 1–3 is extremely fragmentary. According to Baillet’s reconstruction,⁴⁰ the texts could be nearly similar but this remains speculative. However, it seems that something new starts in fragments 1–3 after the description of garments but that this new section probably continues to discuss the rule of encampments (ככול) הַסֵּרֶךְ, “according to all this rule”).

38 In the lists of trumpets, the ambush is mentioned twice (1QM 3:2 and 3:8), but there the word מארב is used for it.

39 See also Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 469.

40 Baillet, DJD 7:14. See also Duhaime, “Étude comparative,” 469–70.

As has been noted, 4Q491b and 1QM differ from each other on a textual level more than 4Q491a and 1QM. Probably because of this, scholars have usually considered it difficult to assume that they show direct literary dependence. The most common model to explain the relationship between these texts is that they are reworkings of a common tradition – although many scholars do not rule out the other option (mutual dependence) either.⁴¹ What can be concluded from all this is that if a similar source was a basis for both 4Q491b and 1QM, it was possible to process this source very freely and creatively. On the other hand, this is also true if the texts are interpreted to show mutual literary dependence – and this is something that actually challenges the theory of a common source: if it was possible to make such noteworthy changes in the source, would it not be equally likely to think that one of the texts was the source for the other? If the options of mutual dependence are weighed, 1QM is more likely to rewrite 4Q491b, since it has a general tendency to organize material in lists and collections. There may be theological implications involved in such an organization (such as here the presence of angels in the camp as well) but some of those implications might also result from the rewriting and the aim to collect and organize the material.

41 Cf., e.g., Duhaime “Étude comparative,” 469, 471–2; Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 48, see also the English abstract in the end of her study. Duhaime concludes that fragments 1–3 are all in all a briefer text than 1QM, and, while 1QM is quite an elaborate text that has a tendency to generalize the application of the rules, especially concerning purity, fragments 1–3 represent a more practical point of view. Also, according to him, the “biblical sources” are utilized more in 1QM. Duhaime seems to agree with the commonly occurring idea that texts tended to expand (rather than be shortened), and if he is judged correctly here, his presupposition is that the briefer text is earlier than the longer one and that later texts are more probably spiced with biblical citations. However, he does not argue that fragments 1–3 and 1QM are directly dependent on each other but emphasizes that his explanation is also valid if the editors behind the texts have independently used a common source and considers this in many cases a probable option. Yishay takes note of the fact that both 1QM 7 and 4Q491 1 include a list of regulations concerning the encampment but that these lists differ in length, style, running order and in some respects in content as well. In her interpretation of the complete manuscript 4Q491, she aligns herself with Duhaime’s thoughts, arguing that 4Q491 and 1QM are two different reworkings of common source material that consisted of war descriptions and a thanksgiving hymn. In addition, she thinks that at the same time some “sporadic theological reworking of the parallel sections” was done. Ultimately, however, according to Yishay, “it is impossible to determine whether one version depends on the other or the two elaborate a common source.” Thus, just as Duhaime finally does, she also leaves it open whether the texts are using a common source or whether they are dependent on each other.

1.2 *Fragment 4 (B-283964)*

Fragment 4 consists of two separate pieces which Baillet joined together.⁴² Abegg explains that the join between these fragments is based on the plural word *משפטים*, of which the first three letters are in one fragment and the rest of the letters (ʾ reconstructed) are in another and considers this join possible.⁴³ Duhaime reads and translates this fragment as follows:⁴⁴

] ןׁ ןׁ [] ןׁ קחן [1
 2 מב [ן עשרים [ש]נה [ן]מעלה לה [ן
 3 [ככול המשפט [י]ם האלה וא [ן
 4 [יׁ ןׁ אויב לה [ן] קחן אש [מה

Since in line 2 some kind of age limits seem to be under discussion (“[... fro]m the [a]ge of twenty [and] over ...”), Baillet and Duhaime have connected this fragment with the end of 1QM column 6.⁴⁵ The end of column 6 and the beginning of column 7 enumerate the age requirements for the different groups of military persons. However, due to the small amount of text in fragment 4, this link remains very tentative and it is not possible to establish the connection between fragment 4 and 1QM 6 beyond doubt.

1.3 *Fragments 5 + 6 (B-283964)*

Baillet joined these two fragments on the basis of 1QM 12:1. As he noted,⁴⁶ when combined, the fragments seem to form the upper left part of a column: fragment 5 preserves part of the top margin and fragment 6 preserves part of the left margin. However, there is no material connection between these two fragments, and the fact that they have preserved different margins does not make their join more probable. According to Abegg, the join of these fragments is “possible but not recommended,”⁴⁷ and Yishay ends up editing these fragments separately.⁴⁸ It should also be noted that, as Table 26 demonstrates, when the fragments are read together and compared to 1QM 12:1, the texts are not entirely similar.

42 Baillet, DJD 7:19. The pieces can be seen in PAM 42.474, <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-283964>. One fragment is in the third line, the second piece from the left and another fragment is above it in the second line.

43 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 49.

44 Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 144.

45 Baillet, DJD 7:19; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 145.

46 Baillet, DJD 7:20.

47 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 51.

48 Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 76–77.

TABLE 26 The texts of 4Q491 fragments 5+6 and 1QM 12:1

4Q491 fragments 5 + 6	1QM 12:1
<p>[... and] the host of [a]n[gel]s are in [your] ho[ly] habitation [to praise] your [tru]th. The elect ones</p>	<p>כיא רוב קדושים [א]לה בשמים וצבאות מלאכים בזבול קודשכה לה[ודות אמת]כה ובחירי עם קודש</p>
<p>1 [ל]מועדי עולמיים [] 2 [] ולספר [מעשי אמתכה]</p>	<p>8 [ל]מועד [ד]י עולמיים ובכול תעודות כבודכה היה זכר [] 9 [] ולספר [פר]מעשי אמתכה ומשפטי גבורות פלאכה אתה [] יתנו לכה עם עולמים ובגורל אור הפלתנו</p>

All in all, it is most plausible to read these fragments separately. Unfortunately, there is not much to conclude either about the texts or about the material facts.

1.4 Fragment 7 (B-367010; B-367011)

Baillet reconstructs this fragment on the basis of 1QM 13:8–9. However, as he notes himself, the fragment is so small that its identification with 1QM 13 remains uncertain and the reconstructions are as well very hypothetical.⁴⁹ As can be seen in Table 27, the link between fragment 7 and 1QM 13 is not impossible (common words colored red) but when omitting reconstructions, there are actually only four letters (from two different words; bold in the table) common between these two passages.

TABLE 27 The texts of 4Q491 fragment 7 and 1QM 13:8–9

4Q491 fragment 7	1QM 13
<p>1 [ל]מועדי עולמיים [] 2 [] ולספר [מעשי אמתכה]</p>	<p>8 [ל]מועד [ד]י עולמיים ובכול תעודות כבודכה היה זכר [] 9 [] ולספר [פר]מעשי אמתכה ומשפטי גבורות פלאכה אתה [] יתנו לכה עם עולמים ובגורל אור הפלתנו</p>

49 Baillet, DJD 7:20.

TABLE 27 The texts of 4Q491 fragment 7 and 1QM 13:8–9 (*cont.*)

4Q491 fragment 7	1QM 13
1 [... through the appointed times of eternity]. [...]	8 through the appointed ti[me]s of eternity. In all your glorious fixed times there was a memorial of your [...] in our midst for the help of the remnant and the preservation of your covenant,
2 [...] and to recount [your truthful works ...]	9 and to re[count] your truthful works and the judgments of your wonderful might ... [...] ... for you, (as) an everlasting people. You have cast us in the lot of light

Therefore, reading fragment 7 with the help of 1QM 13 remains entirely hypothetical – and when fragment 7 is read as it is, unfortunately, again, there is not much to conclude either about the text or about the material facts.

1.5 *Fragments 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, and 23*

These six fragments are very small and they include a dozen complete words maximum. Some of them like fragment 16 and fragments 20 and 21, include vocabulary similar to 1QM, but unquestionable parallels cannot be found.⁵⁰ In addition, it should be noted that, for example, in fragment 16, the terminology that links the text with 1QM is quite common: עדה, קודש, ישראל, גבורה occur often in the Dead Sea Scrolls in general (145–565 occurrences). As regards fragments 17, 19 and 23, each of them include some terms that do not occur in 1QM or the other War Texts. In fragment 17, the term ספר התהלים (see line 2) is unique in comparison to the War Texts,⁵¹ and in fragment 23 the same is true of סליחה (see line 4 where this word probably occurs in the plural). Thus, it can be concluded that there are no textual parallels to be discerned between the extant text of fragments 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, and 23 of 4Q491b and other War Texts and, in addition, that unfortunately, these fragments do not shed much light on the questions of the content and use of 4Q491b.

⁵⁰ Baillet has charted the possible parallels between the fragments of 4Q491b and 1QM; cf. Baillet, DJD 7:40, 42–43.

⁵¹ Incidentally, the term is interesting in general since it is one of the earliest mentions of the title of the biblical collection of Psalms. See Baillet, DJD 7:41; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 163.

1.6 *Summary of 4Q491b*

As the previous analysis shows, only fragments 1–3 of 4Q491b include enough material to make a reasonable comparison with the other War Texts, in this case, with 1QM. On the one hand, the presence of quite a large amount of text that does not occur in 1QM shows clearly that, as a whole, 4Q491b fragments 1–3 cannot be defined as being dependent on one certain 1QM passage or vice versa. In addition, those passages that have similarities to 1QM are not exactly like it or in the same order (cf., e.g., 4Q491b, fragments 1–3, lines 6–8, 10 and 1QM 7:3–7). On the other hand, it is not likely that texts that share so much, especially on a thematic level, would have developed without some kind of literary dependence. In comparison with 4Q491b, 1QM collects the rules about excluded persons (including the man with a seminal emission) together and only then gives the rationale of angels being present, and the rule about the latrine and nakedness. Probably, at least here, 1QM rewrites 4Q491b.

The comparison between 4Q491b and 1QM also demonstrates that in 4Q491b, the war camp gets considerable attention and it is clearly separated from the battlefield. It seems that the question of the presence of angels is something that was still under discussion when the war traditions were transmitted: in 4Q491b, their presence seems to be restricted to the battlefield while in 1QM the angels seem to be present everywhere and there is no need to make a clear separation between camp and battlefield. Interestingly, when 4Q491a and 1QM were compared above, the question of divine beings and their role proved to be a theme that was not stabilized in the war tradition but that was free for rewriting and creative literary work. Another noteworthy theme in 4Q491b is the ambush that gets more attention than anywhere else in the War Texts. Consequently, it can be said that the content of 4Q491b is even more exploratory than the content of 4Q491a (which despite some unique parts also included some clearly stabilized sections).⁵² The content of 4Q491b also coheres with Hempel's general description of the content of Cave 4 as having an eclectic and scholarly character.⁵³

As was the case with 4Q491a, 4Q491b is clearly not meant to be any kind of showroom copy: the manuscript is written in a small script, keeping line

52 Note that when using the words “unestablished” and “exploratory,” I refer to the models of the war that are introduced in the War Texts but occur only once each and thus remain experimental (in the light of the preserved material). By using these terms I do not suggest that there was an intent to produce one authoritative text towards which the “unestablished” traditions were developed. Rather I put forth the idea that there were different models of war descriptions and some of them seem to have become more stabilized than others since they were copied into several manuscripts.

53 Cf. Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 337.

spacing very tight and squeezing as many letters into one line as possible. *Vacats* are never long but very small lacunas within the lines. In addition, 4Q491b includes small marginal markings, hyphens that probably are meant to indicate an outline of the text. They may have been added either by the original scribe or some later one but the last-mentioned option is more probable since there are *vacats* in the text as well and they are not always in line with the marginal markings. This may indicate that the text was considered to be somehow a work in progress and/or that it was a subject of study.

2 4Q493 (4QM^c)

Manuscript 4Q493⁵⁴ consists of two leather fragments which were combined already before Baillet's work.⁵⁵ The join is reliable since the fragments clearly share physical interfaces. All margins are visible, not in their full dimensions but sufficiently to lead to the conclusion that the two fragments form a quite small manuscript, 9 cm high at the highest point and 12 cm wide at the widest.⁵⁶ No traces of stitching are visible but this does not necessarily mean that the right margin would be the beginning of the scroll or that the column would be only one in the scroll; it is also possible that the part of the margin where the stitching was is not preserved or that the sheet to which this and some other columns belong is badly deteriorated.

With its 14 lines, 4Q493 belongs to those manuscripts that have a small writing-block.⁵⁷ The letters in these 14 lines, 50–55 per line, are around 2.5 mm high on average, and spaces between the lines vary from 5 to 6 mm.⁵⁸ This

54 Of 4Q493 there is no new color photo available, at least not yet. The two fragments joined together can be seen, e.g., in PAM 44.018 (B-285358) and the two fragments separately can be seen, e.g., in PAM 41.400 (B-298885) where the fragments are in the bottom right corner of the photo.

55 Baillet, DJD 7:50. See also Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 30. Baillet notes that "le fragment est composé de 2 morceaux joints par un de mes prédécesseurs."

56 Cf. also Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 30.

57 Cf. Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 84, 86), who classifies four writing-block sizes: small with 4–14 lines, medium with 15–24, large with 25–34 and very large with 25–60. Tov notes that this classification is "impressionistic" and "made mainly for the sake of convenience." However, when 4Q493 is compared to other relatively well-preserved War Texts, it stands out with its small writing-block.

58 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 30. According to Abegg, "the line spacing of 4Q493 varies from 5.2 (lines 9–10) to 6.3 (lines 10–11)" mm. In addition, Abegg notes that an average line height is 5.7 mm. See Abegg, "The War Scroll," 70. Yishay "The Literature of War at Qumran," 224, concludes that this is a relatively narrow space between the lines.

spacing is one of the tightest among the War Texts, although in 4Q491a and 4Q491b the spacing is even tighter. The letters are also small rather than large in comparison to other War Texts, although the size of the letters does not vary from text to text as much as the spacing between lines. The manuscript is written in a script which, according to Baillet, is slightly older than that of the Herodian period.⁵⁹ Thus, it is dated to the first half of the first century, and it is considered to be the oldest of the Cave 4 war text fragments.⁶⁰

The manuscript (or at least one column of it) is quite well preserved but in some places it is darkened and the surface of the leather is wrinkled.⁶¹

1 יהמלחמה והכוהנים בני אהרן יעמודו לפני [ה] מערכות
 2 והריעו בחצוצרות הזכרון ואחריו⁶² כן יפתחו א[ת] הש[ערי]ם לאנשי
 3 הבנים והכוהנים יריעו בחצוצרות המלחמה [יד במערכות
 4 גויים והכוהנים יצאו מבין החללים ועמ[דו] מזה למל⁶³
 5 ליד החרף והמאבן ולוא יחללו שמן כהונתם [הח] לל[וי]ם
 6 [ו] לכול מערכות הבנים לוא יגשו ותקעו בקול חד לצאת אנ[שי]
 7 המלחמה להתקרב בין המערכות בחצוצרות [ו]ה[ח] ל[וי]
 8 לשלוח יד במלחמה ובמלא עונותם יתקעו להם בחצו[צ]רות המש[ו]ב
 9 לבוא השערים ויצאה המערכה השנית וככול הסרד הזה ית[קעו]⁶³
 10 להם הכו[ה]נים⁶⁴ בעונותם בצאתם יתקעו [ו] להם בח[צוצרות]

59 Baillet, DJD 7:50. See also Abegg, "The War Scroll," 69, and Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 30.

60 Baillet, DJD 7:50; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 30; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 369; Eshel and Eshel, "Recensions of the War Scroll," 352. See also Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 225.

61 As noted by Baillet, DJD 7:49, and as can be seen in PAM 44.018.

62 According to Tov, this dot is a separation dot that was used "in order to separate two words lest they be understood as one continuous word or context." Tov also gives some other examples of using this kind of dot: see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 211.

63 See the following note.

64 In lines 9–10, there are some really difficult cases to read. At the end of line 9, Duhaime ("War Scroll," 172), following Baillet (DJD 7:50), reconstructs [ה]ל[ויים]. The reconstruction is uncertain – not only because there are no more than two letters left of this word but also because defining these two letters is extremely difficult. For example, the stroke above the line, which Baillet and Duhaime interpreted to be the top of a ל, is not very clear; it could also be an interlinear letter. Near the top of the line, the stroke seems to curve slightly to the left which does not necessarily fit in with the other ל's in this fragment. Abegg ("The War Scroll," 72) suggests that the trace could be part of an interlinear ע while the whole reading would be [יתקעו]. The shape of the stroke also seems to be problematic from this point of view: the right stroke of *ayin* would curve much more strongly than the stroke visible in line 9. In fact, the stroke in line 9 hardly curves at all and it certainly does not change the direction of its curvature. However, if it is a matter of an interlinear letter, it might be a bit different from those that are inscribed in the line. In Abegg's reading, the

11 וּבְמַלְאִים⁶⁵ בַּחצוֹצְרוֹת הַתְּרוּעָה [וּבְ] שׁוֹבֵם יִתְקַן עו
 12 הַמֵּאָסָה [כְּמִשְׁפֵּט] יִתְקַעוּ לְכָל [וּלְ] הַמְּעַרְכוֹת⁶⁶ vacat]
 13 [] תִּתְ [] עַל חֲצוֹצְרוֹת [הַ] שְׁבִתוֹת]
 14 [הַ] תְּמִיד וְלַעֲלוֹת כְּתוּב תְּבוּןָ⁶⁷]

The first word in line 1, *המלחמה*, does not seem to belong to the first sentence of the sheet in lines 1–2. Instead, it might be the end of a sentence that begins

space between the interlinear trace and the trace of the first letter is filled with two letters which is more convincing than reconstructing just one letter between them.

At the beginning of the following line (10), there is an equally uncertain case: after quite clearly visible *להם*, Baillet (DJD 7:50) and Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 172) read *מְרִיעִים* while Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 71), Yishay (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 225) and Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 118) read *הַכֹּזְרֵי הַנְּיִים*. The stroke that is left of the first letter is a right vertical stroke that could fit many letters. The letter that is near the big rift seems to be *י* rather than *ר* – and again, if one reads *מְרִיעִים*, the two letters would be quite far away from each other whereas *הַכֹּזְרֵי הַנְּיִים* seems to fill the space better. In the end part of the word, the letter before *י* is only partly visible and practically impossible to define on the basis of the photos available.

All in all, the cases in lines 9–10 are very difficult to resolve but if one has to choose, the readings suggested by Abegg (and Yishay and Qimron) can be considered to be a bit more plausible. They can also be argued for with some contentual reasons: First, there are no existing parallels to the idea that the Levites should be connected to the trumpets – as they would be in lines 9–12 if Baillet and Duhaime’s reconstruction is considered to be right. Instead, in the War Texts in general, the Levites are always related to the ram’s horns. Second, if one reads *יִתְקַעוּ* in line 9 (like Abegg) but still keeps Baillet and Duhaime’s reading *מְרִיעִים* in line 10, the whole sentence in lines 9–10 would include both the verbal root *תקע* and the verbal root *רוע*, which do not occur together in the same sentence anywhere else in the text – or, for example, in 1QM. Therefore, here, the text is corrected according to Abegg in these lines – although it must be noted that these readings are still extremely uncertain.

- 65 Here, Baillet, Abegg, García Martínez and Tigchelaar, and Qimron read [וּבְמַלְאִים] instead of Duhaime’s [וּבְמַלְאִים] and in the available photos, there is a tiny ink trace near the top of ב which might belong to ו (see Baillet, DJD 7:50; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 71; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 984; Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, 118; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 172). Thus, here, Duhaime’s reading is corrected.
- 66 Here, in the end of line 12, there is an empty space 0.5 cm wide after the last visible letter and before the edge of the fragment. Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 172) does not mark any *vacat* here but this space is longer than any distance between words in the fragment, and thus, suggesting *vacat* is reasonable (cf. Baillet, DJD 7:52; Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 225).
- 67 Here, Baillet (DJD 7:52) and Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 71) read וּבְ instead of Duhaime’s (“War Scroll,” 172) וּבְ. Baillet and Abegg’s reading is equivalent to what is seen in the fragment: there is a pale vertical stroke, possibly belonging to ו but after that, there is yet another pale trace, impossible to link with any letter. Thus, here, Duhaime’s reading is corrected.

in the preceding sheet – but since there is no evidence of the preceding text, this option cannot be proven. Therefore, one should also consider interpreting המלחמה as a subtitle. The latter option is supported by the fact that the sheet in which the preserved text of 4Q493 is written seems to be numbered and ו at the beginning of the fragment should be interpreted to denote the sixth sheet.⁶⁸ Not very many numbered sheets exist among the Dead Sea Scrolls but in the existing cases, a new section begins with a new numbered sheet: for example, 4Q256 (4QS^b) fragment 4, numbered with ג, begins with a subtitle התורה (“instruction for the Maskil concerning the men of the Torah”),⁶⁹ and in 4Q266, the number א is situated in the first right margin of the manuscript. Tov suggests that the numbering might indicate that the sheets “were inscribed individually, to be joined subsequently based on the numerical sequence.”⁷⁰ All this supports interpreting המלחמה in 4Q493 as a title or a subtitle of a new section rather than the continuation of something that began in the preceding column.⁷¹

In the text of 4Q493, priests are key actors:⁷² with the sound of the trumpets, they direct the war waged by skirmishers. Everything starts when the priests take up position in front of the lines and sound the trumpets of memorial (lines 1–2). Then they open the gates for the skirmishers and sound the trumpets of battle which probably starts the battle with the enemies, here called nations (lines 2–4).⁷³ After that, the purity of the priests is taken into discussion and the priests are instructed to distance themselves from the slain,

68 The vertical stroke at the beginning of the line is sometimes read as upper stroke of ל (cf. Baillet, DJD 7:50, who reads here “un signe en forme de hamper de *lamed*”) but its top seems to be slightly lower down than the top of the ל in the next word. In addition, the stroke seems to turn left and down at the top of the letter – a phenomenon which is not observable in the other ל’s of this text. Also, the stroke seems to curve slightly to the left while the upper strokes of ל’s are usually straight. The more reliable reading is interlinear ו (cf. Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 172; Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 225) since the stroke strongly resembles the other ו’s in the fragment (see, e.g., in the same line, the beginning of the second whole word and the second line, the end of the first word).

69 Reconstructed according to 4Q258 column 1. Note that this is a variant version of the title in 1QS 5, וזה הסריב לאנשי היחד (this is the rule for the men of the Yahad); cf. Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 307.

70 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 35.

71 Note, however, that there are no other examples of titles consisting only of one word (cf. the incipit titles in the table of Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 310, and the title and subtitles in 1QM) – which still does not mean that a one-word title would not be a possible option.

72 Cf. also Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 229.

73 Baillet (DJD 7:52) suggests here the reconstruction]הכוהנים יריעו בחצוצרות המלחמה[לשלוח יד במערכות גויים.

in order to not “profane the oil of their priesthood” – which probably refers to their priestly anointing – and to not approach the battle lines (lines 4–6). Instead, the priests probably are ordered to stay near the “catapult” (חרף) and the “ballista” (מאבן), the two weapons that occur only here in the War Texts (line 5). According to Gmirkin, these two were the main classifications of the Greco-Roman artillery: catapults were machines for shooting arrows and ballistas for throwing stones.⁷⁴

The actual battle is directed by blowing a shrill sound and using some trumpets the names of which are not preserved. The men approach the battle lines and stretch out their hand in the battle (lines 6–8). The trumpets of withdrawal summon the men out from the battlefield and the second line marches out. Here there is a reference to “this entire rule” (כול הסרך הזה) according to which everything should proceed (lines 8–9). The second line is again directed by the trumpets, at least with the trumpets of alarm and they, too, are summoned back from the battlefield with trumpets (lines 10–11). After that, the priests blow for all the lines and the first section of the text is closed at the end of line 12 with a *vacat*.

The second section (from line 13 onward) seems to be about worship because the Sabbath and the offerings are mentioned. Although there is not much left of this second section, it can be said that its contents are quite distinctive among the War Texts – rituals and the observance of the law are important themes in 1QM, but nevertheless, the Sabbath is seldom discussed.⁷⁵ The trumpets of the Sabbaths mentioned here do not occur in 1QM,⁷⁶ or in any other M texts.

Although 4Q493 does not have any close parallel among the War Texts, it shares many elements with other M texts. In the following, these elements are discussed in more detail.

2.1 *Trumpets*

Using trumpets to direct the war is one theme that clearly connects 4Q493 to 1QM and other M manuscripts. For example, apart from the “trumpets of battle,” all the trumpets that are mentioned in 4Q493 lines 1–12 also occur in 1QM and some of them also in 4Q491b. In the following, the passages discussing the trumpets of memorial, the trumpets of alarm and the trumpets for

74 Russel Gmirkin, “The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 122 n. 168.

75 In 1QM, the Sabbath is mentioned only in column 2 (see lines 4 and 8).

76 Baillet (DJD 7:53) already notes this. Joseph Baumgarten suggests that the Sabbath trumpets in 4Q493 were probably “intended as a complement of the sacrifices.” See Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Sabbath Trumpets in 4Q493 M^c,” *RevQ* 12 (1987): 559.

withdrawing and/or gathering are collected into one table. In Table 28, the terminology that is common to 4Q493 and the other M passages is marked with red text.

As regards the trumpets the text of 4Q493 has particularly much in common with the trumpet lists in 1QM column 3 and 7. Probably on that basis, the trumpets of the slain and the trumpets for summoning have often been reconstructed in the text of 4Q493 (lines 7, 10).⁷⁷ However, there are no clear arguments for this. It is equally possible that in 4Q493 there are no trumpets other than those preserved; one model to speculate with is that the trumpets of memorial (line 2) start the war, the trumpets of battle (line 4) give a sign to advance, the trumpets of alarm (line 7; reconstructed) are used to frighten the enemy and finally, the trumpets of withdrawal (line 8) call the soldiers back. In the second phase, the trumpets of battle (line 10; reconstructed) again give a sign to advance and with the trumpets of alarm (line 11), the enemy is frightened. There are no clear arguments for this reconstruction either, but it demonstrates that there is no absolute need to insert all the trumpets known elsewhere into this passage – especially when it already includes groups of trumpets that are not known anywhere else. What should also be taken into account is that, as the table shows, in 4Q491b only one trumpet group (trumpets of alarm) is used in order to direct the war – and when keeping this in mind, it is not impossible to think that there were simpler systems of trumpets than those described in 1QM, perhaps preceding it. It is already noted that 1QM tends to gather material together and this characteristic is probably also visible in the lists of trumpets, which might have preserved material from several sources.

Related to this speculation, it should be noted that the sound of the trumpet is not described with as great accuracy in 4Q493 as it is in three passages in 1QM: as Table 29 demonstrates, whereas in 4Q493 the sound is “shrill” (חד), in 1QM passages it is also “staccato” (טרוד). In addition, in 1QM lines 8:13–14, the sound of the trumpets of withdrawal is described in detail, it is “low” (גוח) “level” (מרודד) and “legato” (סמוך). In 4Q493, the trumpets of withdrawal are mentioned but their sound is not discussed at all. Thus, all in all, the trumpets and their sounds seem to be discussed in more detail in 1QM while in 4Q493 the system and its description are probably simpler.⁷⁸

77 See, e.g., Baillet, DJD 7:50.

78 Cf. also Schultz (*Conquering the World*, 310, 369), who concludes that “4Q493 preserved a simpler and shorter description of the battle procedures than in all the other documents.”

TABLE 28 The texts of 4Q493 1–14, 4Q491 1–3 13b–15a, 1QM 3:1–2a, 1QM 7:12b–13a and 1QM 16:3–4a, 18:3b–5a

4Q493	4Q491:13b–15a	1QM 3:1–2a	1QM 7:12b–13a	1QM 16:3–4a (cf. also 4Q491a frg. II col. 2); 18:3b–5a
[ה] 1 יהמלחמה והכותנים בני אהרן יעמודו לפני [ה]	13b ותצוצרות התרועה	1 (סדרי המלחמה	ב2b הוהוה האחד	את כול הסדר הזה יעשו
מערכות 2 והריעו בתצוצרות הזכרון ואהרן בן	יש [מועו ואנשין להפי] ל	ותצוצרות) סדרי המלחמה	יהיה מהלך על פני כול	[ה] הואה על עומדם
יפתחו את [ה] השקיעו 3 לאנשי 4 הכנים והכותנים	בחללי האשמה ואחר יקום	מקראם בהפתח	אנשי המערכה לחזק	נגד מחני כתיים ואחר יתקעו
יריעו בתצוצרות המלחמה 4 די במערכות	הוא [את מער] כוונתו	שערי המלחמה לצאת	ידיהם במלחמה ובד	להמה הכותנים בתצוצרות
4 גויים והכותנים יצאו מבין החללים ועמדי מזה	14 והמאסף מימין ומשמאל	אנשי הכנים ותצוצרות	הששה היו 13 תצוצרות	4 הזכרון ופתחו שערי
למל 5 ליד החרף והמאבן ולוא יחללו שמו	ובא [חור ובפנים א] יבעת	2 התרועות החללים	המקרא ותצוצרות	המל [לחמה ו] יצאו אנשי הכנים
כהותם [הח] לל [ס] 6 [ו] לכל מערכות הכנים	הרוחו [ת] מכלמות	ותצוצרות 2 המארב	הזכרון ותצוצרות	ועמדו ראשים בין המערכות
לוא יגשו ותקעו בקול חף לצאת אנשי]	כלה והיו כול המערכות [ת]	ותצוצרות המרדף	התרועה ותצוצרות	***
7 המלחמה להתקרב בין המערכות בתצוצרות [הנגשות למלחמת האנן יב	בהנגף אויב ותצוצרות	המרדף ותצוצרות	[תצוצרות הזכרון ונאספו
התקיעו להם בתצוצרות המלחמה 9 לבוא	15 אחד	המאסף המלחמה	המאסף	אלהים המלחמה ונתלקו על
השקיעים ויצאה המערכה השנית וכול הסדר				כול כול מערכות מן [כ] תיים
הוא יתקיעו 10 להם הזכרון 11 בעונתה בצאתם				5 להחריםם
ותקיעו [וב] להם בתצוצרות 12 המלחמה [ס]				
כמשפט [יתקיעו לכן] המלחמה ערכות vacat]				
13 [ת] [על תצוצרות [ת] השבתות]				
14 [התמיד ולעלות כתוב תבן]				

TABLE 28 The texts of 4Q493 1–14, 4Q491 1–3 13b–15a, 1QM 3:1–2a, 1QM 7:12b–13a and 1QM 16:3–4a, 18:3b–5a (cont.)

4Q493	4Q491:13b–15a	1QM 3:1–2a	1QM 7:12b–13a	1QM 16:3–4a (cf. also 4Q491a frg. II col. 2); 18:3b–5a
<p>1 The war. The priests, Sons of Aaron, shall take up position in front of [the] lines 2 and sound the trumpets of memorial. Then they shall open the g[ate]s for the 3 skirmishers. Then the priests shall sound the trumpets of battle [...] hand on the lines of 4 the nations. The priests shall get away from the slain and take position [...] side ... 5 to the side of the catapult and the ballista. They shall not profane the oil of their priesthood [...] the s[ai]n.] 6 [And] they shall not draw near any of the lines of the skirmishers. They shall blow a shrill sound for the me[n of] 7 war to march out and approach between the lines, with the trumpets [...] And [they] shall be [g]in 8 to stretch out the hand in the battle. When their portion is fulfilled, they shall blow for them the trump[et]s of withdr[aw]al 9 to enter the gates. The second line shall march out, and, according to this entire rule, the priests shall b[low] 10 for them during its periods. When they march out, [they] shall blow for them on the [trumpets ...] 11 and when [they] fulfil [it], on the trumpets of alarm; [when] they [re]turn, [they] shall b[low ...] 12 the gathe[r]ing. According to the prece[pt ...] they shall blow for a[ll the li]nes. <i>vacat</i> [...] 13 [...] [...] on the trumpet[s of] Sabbaths [...] 14 ... [...] (of) the continual burnt offering and for the holocaust it shall be written ... [...]</p>	<p>13b The trumpets of ala[rm ...] they [shall he]ar. The men [...] to bring] down among the slain of guiltiness. Then the [am] bush shall burst out from its location and shall array its [li]nes as well [...] 14 The gathering (on) the right and (on) the left, on the r[ear] and on the front, the [our direction[s ...] m in destructive battles. All the line[s] which have drawn near for the battle (against) the ene[my] shall be [...] 15 together.</p>	<p>1 battle formations, the trumpets for summoning them when opening the gates of the battle to let the skirmishers march out, the trumpets of alarms of the slain, the trumpets of 2 ambush, the trumpets of pursuit when the enemy is smitten, and the trumpets of gathering when withdrawing from battle.</p>	<p>12b The first priest shall walk in front of all the men of the line to strengthen their hands for the battle. In the hand of the six (others) there shall be 13 the trumpets of summoning, the trumpets of memorial, the trumpets of alarm, the trumpets of pursuit, and the trumpets of gathering.</p> <p>3 They shall act according to this entire rule [...] where they stand, in front of the camps of the Kittim. The priests shall blow for them the trumpets of memorial, the gates of ba[tle] shall open, [and] the skirmishers shall [m]arch out and take position in columns between the lines. *** 3b At that time the priests shall blow 4 [... the trumpet[s of memorial]; all the battle lines shall gather towards them and they shall divide against all ... [...] of the Ki[tim] 5 to annihilate them</p>	

TABLE 29 The texts of 4Q493 6b–8c, 1QM 8:8b–13b and 1QM 16:6b–9

4Q493 6b–8a	1QM 8:8b–13b	1QM 16:6b–9
<p>6b ותקעו בקול ה' לצאת אנשי] [ש] 7 המלחמה להתקרב בין המערכות בחצוצותיהן] וה' [ח] [ג] 8 לשלוח יד במלחמה</p>	<p>8b והכוהנים יריעו בשש חצוצות 9 החללים קול חד טרוד לנצח מלחמה והלויים וכול עם השופרות יריעו 10 קול אחד הרועת מלחמה גדולה להמס לב אויב ועם קול התרועה יצאו 11 וזקוק המלחמה להפיל הללים קול השופרות ידושו ובת[צו]צרות יהיו 12 הכוהנים מריעים קול חד טרוד לנצח יד מלחמה עד השליכם למערכת 13 האויב שבע פעמים ואחר יתקעו להם הכוהנים בחצוצרות המשוב 14 קול נוח מרודד סמוך</p>	<p>6b ובעומדם ליד מערכת כתיים כדי הטל ירימו איש ידו בכלי 7 מלחמתו וששת] [ח חצוצרות החללים קול חד טרוד לנצח מלחמה והלויים וכול עם 8 השופרות יריעו] את ג] [קול גדול ועם צאת הקול יהלו ידם להפיל בחללי כתיים וכול 9 העם יקשו קול התרועה] [והכוהנים יהיו מריעים בחצוצ- רות החללים והמלחמה מתנצחת בכתיים</p>
<p>6b They shall blow a shrill sound for the me[n of] 7 war to march out and approach between the lines, with the trumpets [...] And [they] shall be[g] in 8 to stretch out the hand in the battle.</p>	<p>8b Then the priests shall blow on the six trumpets 9 of the slain a shrill staccato sound to conduct the battle; the Levites and all the people with trumpets shall blow 10 together a great war alarm to melt the enemy's heart. With the sound of the alarm, 11 the war javelins shall go out to bring down the slain. Then the sound of the horns shall cease, but on the [tr]umpets 12 the priests shall keep blowing a shrill staccato sound to conduct the fighting hands, until they have thrown into the line of 13 the enemy seven times. Then the priests shall blow for them on the trumpets of withdrawal 14 a low, level, legato sound.</p>	<p>6b and when they stand near the line of the Kittim, within throwing range, each man shall raise his hand with his hand with 7 his weapon. The six [...] the tr]umpets of the slain a shrill staccato sound to conduct the battle; the Levites and all 8 the people with trumpets shall blo[w ...] [...] a great sound. When the sound is emitted, they shall set their hand to bring down among the slain of the Kittim. The whole 9 band shall cease the sound of the alarm, [but the priest]s shall keep blowing on the trumpets of the slain so that the battle against the Kittim shall still be conducted.</p>

2.2 *Priests*

One characteristic that is common to 4Q493 and 1QM 7 is that the priests who hold the trumpets in their hands are described as the priests “of the sons of Aaron” (cf. 1QM 7:10). Elsewhere in the War Texts, the priests’ genealogical background is not referred to, either with the term “sons of Aaron”⁷⁹ or the term “sons of Zadok” (both of which are used in some other rule texts like the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*).⁸⁰ According to Charlotte Hempel, among the Dead Sea Scrolls there are text passages that lack any interest in the genealogical descent of the priestly leadership and these passages deal with the earliest forms of communal life.⁸¹ Furthermore, she argues that when genealogical questions come in, it can be said that the sons of Aaron represent an earlier strand of tradition than the sons of Zadok.⁸² 4Q493 seems to represent an early tradition that stresses the cultic tasks of the sons of Aaron and that lacks any reference to the sons of Zadok, who in later texts – although not in any War Text – start to appear as authority figures alongside the sons of Aaron.⁸³

The priestly orientation of 4Q493, which was already noted, becomes even clearer when comparing the text to 1QM: in the preserved clauses of 4Q493, the priests are almost always the subject⁸⁴ while in 1QM, in addition to the priests, the Levites and the people blow signals (see, e.g., 8:8b–13b and 16:6b–9 in Table 29) and the tasks of the soldiers are described more precisely (see, e.g., 16:4–7). This difference raises the question of whether 4Q493 could be understood as representing the theology of some smaller priestly-oriented group and whether by the time 1QM is compiled, the priests are in a less dominant position in the movement and the community has become more lay oriented (though still priestly in outlook).

79 See, however, the other references to Aaron in 1QM 3:14 (in the inscription on the grand banner), 5:1 (in the inscription on the grand banner) and 17:1 (a reference to the judgment of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron).

80 Cf. Charlotte Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar, JSJSup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 210–14, 218 (republished in eadem, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 195–210).

81 Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 224.

82 Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 223–4.

83 Cf. Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 223. Hempel sees that the sons of Zadok appear in the “community-specific” texts while the earliest strand of the tradition of the sons of Aaron is reflected in the “non-community-specific” context.

84 The only clear exception to this is in line 9 where המערכה השנית is the subject.

2.3 Purity

As Table 30 demonstrates, the prohibition against contamination is also something that connects 4Q493 and 1QM 9.

TABLE 30 The texts of 4Q493, lines 4b–6a and 1QM 9:7b–9

4Q493 4b–6a	1QM 9:7b–9
<p>והכהנים יצאו מבין החללים וְעָמְדוּ [5] לְמַלְאָכֵי הַחֶרֶף וְהַמֵּאֲבֵן וְלֹא יַחַלְלוּ שֶׁמֶן כְּהוֹנָתָם [הַחַלְלִים] 6 [ו] לְכוֹל מְעַרְכוֹת הַבָּנִים</p>	<p>ובנפול החללים יהיו הכו[הנ]ים מריעים מרחוק ולוא יבואו 8 אל תוך החללים להתגאל בדם טמאתם כיא קדושים המה [לו]א יחלו שמן משיחת כהונתם בדם 9 גויי הבל <i>vacat</i></p>
<p>The priests shall go out from the slain and [5] to the side of the catapult and the ballista. They shall not profane the oil of their priesthood [... the s] lai[n.] 6 [And] they shall not draw near any of the lines of the skirmishers.</p>	<p>When the slain fall down, the pri[est]s shall keep blowing from afar. They shall not come 8 to the midst of the slain (so as) to become defiled in their unclean blood, for they are holy. They shall [no]t profane the oil of their priestly anointing through the blood 9 of nations of vanity. <i>vacat</i></p>

The attitude towards the priests and the slain seems to be different in these texts: while in 4Q493, the priests “shall go out from the slain,” in 1QM, it is forbidden even to “come to the midst of the slain.” In 1QM, after this prohibition, there is a double explanation: first, it is said that entering into the midst of the slain is forbidden since the priests would be defiled by the unclean blood of the slain and that cannot happen because the priests are holy.⁸⁵ Then, there is a sentence closely parallel to 4Q493 which says that the priests shall not allow the oil of their anointment to be profaned. In the end, it is further defined that the purity is not in jeopardy because of just any kind of blood but especially because of the blood “of nations of vanity.” This term, גויי הבל, does not occur in the preserved text of 4Q493.⁸⁶

85 In Numbers, it is ordered that anyone who touches a dead body will be unclean for seven days; see Num 19:16–18, Num 31:19.

86 In 1QM, גויי הבל occurs three times in addition to line 9:9; see lines 4:12, 6:6 and 11:9. See also the very fragmentary line 4Q496 15 5.

These differences again argue for the reworked nature of 1QM: the question of purity is there expanded and it seems to have needed explanation. This would fit together with the suggestion already made, the one according to which 4Q493 could represent the (perhaps exploratory) thinking of a small priestly-oriented group while 1QM reflects the ideas presented to a wider group in which the laymen also played an important role. It could be explained that in 1QM, which was directed at a wider audience, it was necessary to make the difference between priests and laymen stricter than in 4Q493, and thus, it is said that the priests are not allowed to go in the midst of the slain at all.

2.4 *Summary of 4Q493*

Among the War Texts, 4Q493 represents in many ways an unmatched vision of the war: For example, the weapons that are used are unique inasmuch as they are not known anywhere else in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In addition, the number of trumpets as well as their names and their order are not closely parallel to any of the other War Texts – although not completely incomparable either. An exceptionally strong emphasis on priests is also something that makes a difference between 4Q493 and 1QM.⁸⁷ However, there is no reason to suggest that 4Q493 and 1QM need be completely independent and some lines of development can perhaps be traced: the complex trumpet system, the detailed description of trumpet sounds, the diverse direction of the war (i.e., laymen's association alongside the priestly leaders) and the explanatory description of carrying out the purity rules, all presented in 1QM, can be seen as the results of exploiting and reworking some ideas also presented in 4Q493. It is also possible that 4Q493 represents a more experimental war vision aimed at a more narrow audience and thus it may have been in use in tandem with 1QM. The similarity of the titles of these two texts (both including the word המלחמה) may indicate that the texts were intended to be connected with each other – and perhaps the title was needed to make this link since there otherwise were differences between the texts. Abegg calls 4Q493 as a “priestly handbook” (although he adds a question mark after this designation),⁸⁸ thus probably suggesting that this manuscript consisted only of war-related material. However, if 1 at the beginning of the fragment is interpreted as a sheet number, it indicates

87 Cf. also Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 319, 323–4. According to Yishay, 4Q493 concentrates on priests while in 1QM, the viewpoint is mainly that of the soldiers. Both are based on similar traditions but these traditions are used differently, applying to these different points of view.

88 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 66.

that the manuscript was part of a quite large compilation, and one can also play with the idea that 4Q493 belonged to some kind of manual or handbook of different themes in which this (single) preserved sheet/column was dedicated to the war. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to support or deny this speculation.

3 Summary of 4Q491b and 4Q493

When comparing 4Q491b and 4Q493 with 1QM, it can be concluded that, on the one hand, both of these Cave 4 M manuscripts include material common with 1QM – lexical and thematic links between the texts clearly occur – but, on the other hand, there are no parts in 1QM that would from the lexical point of view be close parallels to 4Q491b or 4Q493. Rather, it seems that 4Q491b and 1QM – as well as 4Q493 and 1QM – share elements that are, however, arranged differently and/or modified, probably according to different needs and purposes of use. In general, 1QM tends to collect material and organize it into different kinds of unities, lists and hymns and it is more likely, in both cases, that 1QM rewrites the 4QM text. When comparing 1QM to 4Q491b, it seems probable that in 1QM the idea of the presence of angels is widened from the battle to the war camp. Also, what is clear is that the material was differently organized. When comparing 1QM to 4Q493, it seems that while 4Q493 reflects the ideas of the priestly-oriented group, in 1QM, laymen get more attention and play a more significant role in battle. Thus, in the transmission process of the war traditions, the direction seems to have been towards the laymen's point of view and a more accessible view of sacredness.

As already noted, 4Q491a and 4Q491b can be understood as one manuscript or two. There are arguments for both conclusions and the question still needs further attention. When understood as separate manuscripts, 4Q491a and 4Q491b seem to describe somewhat different visions of the war. In 4Q491b, the war camp is at the center of attention and the requirements for going there and going to the battlefield are discussed. In addition, an ambush seems to be one of the key tools regarding the tactics of the three-phased war. In 4Q491a, in contrast, the war consists of several phases and encouraging soldiers between them is an important theme. Weapons and trumpets receive attention but ambush is not mentioned, at least in the preserved text. However, these differences are not a reason to think that combining these two manuscripts would be especially implausible – 1QM is an example of a manuscript that collects different material so that every now and then the passages even seem to be

contradictory. If understood as one manuscript, 4Q491a and 4Q491b could be an optional anthology of all the war material, probably compiled before 1QM and perhaps serving as one model for it.

While 1QM is inscribed with one hand – not necessarily by one scribe but at least the aim seems to have been to produce a coherent manuscript with regard to its appearance – in 4Q491, there are two different hands clearly distinguishable and some textual markings (cf., e.g., the small hyphens in fragments 1–3)⁸⁹ also seem to denote that the manuscript was not written at one sitting but that the text was somehow a work in progress. Both material facts and content indicate that 1QM was written for a larger audience, not primarily for study purposes or for some other private use, but to be some kind of showpiece that was pleasant to look at. By contrast, 4Q491 was written throughout with a small and tight script, leaving only small spaces between the lines, which indicates a different, probably more private use.⁹⁰ 4Q493 has sometimes been suggested to be a private manuscript as well. At this stage, there is no way to safely prove the private nature of these manuscripts, but the idea of their private quality seems to be consistent with the idea of manuscripts representing the theology of a limited group.⁹¹ Although the categories “private” and “communal” are not exactly straightforward, this categorization is one way to illustrate that (1) it was possible to use multiple manuscripts simultaneously (not only sequentially), (2) multiple manuscripts were probably produced for different purposes (not only to replace each other), and

89 For more about this, see the discussion in Section 1.1 of Chapter 2 above.

90 See note 91 below.

91 According to Mladen Popović, the Qumran manuscripts point to “a communal, school-like context,” whereas the manuscripts found in other Judean Desert sites were “owned by relatively wealthy individuals or families from villages in the countryside.” See Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis? A Comparative Perspective on Judean Desert Manuscript Collections,” *JSJ* 43 (2012): 551–94 (578). Although the Qumran manuscripts do not represent such a personal context, it is still possible that a school-like context had different kinds of manuscripts, some of them for more private use and others for more communal use. Examples of what private or personal use may have meant in practice are manuscripts being studied in private, used when practicing devotion in private, being carried along while travelling. Or perhaps being linked to this kind of copy enabled a learned person to gain or strengthen his status and authority. However, here, the term privacy should not be taken too literally: defining a manuscript as private does not necessarily mean that it was not used by more than one person (either simultaneously or sequentially) or that the manuscript was never read, studied or reworked by more than one person together. Defining a manuscript as private can simply mean that it was not primarily written for communal use or for a larger audience.

(3) multiple manuscripts were probably important on different levels, on both the individual and communal level, but also on a real social and abstract level (textual transmission level).⁹²

92 About this third point, see Brent A. Strawn, "Excerpted 'Non-Biblical' Scrolls at Qumran? Background, Analogies, Function," in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*, ed. M.T. Davis and B.A. Strawn (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 65–123 (79–80). It can also be said that the privacy of the manuscript would indicate, according to Strawn, that the manuscript was also important as a material artifact and as a whole, not just as something that preserves "text." Abstract and concrete levels can also be explained by stating that the human mind tends to create its own model of "text" or "work" (abstract level) but what we actually have are the manuscripts, concrete representations of the traditions (concrete level).

4Q494 (4QM^d) and 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B): Texts that Overlap with 1QM 2?

With this chapter, up to the end of Chapter 6, the Cave 4 War Text fragments not so well preserved are taken under close scrutiny. These fragments are divided into groups partly based on their material characteristics (opisthographic papyrus manuscripts are discussed together in Chapter 6) and partly due to contentual and research-historical reasons (the manuscripts discussed in this chapter). In the earlier research, it has been suggested that there is a close text-historical relationship between 4Q494, 4Q471 and 1QM. The editors of 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B) Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel start their introduction to 4Q471 fragment 1 by stating that it is “part of a version of the War Scroll which is shorter and probably earlier than 1QM 2 or 4QM^d (= 4Q494).¹ In addition, Abegg notes that the script of 4Q494 is similar to that of 4Q471.² Thus, in order to contribute to the earlier discussions, it is reasonable to study 4Q494, 4Q471 and 1QM 2 together. The chapter starts with 4Q494 (1), moves on to 4Q471 (2), and finally, conclusions on them and their relationship to 1QM 2 are drawn (3).

1 4Q494 (4QM^d)

Manuscript 4Q494 consists of only one small fragment, which is about 4 cm high and 6 cm wide.³ The surface of this average-thick fragment is fairly dark brown.⁴ Its scribe did not rule the lines but the line spacing is still quite regular, about 7 mm. The right margin is clearly visible, so the preserved text is at the beginnings of lines.⁵ The writing is careful and dated to the late Herodian

1 Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “4QWar Scroll-like Text B,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, ed. S.J. Pfann et al., DJD 36 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 439.

2 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 77. Abegg adds that “the line height is also similar to fragments 1, 2 and 6 of 4Q471.”

3 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 21.

4 Baillet, DJD 7:53.

5 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 21. Duhaime suggests that the lines originally contained about 80 letters or spaces. However, this remains speculative since there is no material evidence of the length of the lines.

period, early first century CE, contemporary with 1QpHab and the first scribe of 1QH^a.⁶ Six lines of the text are partly preserved and their letters are about 3 mm high. Duhaime reads this manuscript as follows:⁷

8]○○ם[טי] 1
 2 והכוהנים והלויים וראשי ה
 3 הכוהנים וכן ללויים ומשמרות
 4 כוהן הרואש⁹ ומשנהו ראשי
 5 [וע]שרים במשמרותם [י]ש[רתו]
 6 [ואח]ריהם ראשני

Although 4Q494 consists of just one small fragment, it includes terms that make it possible to conclude something about the context of the preserved text: Mentioning priests and Levites suggests connecting the text with service. In addition, in Numbers the term *משמרת* is related to those duties that are to be performed in front of or in the tent of meeting (e.g., Num 3 and Num 18), and in 1 Chronicles and some other Jewish sources *משמרות* refers to priests' work in the temple.¹⁰ This word is also one that links the text of 4Q494 to 1QM. *משמרת* does not occur many times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls outside the M texts; of its 17 occurrences, seven are in M texts (1QM 2:2a, 2:2b,

6 Baillet, DJD 7:53. Duhaime (*The War Texts*, 41) categorizes 4Q494 as the youngest of the Cave 4 war text fragments.

7 Duhaime, "War Scroll," 174. There are no new color photos of this fragment available. However, it can be seen in three PAM photos in the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library: in PAM 44.018, in the bottom right corner of the plate (B-285358); in PAM 42:475, at the bottom of the plate (B-283965), and in PAM 41:848, in the bottom right corner of the plate (B-280290).

8 Yishay ("The Literature of War at Qumran," 255) does not see any clear letters in this line but reads just]○[]○○○[]. It is true that line 1 is very difficult to read: there are just small ink traces of the bottoms of its letters left. Duhaime reads there the letters *ש*, *ב* and *ד*. As regards *ד*, the bottom stroke is weakly visible. However, it is quite certain that it is *ד*: the stroke dips left and seems to be clearly below the bottoms of the other letters – just like the *ד*'s in the following line. About *ש*, the bottom of the left vertical line slightly tilted to the left is visible as is the bottom of the lower right lines. These scant traces are difficult to fit to any other letter. The bottom of the letter next to *ש* seems to be a horizontal stroke. *מ* and *נ* have a horizontal stroke at their bottom, but in both of these letters the stroke dips slightly to the left. This is also true of *כ*. There are no *פ*'s in this fragment, but in 1QpHab, it seems that their bottom strokes also dip slightly to the left. Thus, all in all, it seems most plausible that the trace belongs to *ב*. Therefore, there is no reason to deviate from Duhaime's reading although Yishay's caution is very understandable.

9 Qimron (*The Hebrew Writings*, 112) reads *הראש* here while Duhaime and other editors read *הרואש*. In PAM 44.018, *ו* in the middle of the word is clearly visible.

10 Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:440.

2:3, 2:4; 4Q491 fragments 1–3 line 7; 4Q494 lines 3, 5) and at least four are in biblical quotations or allusions (CD 4:1/Ezek 44:15; 1QpHab 6:12/Hab 2:1; 4Q364 fragment 29:2/Deut 11:1; 4Q365 fragment 27:5/Num 3:28).¹¹ All plural occurrences are in M texts.¹² Another not very common word is משנה which occurs 12 times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls in different meanings (e.g., “copy,” “follower,” “the second one”) but in addition to 4Q494, only in 1QM is it connected with the chief priest, denoting his deputy (כֹּהֵן הַרִאשׁוֹן וּמְשֻׁנָּהוּ).¹³ Thus, it is reasonable to compare 4Q494 with 1QM 2. Table 31 demonstrates the lexical similarities between 4Q494 and 1QM 2:1–3a.

TABLE 31 The text of 4Q494 and 1QM 2:1–3a

4Q494	1QM 2
1] שְׁבַיִשׁ [טי] ם ן ן	1 אבות העדה שנים וחמשים ואת ראשי הכוהנים
2] והכוהנים והלויים וראשי ה'	יסרובו אחר
3] הכוהנים וכן ללויים ומשמרות	כֹּהֵן הַרִאשׁוֹן וּמְשֻׁנָּהוּ רִאשִׁים שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר לִהְיוֹת
4] כֹּהֵן הַרִאשׁוֹן וּמְשֻׁנָּהוּ רִאשִׁים	משרתים
5] [וע] שְׂרִים בְּמִשְׁמֹרֹתָם [י] שְׁרֵתוּ	2 בתמיד לפני אל וראשי המשמרות ששה
6] [ואח] יִהְיֶה רִאשׁוֹן	וְעֹשִׂים בְּמִשְׁמֹרֹתָם יִשְׂרָתוּ
	וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם רִאשִׁי הַלְוִיִּים לְשֵׁרֵת תְּמִיד שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר אֶחָד
	לשֶׁבֶט 3
1 [...] tr[ib]es ... [...] 2 and the priests, the Levites, the chiefs of the [...] 3 the priests, and for the Levites as well. And the courses of [...] 4 the chief priest and his deputy, [...] chiefs [...] 5 [and twe]nty [...] shall se[rve] in their courses. [...] 6 [Aft]er them, chief[s] of [...]	1 fathers of the congregation, fifty-two. They shall dispose the chiefs of the priests behind the chief priest and his deputy, twelve chiefs who are to serve 2 continually before God; and twenty-six chiefs of courses shall serve in their courses. After them, twelve chiefs of the Levites are to serve continually, one 3 for each tribe

11 Other occurrences: 1QH^a 4:5, 1Q36 16 2, 4Q219 2:28, 4Q221 1 5, 4Q276 1 8, 4Q522 9 ii 1.

12 Cf., however, 4Q522 9 ii 14 where מְשֻׁנָּהוּ is reconstructed in the plural. However, the reconstruction is uncertain and the editor (Émile Puech in DJD 25) marked it with a question mark.

13 Cf., however, 11Q19 31:4 where the “second priest” is mentioned and the high priest probably occurs in the next line (הַגִּדְלוֹל הַכֹּהֵן).

There is much in common between 4Q494 lines 4–6 and 1QM 2:1–2, and as Baillet has noted, it is quite possible to reconstruct 1QM 2:1–2 into the missing parts of lines 4–6 of 4Q494.¹⁴ However in lines 5 and 6 of 4Q494, the text seems to follow that of 1QM line 2 so that the text similar to the end of 1QM 2:2a is preserved in line 5 and the text similar to the beginning of 1QM 2:2b is preserved in line 6. Thus, at the end of line 5, there is space for more text in comparison to 1QM 2. Baillet himself finds it plausible that the text of 1QM 2:3b (וראשי משמרותם איש במעמדו ישרתו) is missing in 4Q494, and in (suggested) line 6 the text continues according to 1QM 2:3c.¹⁵ The expression אחריהם would in that case be located before the mention of the chiefs of the tribes and the fathers of the congregation in 4Q494 while in 1QM 2 it is located only after their mention. However, the simpler and more probable option – suggested by Abegg and Schultz (and brought up by Baillet himself as well)¹⁶ – is that there is a *vacat* in the end of line 5. By assuming this, one does not have to accept line 5 of 4Q494 being somewhat longer than the other lines which is the presupposition for Baillet’s solution. Thus, the upshot is that 4Q494, lines 3b–6 form a close textual parallel to 1QM 2 lines 1–3a, but while 1QM does not include any *vacats* here, 4Q494 does include one.

Since 1QM 2 is generally very well preserved,¹⁷ it is possible to analyze its content and that of the suggested parallel passage in 4Q494 in more detail in order to assess what kinds of traditions are being transmitted here. In the context of 1QM, column 2 is exceptional since it is the only one describing the temple service. Lines 1–6 enumerate the groups who all probably are meant to have some duties related to the service: the chief priest (כוהן הראש) is at the top of the service hierarchy and his “deputy” (משנה) is also mentioned.¹⁸ Furthermore, 12 chiefs of the priests and 26 chiefs of the *משמרות*, i.e., “courses” or “divisions,” probably also priests, are mentioned in the text. The tasks of these two groups seem to be somehow different: the 12 chiefs of the priests are to serve in the regular offering (להיות משרתים בתמיד, 1QM 2:1b–2a) and the 26 chiefs of the courses are to serve in their courses (במשמרותם ישרתו, 1QM 2:3b). The probable explanation for the separation of these two groups is that the 12

14 Baillet DJD 7:53. Consequently, it is usually suggested that lines 1–3 are parallel to 1QM 1, lines at the end of the column. However, since the end of 1QM 1 is not preserved, it is impossible to compare it to 4Q494.

15 Baillet, DJD 7:54.

16 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 78; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 227–8, n. 144; Baillet, DJD 7:54.

17 Only the end of the column is partly damaged.

18 Davies (1QM, *The War Scroll from Qumran*, 26) notes that this mention of the chief priest is the only one in columns 2–9 whereas in columns 15–19 the chief priest has a more significant role.

priests were meant to be in the temple all the time, while the 26 priests were ordered to be there only twice a year, during their course.¹⁹

A similar division seems to prevail among the Levites: there are 12 Levites who are to serve continually (לשרת תמיד, 1QM 2:2) and some number (probably 26)²⁰ of chiefs of the courses who are said to serve each one in his office (איש במעמדו ישרתו, 1QM 2:3). In this case as well, there are two groups with different responsibilities. The same verb that is used of the tasks of the 26 priests (שרת) is also used of the tasks of the Levites.²¹ This may indicate that the difference between the priests and the Levites was not intended to be very strict.²²

- 19 Cf. also Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 202; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 219. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 204–6, notes that the number 26 in 1QM 2 is odd when comparing the text to the Hebrew Bible and other Jewish sources: in 1 Chronicles, in Josephus, and in the rabbinic sources, the number of divisions or courses to serve in the temple is 24. Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, DJD 36:440, add that, in their opinion, when describing the order of the 24 courses' service, 1 Chronicles 24 reflects the reality of the Second Temple period. Yadin explains this peculiarity by arguing that the number 26 in 1QM 2 is parallel to the divergent calendar of the Qumranites: for them, there were 52 weeks per year and 26 per half a year and hence the 26 chiefs of courses will serve half a year. Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 222–33, explains this argument by stating that 26 is the “number of weeks of courses that were counted in the given six month period.” According to him, the priests were still divided into 24 courses but while 20 of these courses served twice a year, one week at a time, four courses served three times a year, also one week at time. In any case, it is clear that the number 26 refers to a period of half a year.
- 20 Davies (1QM, *The War Scroll from Qumran*, 26) suggests that there are also 26 courses of the Levites. This is likely but the number 26 is not explicitly mentioned in relation to the Levites in the text.
- 21 The verb שרת (*piel*), which means “to serve,” for example, in personal service (cf., e.g., Gen 39:4) or to serve God (cf., e.g., 1 Sam 2:11). In the Hebrew Bible, this verb occurs very often when discussing service at the sanctuary or in worship; for example, in Exodus it is always related to priests (Ex 28:35, 43; 29:30; 30:20; 35:19; 39:1, 26, 41). In addition, the verb is also used when discussing the duties of the Levites in the Hebrew Bible (see Num 1:50). Considering all this, the usage of this verb in 1QM 2 does not seem to be in any way atypical.
- 22 However, the difference between בתמיד (mentioned in relation to the 12 priests in 1QM 2:1) and תמיד (mentioned in relation to the 12 Levites in 1QM 2:2) is often discussed. Eshel and Eshel, among others, remark that בתמיד is found in Tamid 3:5 where it refers to the daily burnt-offering. See Eshel and Eshel, “4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991, volume 2*, ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L.V. Montaner, STDJ 11, 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 615. However, they end up arguing that in 1QM בתמיד functions as an adverb – as does Duhaime by translating משרתים להיות בתמיד as “to serve steadily.” Yadin translates משרתים להיות בתמיד “to be serving in their daily burnt-offering” but notes that תמיד “also means continually” – and translates it as such when it occurs without preposition (at the end of line 2 “continually,” in lines 3 and 5 “perpetually”). Davies, 1QM, *the War Scroll from Qumran*, 27, argues as well that the

When scrutinizing Persian and Hellenistic texts in general, it seems that, from the late Persian era onwards, the Levites were given more equal status in relation to priests and the attitude towards them became more positive.²³ In the Hellenistic era, there was probably an intense debate going on concerning the relationship between the priests and the Levites²⁴ – and it is quite possible that 1QM 2 also reflects this.

What is more exceptional is that in 1QM column 2 the laymen seem to be a part of the cultic activity.²⁵ In line 1QM 2:5, the pronoun אלה can be meant to

task of the priests is “to be offering the Tamid before God” (להיות משרתים בתמיד לפני) (אל) while the chiefs of the Levites “serve continually” (לשרת תמיד) and the lay leaders “stand continually” (להתיצב תמיד). According to Davies, there is very probably a difference between בתמיד and תמיד since “the two occur within such a short space that a distinction is almost certainly intended.” The interpretation that תמיד with ב is meant to be understood as a noun and not an adverb is plausible since there is no reason to add a preposition to an adverb. Also, in the Hebrew Bible, there are several examples of תמיד with an article which indicates that the word was not used as an adverb but as a noun (cf. e.g., 10 cases in Numbers 29 and parallel in 4Q366 [4QRP^d] fragment 3). A similar case is also found in other M texts, 4Q493 line 14 (להתמיד ולעלות כְּתוֹב תְּבִינְךָ). All this may indicate that some distinction between the tasks of the priests and the tasks of the Levites was still intended to be made; cf. also Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 221.

23 A good example of this is the Temple Scroll, in which the Levites are given a more significant role in the temple cult than in the Pentateuch, although it is still differentiating between priests and Levites, see e.g., Sidney White Crawford, *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 56; Molly M. Zahn, “The Levites, the Royal Council, and the Relationship Between Chronicles and the Temple Scroll,” in *Law, Literature, and Society in Legal Texts from Qumran: Papers from the Ninth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Leuven 2016, ed. J. Jokiranta and M.M. Zahn, STDJ 128 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 253–269 (256). Zahn notes that in addition to Temple Scroll, several other Second Temple texts reflect this expanded role of Levites, among them 1QM and related manuscripts (see esp. 256 n. 10). In general, the question about priests and Levites in the Second Temple times is widely debated, see e.g., Jacob Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 501–23; idem, “The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles,” in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. G.J. Brooke, JSPSup 7 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 165–80; Robert 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. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 465–79; Jeffrey Stackert, “The Cultic Status of the Levites in the Temple Scroll: Between History and Hermeneutics,” in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition*, ed. M.A. Leuchter and J.M. Hutton, AIL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 199–214; Hanna Tervanotko, *Denying Her Voice: The Figure of Miriam in Ancient Jewish Literature*, Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 23 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 181–91; just to mention a few examples.

24 Tervanotko, “Denying Her Voice,” 188.

25 Note a contrary view in Numbers, for instance, where the Levites are separated from the other Israelites to take care of the service on behalf of the people (Num 8:18–19).

refer either to all the above-mentioned groups²⁶ – the priests, the Levites, and the laymen – or specifically to the laymen²⁷ who are mentioned just before it (1QM 2:3b–4).²⁸ If אלה refers to laymen only, that would probably mean that the laymen were expected to be present at the temple, in addition to the priests and the Levites, during the times of sacrifices.²⁹ If it refers to all three groups, it would still mean that the laymen play a role in the temple service (although still different from that of the priests and the Levites).³⁰ Thus, in 1QM 2, there are clearly three different groups of people – priests, Levites and laymen – who all participate in the temple service.³¹ Manuscript 4Q494 also reflects this division into three but it is possible that there the priests are more clearly separated from the other groups by leaving a *vacat* in line 5 just before the discussion moves on from priests to Levites. This may indicate that the role

-
- 26 Yadin (*The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light*, 264) interprets in this way. Eshel and Eshel (“4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma’amadot in the War Scroll,” 618) end up arguing that אלה refers to the Levite courses and all the laymen.
- 27 Davies (1QM, *The War Scroll from Qumran*, 27) brings up this option and speculates that the text of 1QM 2 had undergone some revision at this point so that the tasks of the Levites have been moved to the laymen.
- 28 The latter option can be supported by noting that the idea that the laymen take part in the cult is not unknown in other M texts: in 4Q491b fragments 1–3 lines 8–9, there is a mention concerning the service (cf. also Eshel and Eshel, “4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma’amadot in the War Scroll,” 613–14): “When they march out to set up the battle [to humi]liate [the enemy ...] among them set free by l[ot] for each tribe, according to its numbered men (פקודיהם), for the daily duty. [...] (On) that day, from all the tribes, they [shall m]arch out of the camps towards the house of meet[ing ... shall] march out towards them the [priest] s, the Lev[i]tes, and all the camp commanders.” In this passage, פקודיהם, the numbered men, are laymen who are excused from military service to perform their duties in the sanctuary. The same term also occurs in 1QM 2:4, shortly before אלה, and it is thus quite possible that אלה refers to the laymen. What should also be noted is that the predicate verb for אלה is יצב, which is used earlier of laymen.
- 29 Cf. Schultz (*Conquering the World*, 220) who, however, seems to consider it more probable that אלה refers to all the groups.
- 30 This is indicated by the verbs that are used to describe the duties of different groups. As was already noted, the verb שרת is connected with the priests and the Levites. The verb which is related to laymen, namely יצב in *hithpael*, means “to take one’s stand,” “to hold one’s ground.” In the Hebrew Bible, this verb can be related to laymen (Ex 14:13; 19:17; Num 11:6; 23:3) as well as to God or the angel of God (Ex 34:5; Num 22:22; 1 Sam 3:10) but it does not have any special connection with temple service or priests and Levites.
- 31 This division into three groups also occurs in 1QS (see 2:19–25). However, there are also different interpretations of the division; see 1QS 7:8–9 where the three groups are the priests, the elders and the rest of the people. Cf. Kellerman, “לוי,” *TDOT* 7:483–503 (503). Note also CD 3:21–4:4 where Ezek 44:15 is quoted and interpreted. There, the three groups are the priests, the Levites and the sons of Zadok. The priests are interpreted to be “the repentant of Israel” (CD 4:2b), the Levites are said to accompany the priests (4:3a), and the sons of Zadok are “the chosen of Israel,” those “who are to appear in the last days.”

of the laymen was an issue under discussion during the transmission of the War Texts.

2 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B)

Manuscript 4Q471 was first thought to consist of 10 leather fragments but later fragments 4–10 were identified as belonging to other manuscripts: fragments 4–5 to 4QPrayer Concerning God and Israel (labeled now with the code 4Q471c), fragment 6 to 4QPolemical Text (4Q471a) and fragments 7–10 to 4QSelf-Glorification Hymn (4Q471b).³² Thus, ultimately, only fragments 1–3 belong to the manuscript 4QWar Scroll-like Text B, also known as 4Q471. These fragments are not edited by Duhaime but Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel in DJD 36. Thus, the following text is an emended version of Eshel and Eshel's edition.³³

Fragment 3 is small; it measures only 1.2 × 3 cm and includes remnants of four lines. Fragments 1 and 2 are a bit larger, 7.6 × 5.2 cm and 5.2 × 7 cm. In fragment 1, there are remnants of nine lines preserved and in fragment 2, remnants of 11 lines. Line spacing in these fragments is 7 mm and an average letter is 3 mm high. The lines contain about 45 letters or spaces each, so the line length is quite short. The script is identified as belonging to the Herodian period, namely to the second half of the first century BCE.³⁴

2.1 Fragment 1 (B-358443; B-358442)

1 הַ מְכַוֵּן אֶשׁ [ר
2 כֹּל אִישׁ מֵאֲחֵיו מִבְּנֵי
3 וְהָיוּ עִמּוֹ תְּמִיד וְשִׁרְתוּ]

32 Abegg ("The War Scroll," 117) mentions 13 fragments, which were reduced to 8. Of these, he introduces only 7 since "fragment 8 is too small to suggest a sure connection." Abegg's numbering and arrangement of fragments differs from that of the DJD edition: Abegg's fragment 1 is more commonly known as 4Q471a, fragments 5 and 6 as 4Q471b, fragment 3 as 4Q471c (fragment 1) and fragments 2, 4 and 5 as 4Q471 (Abegg's fragment 4 = fragment 1; fragment 2 = fragment 2; fragment 5 = fragment 3). See Abegg, "The War Scroll," 118–35.

33 Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "4QWar Scroll-like Text B," in *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, ed. S.J. Pfann et al., DJD 36 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 442. In case of fragment 1, Eshels' large reconstructions based on the suggestion that the text in this fragment is parallel with the text in 1QM 2 are omitted in the following text. Also, the translation of this fragment (cf. Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:443) is reworked considerably in the following tables.

34 Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:439; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 23.

4 כול שבט ושב[ט] אִישׁ
 5 ארים ומזן ה[ל]וים שנים
 6 וישׁו[] אִ תמיד כְּ[ו]ל³⁵
 7 ל[מ]ען יהיו מלמדים³⁶
 8 תִּמְחַלְקוּ[תם]
 9]מה[

As can be seen, there is not much that can be concluded about the text without using possible parallels and/or reconstructions. Line 1 contains only a few words. Line 2, as Duhaime suggests, could perhaps be interpreted as dealing with people who are selected from among their brothers but this cannot be safely said either. Lines 3–6 possibly deal with service: the verb שרת “to serve” possibly occurs at least in line 3 and תמיד (cf. lines 3 and 6) often refers to the daily offering (although it may also be an adverb “continually”). Tribes and Levites and/or their representatives probably play some role in the service. As regards lines 7 and 8, they might have something to do with warfare since

35 While Eshel and Eshel (DJD 36:442) read ושב[ט] in the beginning of this line, Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 128) reads only ם[] and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 950) do not see any trace (they read here וישר[תו] (ושבט]). There is an extremely tiny ink trace left at the beginning of the preserved part of the line – but it is impossible to say what letter it belongs to. Therefore, Abegg’s reading is a better equivalent to what is seen on the fragment and the text is here emended according to it.

In this same line, after the letters ויש, Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 128) reads ב and not ך as Eshel and Eshel (DJD 36:442) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 950) do. Both Abegg and Eshel and Eshel base their readings on the presupposition of a parallel text, in Eshel and Eshel’s case 1QM 2:3,5 and in Abegg’s case 11Q19 (11QTemple^a) 57:13. However, since there is only a tiny trace left of the bottom of this letter, it is impossible to identify the letter, and therefore, only ם is marked at this point.

36 Here, Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 128) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 950) read מלמדי here while Eshel and Eshel (DJD 36:442) read רב[ח] מלמדי. Of the final preserved letter of the line, only the top and the right side can be seen. The letter seems to consist of one vertical stroke on the right, one horizontal stroke at the top and probably another vertical stroke that reaches above the top stroke. These strokes would fit with ך but when scrutinizing the ך in line 2, one can note that the right vertical stroke also reaches above the top stroke. In this respect, the traces would fit better with ם in which only the left vertical stroke reaches above the upper horizontal stroke. The space between the letter in question and the ך that precedes it is no longer than the corresponding spaces in line 5 (ארים[and לוים]), so it is probable that it belongs to the same word as the letters preceding it. Also, when examining the whole fragment, the spaces between the words seem to be longer than that between ך and the letter now under discussion. For all these reasons, Abegg’s and García Martínez and Tigchelaar’s reading here better represents what is seen on the fragment than that of Eshel and Eshel, and the text is here emended according to it.

teaching or training in line 7 (למד) may refer to military training (although it might refer to teaching instructions or something else as well) and the word מחלקה in 1QM 2 refers to “divisions” that are for waging war. However, the root למד occurs in 1QM but not in column 2 and never in the *piel* participle form,³⁷ and as regards מחלקה, in the Dead Sea Scrolls in general, it more often refers to divisions of time (cf., e.g., CD 16:3; 4Q216 1:11; 4Q217 2:1; 4Q384 9:2). Thus, the text’s connection to warfare does not have a very strong basis.

Since the fragment itself gives very little information, it is understandable that scholars have tried to reconstruct it with the help of other texts: Eshel and Eshel reconstructed the text of fragment 1 on the basis of 1QM 2, and Abegg, for his part, on the basis of 11Q19 (*11QTemple^a*) 57.³⁸ In Table 32, the words that are common between 4Q471 fragment 1 and 1QM 2 are colored red. It is easy to observe that the common words do not necessarily form parallel sentences but occur sporadically. It should also be noted that some of the words of 4Q471 fragment 1 (indicated with footnote markers in Table 32) do not occur in 1QM 2 as such. Thus, reconstructing fragment 1 on the basis of 1QM 2 needs a fair amount of creativity since one cannot just place the text of 1QM in the lacunae of fragment 1. Eshel and Eshel state explicitly that their reconstructions in fragment 1 lines 3 and 5 are based on 1QM 2 (cf. line 3 and 1QM 2:1; line 5 and 1QM 2:2).³⁹ However, the reconstructed text in lines 4, 6, 7 and 8 also finds its parallels in 1QM 2.

37 Cf. למד in the *pual* participle in 1QM 6:12, 13 and 10:10, in the *piel* imperfect in 1QM 10:2 and in the *piel* infinitive in 1QM 14:6. Of these occurrences מלחמה למד is in 6:12 and 14:6.

38 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 128–130; see also Abegg, “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. J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 147. I briefly discuss this possible link between 4Q471 and 11Q19 in my dissertation, see Vanonen, “Stable and Fluid War Traditions: Re-Thinking the War Text Material from Qumran” (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2017), 162–3. All in all, what can be concluded is that both the suggested textual parallels to 4Q471 fragment 1 are uncertain and at least they are not closely parallel to 4Q471.

39 Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:442.

TABLE 32 Words common in 4Q471 1 and 1QM 2

4Q471 fragment 1	1QM 2
1 אֶ[מִבְּנֵי] אֶשְׁרַ	1 אבות העדה שנים ותמישים ואת ראשי הכוהנים יסרכו אחר כוהן הראש ומשנהו ראשים שנים עשר להיות
2 כֹּל־אִישׁ מאחזי מבִּי	2 משרתים
3 וְהָיוּ עֲמוֹ תַמִּיד וְשֵׁן[רְתוֹ]	3 בתמיד לפני אל וראשי המשמרות ושה ועשרים במשמרותם ישרתו ואחריהם ראשי הלויים לשרת תמיד שנים
4 כֹּל שֶׁבֶט וּשְׁבָטִים] אִישׁ	4 עשר אחד
5 רִים וּמִן] הַלְוִיִּם שֶׁנִּים	5 לשבט וראשי משמורתם איש במעמדו ישרתו וראשי השבטים ואבות העדה אחריהם להתיצב תמיד בשערי
6 וְיִשְׁׁ] תַמִּיד כֹּלִים	6 המקדש
7 לְמַעַן יִהְיוּ מְלֻמִּים]	7 וראשי משמרותם עם פקודיהם יתיצבו למועדיהם לחודשיהם ולשבחות ולכל ימי השנה מִבְּנֵי חמשים שנה
8 אֶת מִחְלָקָתָם]	8 ומעלה
9 מִהַ]	9 אלה יתיצבו על העולות ועל הזבחים לערוך מקטרת נוחח לרצון אל לכפר בעד כול עדתו ולהדשן לפני תמיד
	10 בשולחן כבוד את כול אלה יסרכו במועד שנת השמטה ובשלוש ושלושים שני המלחמה הנתרות יהיו אנשי השם
	7 קריאי המועד וכול ראשי אבות העדה בחרים להם אנשי מלחמה לכול ארצות הגוים מכול שבטי ישראל יחלצו
	8 להם אנשי חיל לצאת לצבא כפי תעודות המלחמה שנה בשנה ובשני השמטים לוא יחלצו לצאת לצבא כיא שבת
	9 מנוח היאה לישראל בחמש ושלושים שני העבודה תערך המלחמה שש שנים ועורכיה כול העדה יחד
	10 ומלחמת המחלקות ב[ע]תש ועשרים הנתרות

TABLE 32 Words common in 4Q471.1 and 1QM 2 (cont.)

	4Q471 fragment 1	1QM 2
1	[...] ... from a[] tha[t ...]	1 fathers of the congregation, fifty- two . They shall dispose the chiefs of the priests behind the chief
2	[...] each man from his brothers from the sons of [...]	priest and his deputy, twelve chiefs who are to serve 2 continually before God; twenty-six chiefs of courses shall serve in their courses. Behind them, twelve chiefs of the Levites are to serve continually ,
3	[...] ... they [...] and will be con- tinually with him, and [they] will s[erve ...]	one 3 for each tribe ; their chiefs of courses shall serve, each one in his position. The chiefs of the tribes and the fathers of the congregation behind them are to take up their station continually in the gates of the sanctuary; 4 their chiefs of courses with their numbered men shall take up their station for their
4	[...] each tribe and trib [es]man [...]	festivals, for their new moons and Sabbaths, and for all the days of the year, from the age of fifty and over. 5 These shall take up their station at the burnt offerings and the sacrifices to prepare a soothing
5	[...] ... and from [the] Levites , two	incense for the good pleasure of God, to atone on behalf of all his congregation and to grow fat before
6	[...] ... [...] ... continually a[]	him continually 6 at the table of glory. They shall arrange all these during the appointed time of the
7	[...] in] order to have them trained [...]	year of remission. During the remaining thirty-three years of the war, the men of renown 7 appointed to the meeting and all the chiefs of the fathers of the congregation shall choose for themselves men of
8	[...] ... of [their] divisio [ns ...]	war for all the lands of the nations. From all the tribes of Israel they shall equip 8 for themselves men
9	[...] ... [...]	of worth who shall march out to campaign according to the fixed times of war year after year. But dur- ing the years of remission they shall not equip them to march out to campaign, for they are a Sabbath
		9 of rest for Israel. During the thirty-five years of service, the war shall be prepared during six years, the whole congregation preparing it together. 10 The war of the divisions shall take place during the remaining twenty-nine years.

If some of the words in common between 4Q471 fragment 1 and 1QM 2 were rare, the link between the two texts would be stronger. Many of the words in common between the two passages are not the most frequent ones in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, but on the other hand, they are not very rare either: תמיד occurs 68 times, שבט 61 times, לוי 97 times and מחלקת 15 times.⁴⁰ Therefore, Eshel and Eshel's conclusion that 4Q471 fragment 1 includes a "shorter and probably earlier version" than both 1QM and 4Q494 has to be considered bold.⁴¹

2.2 Fragments 2 (B-358445; B-358444) and 3 (B-358447; B-358446)

1 ק שרׁוֹן [1
 2 ◦ [שמר עדוות ברית] ◦⁴² [2
 3 [ור כול צבאותם באורכ אפ]ים 3
 4 [ש ולהניא לבבם מכול מע]שה 4
 5 [ע]בדי חו[ש]ׁ כׁ כיא משפטׁ⁴³] 5
 6 ◦ [באשמת גורלו]ׁ⁴⁴ 6

40 In an ideal case, when comparing two texts, one should not compare single words but whole phrases. However, in Table 32 above, it was demonstrated that if only the preserved words of 4Q471 fragment 1 are taken into account, the remaining words are mostly sporadic.

41 See Eshel and Eshel, "4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll," 620.

42 In the beginning of the line, there is a small ink trace on the fragment a bit before ש. This may belong to ל as suggested by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 950) and reconstructed by Eshel and Eshel (DJD 36:442) but what raises questions is whether the relatively long space between the letters ש and ל is meant to be a space between words. If one wishes to be as consistent as possible with what is seen in the fragment, it is better to mark ◦ before ש and leave a space between them. Therefore, the reading is here corrected from Eshel and Eshel's שמר ל[ׁ] to ◦ [שמר. At the end of the same line, Eshel and Eshel read בריתנׁ but in the available photos, neither of the controversial letters is visible. Instead, later in the same line (on another piece), there is a horizontal stroke at the bottom of the line, curving up on the left. This trace, however, is too far away from ברית to belong to its suffix as suggested by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (בריתכה; see *Study Edition*, 950). It could perhaps belong to a final mem or perhaps there were two letters written close to each other (see an example in line 7, ברע, in which beth and res are tied together). Here, the reading is corrected from]◦ [בריתנׁ] to]◦ [ברית].

43 In this line, Abegg ("The War Scroll," 123) reads חושׁב instead of חושׁב. See also García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 950) who read חו[ש]ׁ. In the available photos, ש is not visible and the surface is scuffed at this point. Abegg's reading is more consistent with what is seen on the fragment and therefore, here, it replaces Eshel and Eshel's (DJD 36:442) reading חושׁב.

44 In this line, Abegg ("The War Scroll," 123) sees a trace of a letter just before ׁ and in PAM 43.551 the trace really is clearly visible at the right edge of the fragment, at the top of the line. Therefore, Eshel and Eshel's (DJD 36:442) reading ׁ[is here corrected to ׁ◦ [.

7 למאוס בטון]ב ולבחור ברע ולה]
 8 [שנא אל ויציב ל]
 9 ב]כול הטוב אש]ר
 10 עברת נקם] 45
 11 ר] 46

1 מ] 47
 2 מ] 48
 3 ק] 49
 4 ל] לגו] 50

- 45 In this line, Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 123) reads three unidentifiable letters before עברת while Eshel and Eshel (DJD 36:442) read only עברת]. In PAM 41.849, the messy traces can be seen but it is difficult to say how many letters they belong to. In any case, again, Abegg’s reading is more consistent with what is seen on the fragment and line 10 is corrected at this point.
- 46 In addition to ר, right after it, there is a tiny vertical stroke, probably an ink trace, visible. Therefore, the reading is corrected from]ר] to]ר].
- 47 Here, Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 130) reads]ממ] instead of Eshel and Eshel’s]ממש] (DJD 36:442) and there really is a small trace of a letter at the beginning of the preserved part of this line. Two *mems* are quite clear and after them, there is a trace of a letter, a small vertical stroke that might belong to ש but might be part of some other letter as well. Therefore, as a whole, Abegg’s reading better represents what is seen on the fragment and the reading here is corrected from]ממש] to]ממ].
- 48 Here, one can agree with Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 130) that the visible part of a letter belongs to מ, although כ (cf. Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:442) might be a possible option as well. The vertical stroke of the letter leans slightly to the left and curves left at the bottom of the letter. This kind of trace would fit both מ and כ. However, the horizontal stroke at the bottom of the letter slopes downward and this fits מ better than כ (cf. מ in the preceding line and כ in fragment 2, line 3). Therefore, כ is here corrected to מ.
- 49 Here, Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 130) reads] 45 instead of]ק] that is suggested by Eshel and Eshel (DJD 36:442). Abegg is correct that there are traces of at least four different letters in this badly deteriorated line. First, there is a horizontal stroke, possibly the bottom of ב, ג, ט, כ, מ, נ, ס, or פ or part of ת (the left vertical stroke curving to the left at the bottom). The second trace is the bottom of a long vertical stroke reaching below the line. This trace is probably the one Eshel and Eshel reasonably interpret as ק (although there might be other options as well). The third trace is a small spot near the bottom of the line. This trace is so small that it is impossible to say what letter it belongs to. The fourth and final trace is a bigger spot in the middle of the line that must also remain undefined. Thus, the reading is here corrected from]ק] to] 45].
- 50 Here, Eshel and Eshel’s (DJD 36:442) suggestion of ר seems odd since the trace of the letter visible is just one vertical stroke which clearly does not curve to the left at the top of the letter as it should do for ר. What may explain this suggestion is the ר in fragment 2, line 3 where a break runs through the letter. This letter also shows no curve to the vertical stroke and a blank space between the vertical stroke and the break as does the letter in fragment 3. Comparison between these letters is, however, difficult since neither of them

As we have seen, the text of fragment 3 is practically illegible and the deteriorated lines of fragment 2 do not afford much information either. However, what can be said of the text in fragment 2 is that it includes language that tends to make strong contrapositions: slaves of darkness, the guiltiness of his lot, choosing the evil, hating, and the fury of vengeance are in no sense neutral expressions. One theme in the text is some kind of hostility. The term ברית brings association with God and loyalty to him. These themes – strong contrapositions and loyalty to God – are known, for example, in 1QM 1, 15–19, especially of many poetic parts of the text, and as regards the vocabulary of fragment 2, there are terms that occur often in 1QM and especially columns 1 and 10–19. For example, the words ברית (13 times in 1QM, only in columns 1, 10–19), חושך (16 times in 1QM, 14 occurrences in columns 1, 10–19), לבב (seven times in 1QM, only in columns 1, 10–19), אשמה (six times in 1QM, five occurrences in columns 1, 10–19), and גורל (18 times in 1QM, 17 occurrences in columns 1, 10–19), belong to this category. On the other hand, the themes mentioned above are not rare in Dead Sea Scrolls in general and the words discussed are quite common in general as well (82–258 occurrences in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls). Actually, some of them occur more often in texts other than 1QM (e.g., ברית, לבב and אשמה occur more often in 1QS than in 1QM). In addition, there are words in fragment 2 that do not occur in 1QM at all (גוא, נצב, טוב, עדוות), and it should also be noted that none of the preserved lines have an exact parallel in 1QM. Eshel and Eshel suggest tentatively that fragments 2 and 3 “were related to the speeches of the War Scroll” and that the first four lines “seem to speak about the sons of light.”⁵¹ However, there is nothing in these fragments that would refer to the sons of light in particular.⁵² The word חושך is perhaps the one that can actually link 4Q471 fragment 2 to 1QM since 1QM is the text in which it occurs most frequently, but it should be noted that חושך עבדי does not occur in 1QM or any other M texts.

All in all, it can be said that 4Q471 fragments 1–3 do not have any close textual parallels among the text known as War Texts. Nor are there any thematic elements that would clearly link them with 1QM or other War Texts. Unfortunately, due to the poor condition of the fragments, the text as it is does not say much, and at this stage they mainly demonstrate that when small

is preserved in full. Identifying the letter as τ – as does Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 130) – must also remain uncertain since there are no other *zayins* in 4Q471. τ is without question a possible option since there are just a few letters which could include this kind of straight vertical stroke. Therefore, the reading is here corrected from τ ל[גור]ל to τ ל[גור]ל.

51 Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:444.

52 Note that Schultz also argues that fragments 2 and 3 do not have any clear overlaps with M texts. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 30.

fragments are in question, one can often read them as belonging to any context. It can be stated that the textual elements pointing to the War Texts are weak and uncertain.

3 Summary of 4Q494 and 4Q471

The overlap between the texts of 4Q494 and 1QM 2 is evident and gives justification for categorizing them at least in part as close parallels. However, what is also clear is that the texts are not exact copies of each other. The differences between the texts may have to do with the discussion on the roles of priests, Levites and the laymen in the temple service. It is possible that in 1QM, the role of the laymen was extended in comparison to that in 4Q494.

4Q471 is a controversial manuscript; there is no consensus even on which fragments should be considered part of it. What is clear is that neither fragment 1 nor fragment 2 preserves text closely parallel to any other manuscripts classified as War Texts. The text of fragment 1 shares vocabulary with 1QM 2 and the text of fragment 2 includes words also known in 1QM 1, 15–19. However, these possible lexical links are vague since the words in question also occur in other texts, sometimes frequently. As Schultz argues (when discussing fragment 1 and 1QM 2), speculation about whether fragment 1 could represent an earlier stage in the textual history than 1QM 2 – assuming that there was such a chronological development – cannot be affirmed,⁵³ and on the basis of the analysis above, it cannot even be considered probable.

53 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 231.

4Q495 (4QM^e): Remnants of a War Text?

Baillet already remarked that the two buff-colored fragments considered to belong to 4Q495 are different from the material point of view: there are streaks on the surface of both fragments but in fragment 2 the streaks ascend to the left while in fragment 1 they are horizontal.¹ In PAM 44.014, the ascending streaks on fragment 2 are clearly visible and one horizontal streak on the left side of fragment 1 can also be seen, although weakly. Later, Abegg also called into question whether the scripts of fragments 1 and 2 that form this manuscript are sufficiently similar to each other.² However, here is such a small amount of text on fragment 1 that evaluating the similarity of the scripts is practically impossible. In any case, there clearly are reasons to doubt the idea that these two fragments belong to the same manuscript. Both are, however, still discussed below.

Both fragments of 4Q495 are small and irregularly shaped. As Duhaime describes, fragment 1 is “a small triangle,” about 1.5 cm high and 1.8 cm wide.³ Fragment 2 is a bit larger, about 4 cm wide at its widest part and 3.5 cm high at its highest point.⁴ The skin of the fragments is rather thin; however, it is not affected by the thick strokes that are used to mark lines and margins, i.e., the skin was not torn when the lines were drawn.⁵ According to Baillet, the script, written in black ink that is mostly faded, is Herodian and thus, originates from the middle of the first century BCE and is contemporary with that of 1QM.⁶ The line spacing of both fragments is on average about 7 mm and the height of the letters is about 3 mm.⁷

1 Baillet, DJD 7:54.

2 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 80.

3 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 21.

4 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 22.

5 Baillet, DJD 7:54–55.

6 Baillet, DJD 7:55. See also Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 22.

7 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 22.

Fragment 1 (B-285354)

אֶל־שֵׁר] 8 1
] ברית ומ' 2

Fragment 2 (B-285358)

אֶל־ ברתנו לְכָ] 1
] פְּקֻדָּתָהּ לְעֹזְרֵנוּ 2
] ואתה עשיתָהּ 3
 מְלֹאכֵי חַ] בל 4

Since there is more text for an analysis in fragment 2, the discussion starts with it. It can be interpreted as a speech or hymn, addressed to God and recited by a “we” group. God has created the “we” group for him (line 1). He has also appointed something or someone to be the group’s help or rescue (line 2). In line 3, the interpretation becomes more difficult; God has done or made something but it remains unclear what. In line 4, only “angels” in the plural construct form is quite clearly visible.

Previously, scholars have linked this passage with 1QM 13 lines 9–12,⁹ and as Table 33 shows, this suggestion is plausible. If the words in 1QM 13:9b–12a are reconstructed in 4Q495, the lengths of the lines are 64 spaces or letters in line 1, 54 in line 2, and 62 in line 3.¹⁰ It is not impossible that line 2 was shorter than others but it is also possible that there was a *vacat* near the end of this line¹¹ in

8 The trace in the beginning of this line could be interpreted as the lowest point of the vertical stroke of ך (cf., e.g., ך beside ף in line 3 of fragment 2; Baillet, DJD 7:55; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 79; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 176; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 984). It is also possible that the trace is the lowest point of the left vertical stroke of ך (cf., e.g., ך beside ף in 1QM, at the beginning of line 1:6; Baillet, DJD 7:55; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 176). In addition, it could be the lowest point of the long curve of ץ (cf. ץ in front of ף in fragment 2 line 3 where there is a quite long space between these two letters) – which would be a more probable option than ך since the trace seems to come to the bottom of the line or even below. However, without assuming any parallels to the text of 4Q495 fragment 1, it is best to follow Yishay’s (“The Literature of War at Qumran,” 272) cautious line here and content oneself with marking ◦ – or at least refrain from reconstructing the whole word. Thus, the reading is here corrected from אל־שֵׁר]אֶל to שֵׁר]אֶל and the reconstructions are also omitted in line 2.

9 Baillet, DJD 7:55; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 80; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 176; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 985; Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, 124.

10 Cf. Baillet, DJD 7:55.

11 Schultz too ponders this: see Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 67.

order to separate the discussion on the commander of light and the discussion concerning Belial. In that case, there would be a small difference between the manuscripts at this point.¹²

After concluding this – and if one finds plausible the idea that fragments 1 and 2 really belong to the same manuscript – it is reasonable to try to find a parallel to the text of fragment 1 somewhere near 1QM 13. If one wades through all ברית words in 1QM, only one fits together with that of 4Q495 fragment 1. In line 10 of column 10, ברית is followed by ו and מ as it (probably) is in 4Q495 fragment 1. In addition, in the preceding line in 1QM 10, there are two words in which the certain letters ש and ר in line 1 of fragment 1 would fit: either ישראל or אשר.¹³ This is demonstrated in Table 34.

Especially with regard to fragment 1, a question of whether there are adequate arguments to consider it as belonging to the War Texts arises. If one is not convinced that fragments 1 and 2 belong to the same manuscript, it is true, as Abegg notes, that there are several options for finding passages to which the letters of fragment 1 may belong. Abegg mentions CD 19:11–13 (ברית וכן) and 1QS 5:8–9 (הברית ודורשי)¹⁴ and Schultz continues the list by adding five other options, e.g., 4Q387 (4QapocrJer C^b) fragment 3:5–6 (ברית ועבדי).¹⁵ Furthermore, it must be taken into account that the text on the fragment could be something that is not known elsewhere. Be that as it may, as Schultz writes as his own opinion on the matter, “whether or not one chooses to assign 4Q495

12 Another difference between the texts seems to be in line 1QM 13:9b / 4Q495 2 1: while in fragment 2, the text is אֵל ברתנו לכֹּהַ, line 13:9b, according to Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 122, reads ויתנו לכה [. There are other options to read line 13:9b as well (cf. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 323, and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 134, read אל דיתנו [פ, Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 234, reads בֵּריתנו [אל ב, but what can be concluded is that the letters in 4Q495 and 1QM 13 at this point are not exactly the same. Thus, although the texts of 4Q495 and 1QM 13 can be fitted together, they are not completely identical.

13 Baillet reconstructs the text according to the option that the letters ש and ר belong to the word ישראל. See Baillet, DJD 7:55.

14 Cf. 1QS 5:8b (לב ובכול נפש לכול הנגלה ממנה לבני צדוק הכהנים שומרי הברית ודורשי רצונו) and 5:9 (ולרוב אנשי בריתם). If so, the letter at the beginning of line 1 should be interpreted as א instead of י and the last visible letter in line 2 as ד instead of מ. Abegg himself endorses the first reading but not the second. In the case of CD 19:11b–13, the last visible letter in line 2 should be interpreted as כ instead of מ. Cf. 11b: כאשר היה בקץ פקדת הראשון אשר {והתוין} להתות התיו על מצחות נאנחים ונאנקים; 12: אמר {יחזקאל} בידי יחזקאל vacat {והתוין} להתות התיו על מצחות נאנחים ונאנקים; 13: והגשאים הסגרו לחרב נוקמת נקם ברית וכן משפט לכל באי. See Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 80.

15 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 80; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 24 n. 40.

fragment 1 to the War Texts, it makes no difference as nothing is gained or lost.”¹⁶ In any case, the possible parallelism between 4Q495 and 1QM is based on what is seen in fragment 2. That there is some degree of parallelism between 4Q495 fragment 2 and 1QM 13 can be considered to be rather convincing. There are no other parallels to 1QM 13 preserved and thus, finding the parallelism is significant: it indicates that the thanksgiving hymn or a part of it was transmitted in some form in the second half of the first century. In other words, the thanksgiving hymn in 1QM 13 was not unique, although probably a late part of 1QM (cf. Section 2 of Chapter 2 above).

16 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 24 n. 40.

TABLE 33 The texts of 4Q495 2 and 1QM 13:9b–12a

4Q495 fragment 2		1QM 13	
1	[...] God, you have created us for yo [u ...]	1	אָל ברתנו לך] 9b אתה] [יתנו לכה עם עולמים ובגורל אור הפלתו 10 לאמתכה ושר מאור מאז
2	You have entrusted to our rescue [...]	2	פקדתה לעזרתו וב] [ק וכול רוחי אמת בממשלתו
3	You have made [...]	3	ואתה 11 עשיתה בליעל לשהת מלאך משטמה ובחושך] [תו ובעצתו להרשיע ולהאשים וכול רוחי
4	angels of de[struction ...]	4	מלאכי 12a גורלו מלאכי חבל בחוקי חושך יתהלכו ואליו [תש]קתמה יחד
9b ... [...] for you , as an everlasting people. You have cast us in the lot of light 10 according to your truth. The commander of light, long ago, you entrusted to our rescue ... [...] ...; all the spirits of truth are under his dominion. You 11 have made Belial to corrupt, a hostile angel. In the darkness[ss ...] ... his counsel is aimed towards wickedness and guiltiness. All the spirits of 12a his lot, angels of destruction , are behaving according to the statutes of darkness; towards it is their only [de]sire.			

TABLE 34 The texts of 4Q495 1 6b–8c and 1QM 10:9b–10a

4Q495 fragment 1	1QM 10
1]ֹשֶׁר[1	9b וּמִיָּא כַעֲמֵכָה יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר בַּחֲרָתָה לְכָה מְכֹל עַמֵּי הָאָרֶצוֹת
2]בְּרִית וְלֹא[10a עִם קְדוּשֵׁי בְרִית וּמְלוֹמְדֵי חֹק מִשְׁבִּילֵי בִנְיָ[ה]
1 [...] ... [...]	9b Who is like your people Israel, whom You have chosen for Yourself among all the peoples of the lands,
2 [...] covenant ... [...]	10a the holy people of the covenant , learned in the statutes, taught in discern[ment ...]

4Q496 (4QpapM^f) and 4Q497 (4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A): Opisthographic War Text Manuscripts

Among the Cave 4 manuscripts there are two opisthographs, i.e., manuscripts that are inscribed on both sides. These two are 4Q496 and 4Q497, both very fragmentary. Like most Qumran opisthographs, they are both written on papyrus¹ – and at the same time they are the only papyrus manuscripts considered to belong to the War Texts. Usually, in the case of papyri, on the recto side, i.e., the side that is inscribed, the fibers run horizontally.² Both 4Q496 and 4Q497 are written on that side of a papyrus scroll where the fibers run vertically, i.e., they are on the verso side of the manuscripts.³ Furthermore, it is common to 4Q496 and 4Q497 that they are both written in the verso side of a document that contains a hymn text on its recto side.

In this section, 4Q496 and 4Q497 are first introduced in a similar way as manuscripts 4Q491–4Q495 above: the text and the content of the best preserved fragments are discussed first, one fragment at a time, and the possible relationship of their text and the text of 1QM is evaluated. At the end, the

-
- 1 Tov lists 35 opisthographic manuscripts from Wadi Daliyeh, Qumran, Nahal Hever/Seiyal and Masada (see *Scribal Practices*, 295–7), most of them being non-literary papyrus manuscripts. However, Tov notes that it is impossible to define the exact number of opisthographs because, for example, some collections of fragments preserve several handwritings. Of Qumran opisthographs, half are documentary and the other half are literary. Six of these manuscripts are on leather. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 69.
 - 2 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 68. Especially in the case of codices, some criticism of this definition has been presented. Eric G. Turner emphasizes that the recto “is not the apparently smoother side,” see Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex*, (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, Inc, 1977), 44.
 - 3 Both Tov and Brooke note that sometimes it is not very easy to distinguish which side is recto and which is verso. Brooke mentions that, for example, in the case of 4Q255/4Q433a, there is no agreement about which side is the verso and which is the recto; see George J. Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex? Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs,” in *On Stone and Scrolls: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*, ed. J.K. Aitken et al. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 175–93 (130). In addition, Tov gives examples of manuscripts in which only the verso side is inscribed (see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 68). Similar problems apply to leather opisthographs but usually, the hairy side of the manuscript is recto and the flesh side is verso (see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 68–69).

opisthographic nature of these manuscripts is brought up again and their possible purpose is analyzed.

1 4Q496 (4QpapM^f)

As already noted, this manuscript is preserved, together with 4Q506, on the verso side of a papyrus scroll which, on its recto side, includes the prayer text 4Q509 and possibly yet another prayer text 4Q505.⁴ The text on the verso side is written upside down vis-à-vis the recto – the system that is more generally known from leather opisthographs.⁵ The arrangement of the columns differs on the recto and on the verso side.⁶ The recto side, although it was inscribed earlier, is better preserved and gives a better basis for the material reconstruction of the fragments. Even then, there are great difficulties in arranging the over 300 fragments of this manuscript. Table 35 shows a rough arrangement made by Baillet:⁷

TABLE 35 Arrangement and dating of 4Q496, 4Q505, 4Q506 and 4Q509 according to Baillet

	Side	Fragments	Date
4Q496	verso	1–119	perhaps little earlier than 50 BCE
4Q505	recto	120–129	about 70–60 BCE
4Q506	verso	124–129, 131–182	about 50 BCE ⁸
4Q509	recto	1–119, 131–313	about 70–60 BCE

4 See discussion of 4Q504 and 4Q506 in Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 59–94.

5 According to Tov, there are three ways to inscribe the opisthographs. One is to begin to write the verso after rolling the manuscript over and upside down as in the case of 4Q496. Another is to write on both sides in accord with the fibers, i.e., in horizontal lines on the recto and in vertical lines on the verso. This way usually pertains in the documentary papyri where the signatures were written on the verso side. The third way is to inscribe the text of the verso on the flip side of the document, turning the manuscript 180 degrees. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 70. Cf. also Falk, “Material Aspects,” 46–47.

6 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 70.

7 Baillet, DJD 7:57–58, 168, 170, 184.

8 Note that there are different opinions on this dating: see, e.g., Falk (“Material Aspects,” 47) according to whom the correct date for 4Q506 is mid-1st century CE.

It is also possible that 4Q505 should not be interpreted as a separate composition. Florentino García Martínez has argued that the ten fragments Baillet identified as 4Q505 should in fact be considered as belonging to 4Q509,⁹ and, according to Daniel Falk, García Martínez “is almost certainly correct.”¹⁰

The line spacing of 4Q496 is around 8 mm and the height of an average letter is 3 mm.¹¹ The thickness of the papyrus material of 4Q496 is average.¹² According to Baillet, the script is very difficult to date. However, he defines it as pre-Herodian (dating back to the time before 37 BCE) and to be more precise, supposes it to be slightly earlier than 50 BCE.¹³ Other scholars are almost of the same opinion: Duhaime¹⁴ dates the script to the first half of the first century BCE while Schultz¹⁵ thinks it originates from the middle of the first century BCE. If one considers Baillet’s dates correct (cf. Table 35), 4Q496 was probably inscribed a bit earlier or about the same time as 4Q506 and the verso side, on which these two texts are found, was inscribed about 10–20 years later than the recto side. One should note, however, that there are different opinions on the date of 4Q506. If Falk’s dating, mid-1st century CE, is true,¹⁶ there would be over 100 years between the first and the last time the manuscript was inscribed.

Previous scholars have linked 4Q496 especially with 1QM columns 1–3.¹⁷ However, there is no consensus on how much these texts differ from each other: Duhaime¹⁸ defines 4Q496 as a similar recension in relation to 1QM while Abegg finds this “extremely suspect,” though emphasizing that the close relationship between 1QM columns 1–3 and 4Q496 is a matter of fact.¹⁹ According to Schultz, 4Q496 differs from 1QM but he also argues that “with respect to col. 1 it appears to be particularly similar, if not altogether identical.”²⁰

9 See Florentino García Martínez, review of *DJD VII: Qumran Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520)* by Maurice Baillet in *JSJ* 15 (1984): 157–64, esp. 161–2.

10 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 60. According to Falk, 4Q504 and 4Q506 are copies of prayers for days of the week and 4Q509 + 505 form a copy of a collection of festival prayers. See Falk, “Material Aspects,” 41, 53.

11 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 22.

12 Baillet, *DJD* 7:57.

13 Baillet, *DJD* 7:58.

14 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 41.

15 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 370.

16 Falk, “Material Aspects,” 47.

17 See Baillet, *DJD* 7:58–61; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 82; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 42; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 987–9; Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, 111–13.

18 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 41.

19 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 82.

20 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 90.

Since most of the fragments are tiny and include only a few sporadic letters, it does not make sense to read every piece through in detail. In the following, the better preserved fragments 3 and 1 + 2 are discussed.²¹

1.1 *Fragment 3*²² (B-285252)

]◦[1
]◦◦[]◦[2
גדולה ל[ה]ל[ח]ם ב[מלכי	3
]יש[ראל זהיאָה עת]	4
גור]ל בליעל זהיתה מ[הומה	5
]וסרה ממשלת [כתיים	6
]לזל בני הושך ובני]	7
]כול מועד הושך]	8
]כבוד [ושמ[חה	9

Since fragment 3 is so poorly preserved, it is difficult to analyze its content. Belial and the Sons of Darkness are mentioned, so it is probable that the text discusses some kind of juxtaposition where the enemy is named. Another preserved group of words is that related to the time and the passing of it: עת and מועדים clearly belong to this category and the verbal root סור may also have this kind of connotation (the basic meaning in *qal* is “to turn aside” but it can also mean “to cease”). In addition to these, other preserved words seem to be גדולה and כבוד, although both contain uncertain letters. With this number of words, nothing very certain can be said about the content of the text; especially considering that many of the words are common in the Dead Sea Scrolls in general (גדולה, כבוד, מועדים, עת, בליעל, חושך all occur over 70 times).

21 There are some new full spectrum color images and some infrared images available of this manuscript. However, none of them are of the fragments that are mainly discussed below. The fragments can be seen, for example, in PAM 43.865 (B-285252) where fragment 3 is the rightmost fragment in the second line and fragment 1 just above it (note that the photo must be rotated horizontally) and PAM 43.860 (B-285247) where fragment 2 is the rightmost fragment in the second lowest line (note that the photo must be turned upside down).

22 I had the opportunity to study this fragment in detail at the IAA Dead Sea Scroll laboratory in Jerusalem in 2009. I did not find any significant reasons to criticize Duhaim's reading but studying the fragment clearly demonstrated how difficult this fragment is to read. This can be seen in the editions available as well: there is no significant disagreement between them about the readings but this is not due to the fragment's legibility – actually the opposite is true: since the text of this fragment is so difficult to read, the editors are hesitant to suggest divergent readings.

It has already been demonstrated that although 4Q496 fragment 3 is often claimed to be a close parallel to 1QM 1, this assertion is not indisputable. Still, there is much in common between these texts: It may be noteworthy that the verbal root סור occurs in the *qal* perfect 3rd person masculine singular form only here and in 1QM 1:6. All lexical links are demonstrated in Table 36.²³

TABLE 36 The texts of 4Q496 fragment 3 and 1QM 1:4b–9a

4Q496 fragment 3	1QM 1
]°[1 ב4 ובקצו יצא בחמה גדולה להלחם במלכי הצפון ואפו
]°°[]°[2 להשמיד
גדולה ל[ה]°[ח]° ב[מלכי	3 ולהכרית את קרן 5 ^a]° [אה עת ישועה לעם אל וקץ ממשל
יש]ראל והיא עת]	4 לכול אנשי גורלו
גור]° בליעל והיתה מן[הומה	5 וכלת עולמים לכול גורל בליעל והיתה מהומה 6 ג] [בני יפת
יסרה ממשלת] כתיים	6 ונפל אשור ואין עוזר לו וסרה ממשלת כתיים להכניע ישועה
ל] כל בני חושך ובני]	7 לאין שארית
כנ]ל מועדי חושך]	8 ופלטה לוא תהיה 7 ל[בנ]י חושך vacat 8 [בני צ]דק יאירו
כבד] [ו]שמ[חה	9 לכול קצוות תבל
	הלוך ואור עד תום כול מועדי חושך ובמועד אל יאיר רום
	גודלו לכול קצי
	ga]° [לשלום וברכה כבוד ושמחה ואורך ימים לכול בני
	אור

a I have argued elsewhere that it is probable that the horn mentioned here is to be reconstructed as the “horn of Israel” which would fit together with the letters visible in 4Q496 line 4. See Hanna Vanonen, “The Textual Connections between 1QM 1 and the Book of Daniel,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala, and M. Marttila, BZAW 419 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 223–45 (229–42). See also David Flusser, “Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll,” in *Qumran and Apocalypticism: Vol 1 of Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, trans. Azzan Yadin (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 140–58, whose reconstructions of 1QM 1 are, in my opinion, likely; not because of 4Q496 but they make sense in light of the whole section (contrary to Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 90–91, who also accepts Flusser’s reconstructions but argues that 4Q496 specifically confirms them).

23 The reason why fragment 3 of 4Q496, despite its deteriorated nature, has especially interested scholars of 1QM is that there are many unresolved questions concerning 1QM 1, the supposed parallel to fragment. About these, see my article “The Textual Connections between 1QM 1 and the Book of Daniel,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala, and M. Marttila, BZAW 419 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 223–45 (229–42). See also David Flusser,

TABLE 36 The texts of 4Q496 fragment 3 and 1QM 1:4b–9a (*cont.*)

4Q496 fragment 3	1QM 1
1 [...][...]	4b When his time has arrived he shall go out with
2 [...][...][...][...]	great fury to wage war against the kings of the
3 [...] great [...] to [wa]ge	north, his wrath (aiming at) bringing ruin and
[wa]r against [the kings of ...]	cutting off the horn 5 ... [...] ... a time of salvation
4 [... Is]rael. It shall be a time	for God's people and a time of dominion for all the
[...]	men of his lot, but of everlasting destruction for all
5 [... the lo]t of Belial. There	the lot of Belial. There shall be panic 6 ... [...] the
shall be p[anic]	sons of Japheth, Ashur shall fall down, with no one
6 [...] the dominion of [the	to help it; the dominion of the Kittim shall come
Kittim] shall come to an end	to an end, wickedness being subdued without a
[...] 7 [...] for] all the Sons of	remnant; neither shall there be an escape 7 f[or
Darkness. The Sons of [...]	the Son]s of Darkness. <i>vacat</i> 8 But [the Sons of
8 [...al]l the appointed times	Rig]hteousness shall shine unto all the uttermost
of darkne[ss ...]	ends of the world, going on to shine till the
9 [...]glory [and] jo[y ...]	completion of all the appointed times of darkness.
	At the appointed time of God, his exalted greatness
	shall shine to all the ends of 9a ... [...] for peace and
	blessing, glory, joy, and long life for all the Sons of
	Light.

1.2 Fragments 1 + 2 (B-285252; B-285247)

The noteworthy obscurity of the text is also true with fragment 1 + 2. Fragment 2 includes the remains of lines 1–6 and fragment 1 the remains of lines 7–11.²⁴ Baillet considers it certain that these two fragments should be read

²⁴ "Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll," in *Qumran and Apocalypticism: Vol 1 of Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, trans. Azzan Yadin (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007).

²⁴ See Baillet, DJD 7:58–59; Abegg, "The War Scroll," 83; Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 286. However, Baillet notes that in line 5 a part of the $\text{ר} \text{ל} \text{א} \text{ו} \text{ר} \text{ו}$ is in fragment 1 (see Baillet, DJD 7:59). Note also Baillet, "Débris de textes sur papyrus de la grotte 4 de Qumran," *RB* 71 (1964): 353–71 where a preliminary edition of the fragment was published. See esp. pp. 365–66 and note that the fragment is there numbered as fragment 1.

together: according to him, the narrow strip at the top of fragment 1 completes fragment 2. However, Baillet could not try to join the fragments together physically due to their poor condition.²⁵

Duhaime reads the fragments as follows:²⁶

-]°[1
- אָלִים[2
- ובכו[ל צרותם 3
- מלח[מָתֶם 4
- ושלן[שֶׁה יתאזרו 5
- מאמ[צַת לִבֵּב בְּ]נִי 6
- מ[מְשֻׁלְתוּ וּלְכָן]וּל 7
-]אמת לכלת[8
-]ל[°]ת 9
-]ב[10
-]°[11

Only a few (more or less) complete words have been preserved in the fragments and many of them are quite common: לבב, אמת and אל occur over 100 times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, and צרה, ממשלה and כלה 44–81 times each. The verbal root אזר is rarer, it has only seven occurrences, and all *hithpael* cases are in M manuscripts, one here in 4Q496 and three in 1QM – which could indicate some kind of connection between fragments 1 + 2 and 1QM. Of the preserved words, צרה and כלה refer to distress and destruction, but, on the other hand, אל and אמת could refer to reliability and continuity. This may reflect some kind of struggle between the state of permanence and the state of devastation. This is practically all that can be said just by looking at the best-preserved words.

As was the case with the lexicon of fragment 3, the words of fragments 1 + 2 can also be found in 1QM column 1. The lexical links between fragments 1 + 2 and 1QM 1 are demonstrated in Table 37.

25 Baillet, DJD 7:59.

26 Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 178–9.

TABLE 37 The texts of 4Q496 fragments 1 + 2 and 1QM 1:11–17

4Q496 fragments 1+2	1QM 1	
]o[1	10b עדת אלים וקהלת 11 אנשים בני אור וגורל חושך נלחמים יחד
אָלִיִּם[2	לגבורת אל בקול המון גדול ותרועת אלים ואנשים ליום הווה והיאה עת
ובכנול צרותם	3	12 צרה ע[ל כו]ל עם פדות אל ובכול צרותמה לוא נהיתה כמוה מחושה
מלחמתם	4	עד תומה לפדות עולמים וביום מלחמתם בכתיים 13 יצא[ו]o[]נחשיר
ושלו[שה יתאזרו	5	במלחמה שלושה גורלות יחזקו בני אור לנגוף רשעה ושלושה יתאזרו
מאמ[צת ל]בב בני	6	חיל בליעל למשוב גורל 14 []o[]דגלי הבנים יהיו להמס לבב וגבורת אל
מ[משלתו ולכ]ול	7	מאמצת [לבב בני אור]זבגורל השביעי יד אל הגדולה מכנעת 15 []ל
]אמת לכלת[8	מלאכי ממשלתו ולכול אנשי[]o[]קדושים vacat [16 []ל
]ול[]תo[9	יופיע בעזרת[]אמת לכלת בני חושך א[ז] []ל[]ה[]מון גדול 17 []o[]
]ב[10	[]o[]תגנו יד בכל[]י מלחמה []
]o[11	
		10b the congregation of divine beings and the assembly of 11 men, the Sons of Light and the lot of darkness, shall fight each other to (disclose?) the might of God, with the uproar of a large multitude and the war cry of divine beings and men, on the day of calamity. This is a time of 12 tribulation ... [...] ... the people whom God redeems; of all their tribulations none was comparable to this, because of its hastening towards the end for an everlasting redemption. In the day of their war against the Kittim 13 ... [...] ... [...] carnage. During the war, the Sons of Light shall strengthen for three lots and smite wickedness, and for three lots the army of Belial shall gird itself for the return of the lot of 14 [...] ... There shall be skirmishing battalions to melt the heart and the might of God supporting the he[art of the Sons of Light.] During the seventh lot, the great hand of God shall subdue 15 [...] ... the angels of his dominion, and for all the men of [...] vacat 16 [...] ... the holy ones, he shall appear in help [...] truth for the destruction of the Sons of Darkness. Then [...] 17 [...] ... [...] great ... [...] ... they shall set the hand to ... [...]

a Since lines 9–11 have just a few letters, there is no translation for them.

As the table illustrates, almost all the preserved words of fragments 1+2 can be found in 1QM column 1. However, the line lengths have caused some discussion. Abegg notes that in fragments 1+2, according to Baillet's reading (reconstructed with the help of 1QM 1), in lines 3–5 the average line length is 63 letters or spaces per line and in lines 6–7, 68 letters or spaces per line. The lengths of lines 4 and 5, however, seem to differ considerably: there would be only 54 letters or spaces in line 4 and as many as 76 letters or spaces in line 5. Therefore, in his comments on his readings, Abegg questions Baillet's reading in line 4 and suggests that יִשְׁׁרָאֵל "would fit the traces equally well and balance the lines better" than מְלִיחַ .²⁷ This example describes well the discussion on the fragments: the traces are so weak that completely different readings can be said to fit the traces equally well and the discussion is more about how the traces should be located in the existing text of 1QM 1. Furthermore, Abegg adds that line 8 seems to consist of 86 characters when reconstructed directly after 1QM 1. Since this line length is very long in comparison with the other lines, Abegg argues that there might be a difference between 4Q496 and 1QM 1 at this point.²⁸

All in all, both Baillet and Abegg are dependent on the presupposition that there is a very close parallelism between fragments 1 + 2 and 1QM 1. Abegg, although criticizing Baillet on some details, still believes that 1QM 1 is the right starting point for interpreting fragments 1 + 2. When studying fragments 1 + 2 and 3 together and noting that their lexicon is to be found in 1QM 1 almost in its entirety, the conclusion that 1QM and 4Q496 may be somehow textually related is reasonable.

1.3 *Summary of 4Q496*

The conclusion reached above, that 1QM and 4Q496 possibly are textually related, is further supported by the fact that many of the other fragments of 4Q496 can be placed in the text of 1QM (although these placements are seldom indisputable).²⁹ What can be said is that, in any case, the texts are not

27 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 84. Note that Abegg still does not suggest this reading in his own edition (cf. p. 83) but only in his comments.

28 Abegg, "The War Scroll," 84.

29 Baillet, DJD 7:63–68, managed to place the fragments apart from 17–34, 36–74, 76–96, 98–123 according to 1QM. For Abegg, "The War Scroll," 81–97, fragments 2 + 1, 3, 4, 5+6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 26, 31, 32, 35, 49, 57, 58, and 76 are legible and thus relevant. In the beginning, Abegg says that he is going to discuss 23 (cf. p. 81) fragments but in the end it seems that there are 24 legible enough to him (cf. pp. 82–97). Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 286–300, goes through fragments 2 + 1, 3, 4, 5+6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 32, and 35 but finds mainly fragments 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 32 to be relevant for the discussion. In my dissertation, I very briefly discuss thorough fragments 1–16, 37 and 75

similar throughout but close parallelism is within the realm of possibility. It is a practical starting point for further reasoning, although the theoretical nature of this conclusion should be kept in mind.

2 4Q497 (4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A)

This manuscript consists of 54 very poorly preserved papyrus fragments.³⁰ It is not clear whether these fragments even belong to the same document, but what makes their arrangement a bit easier is that 4Q497 is the verso side of the manuscript 4Q499.³¹ The fragments are of different sizes: fragment 45 is the smallest and about 5 mm high and 7 mm wide while the largest one, fragment 1, is about 5.5 cm high and 1.7 cm wide. There are 5–6 lines preserved at the most in one fragment, and only a few letters are visible in each line. Letters are about 3 mm high and line spacing in the best-preserved fragments is about 8 mm.³² The script has been dated to the middle of the first century BCE,³³ and thus it is probably slightly later than the text on its recto side, 4Q499, which is from about 75 BCE.³⁴ George Brooke notes that some of the fragments preserve edges of columns on their verso side and therefore the manuscript included more than one column of text. However, he remarks that on the recto side, no column structure can be clearly distinguished.³⁵ The text on the verso side is written in the same direction as the text on the recto side, so the verso side is the flip side of the document (as in modern books).³⁶ Brooke supposes that this might indicate that the scroll was perhaps shorter rather than longer.³⁷ He also states that both 4Q497 and 4Q499 are written “in the full orthography of the Qumran scribal school” which, according to him, indicates that the scribal context of the manuscript did not change between the two stages of its

and their possible parallels in 1QM, see Vanonen, “Stable and Fluid War Traditions,” (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2017), 186–7.

30 Baillet, DJD 7:9–72; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 135; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 31.

31 Baillet (DJD 7:69) notes that his description of this manuscript can be applied both to the recto and to the verso side. As regards 4Q499, it has been suggested to be either a hymn or prayer of some kind or a copy of the “Prayer of Enosh.” See e.g., Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 26–27, who thinks it is a copy of the “Prayer of Enosh.”

32 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 31.

33 Baillet, DJD 7:69; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 31.

34 Baillet, DJD 7:74.

35 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 128.

36 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 70; James Nati, “The Rolling Corpus: Materiality and Pluriformity at Qumran, with Special Consideration of the *Serekh ha-Yahad*,” in DSD 27 (2020): 161–201 (188).

37 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 131.

writing.³⁸ Furthermore, James Nati suggests that the fact that the text on the verso is flipped horizontally may indicate that the two texts – often considered to be separate compositions – were read continuously and thus, understood as one composition.³⁹ This would mean that the text of 4Q497 was primarily understood to be a liturgical text.⁴⁰

Of 54 fragments, Baillet introduces 47 that have legible letters on them (1–36, 38–45, 47–48, 52). Many of these cannot be compared to other texts since they only contain one or two letters and there are boundless opportunities to find possible textual parallels to them. Abegg restricts his scrutiny to eight fragments only (1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 28), all preserving several lines and more than two letters in at least two lines. However, even this restriction does not mean that there are complete words visible on the fragments. In this study, there is no need to wade through all the fragments: it is enough to take one example under closer scrutiny in order to demonstrate the condition of the fragments and their content.

Fragment 1 (PAM 43.652)

] כֹּס [1
] [2
] ׀׀׀׀ ׀׀׀׀ [3
] קוּ שִׁי לִבָּב [4
] בְּרִית [5
⁴¹] ׀ ק׀ ׀ [6

The only completely preserved words in this fragment are לִבָּב and בְּרִית which are both very common in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls in general. Thus, there is not much to conclude from the fragment as it is, and the only way to find out more about the content is to study whether there might be any textual parallels to it. Baillet suggested an overlap with 1QM 14 but was very uncertain of this: he ended up calling the text “Texte ayant quelque rapport avec la Règle

38 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 135.
 39 Nati, “Rolling Corpus,” 188, see also 189.
 40 Cf. also Falk, “Material Aspects,” 53, and the discussion in Section 3 below.
 41 Here, Abegg (“The War Scroll,” 136) and Baillet (DJD 7:69) see a trace of a letter before the possible ׀ and certain ק. This trace is clearly in view in PAM 43.652: there is a small curved stroke at the top of the line. It is difficult to say which letter it could belong to – perhaps פ might come into consideration – but since the manuscript is so fragmentary, it is difficult to make any comparisons to other better preserved letters. However, here, Duhaime’s reading is corrected to] ׀ ק׀ ׀ [.

de la Guerre” (a text that has something to do with the War Scroll).⁴² Later, Abegg studied the lexicon of this manuscript in detail and came to the conclusion that the words visible in 4Q497 can also be found in manuscripts other than 1QM and that “the special relationship that has been suggested between these manuscripts (i.e., 4Q497 and 1QM) must be rejected.”⁴³ Schultz does not claim this but ends up omitting 4Q497 from his material “since its extreme fragmentary nature precludes it from having any significance.”⁴⁴ Yishay and Qimron do not consider 4Q497 as a part of their research material.⁴⁵ Tov – as well as Duhaime – states that 4Q497 is not an M manuscript but a *War Scroll-like text*.⁴⁶ Duhaime notes that the words in 4Q497 “sometimes point to parallels with 1QM – but when such possible parallels occur, either the other traces do not match the text of the possible parallel, or not enough is left to make the connection certain.”⁴⁷

In any case, however, Baillet and Duhaime find four fragments of 4Q497 to be parallel with 1QM: fragment 1 with 1QM 14:7–8, fragment 2 with 1QM 12:14, fragment 4 with 1QM 11:17 and fragment 47 with 1QM 13:7.⁴⁸ As Table 38 of fragment 1 and 1QM 14 shows and as Baillet and Duhaime themselves also state, these parallels are extremely uncertain.

If the suggested reconstruction of ^ש[קו] is right, the words common in fragment 1 and 1QM 14 are not in the same order. On the other hand, the words that are clearly visible – ברית and לבב – are so common that on their basis it cannot be concluded that this fragment is parallel to 1QM. The other three fragments are as small and unclear as this case.

It is easy to agree with Abegg and Schultz that the extremely fragmentary nature of the manuscript reduces its significance in the discussion and that the words visible could easily fit in with other compositions as well. However,

42 Baillet (DJD 7:69) notes that he has been struggling with this question: “On ne saurait donc les considérer comme représentant un septième exemplaire de l’ouvrage en question, et il faut nuancer ce qui a été dit précédemment. Here, he refers to his article “Les manuscrits de la Règle de la Guerre de la grotte 4 de Qumran,” *RB* 79 (1972): 217–26 (224–25). See also Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 135.

43 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 135–36; Abegg, “4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity,” 138–39.

44 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 26–27, 33 n. 74.

45 Yishay defines her topic as “Qumran literature related to the eschatological war, manuscripts 4Q491–4Q496” (see Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 350) and Qimron does not include 4Q497 in his edition (see Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, 111–34). Yishay mentions 4Q497 just in passing and categorizes it as one of the “additional texts” close to the war literature, together with 4Q276, 4Q285 and 4Q471. See Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” T.

46 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 50; Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 198. The question about naming and labeling the War Texts is discussed in more detail in Part 2 below.

47 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 31.

48 Baillet, DJD 7:69–72; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 43.

TABLE 38 The texts of 4Q497 fragment 1 and 1QM 14:7b–8a

4Q497 fragment 1	1QM 14
] כֹּס [1	
] [2	
] ׀׀׀׀ ׀׀׀׀ [3	ב 7 ובעניי רוח[] סם לבב קושי ובתמימי דרך יתמו כול
] קו[שׁי לבב] 4	גויי רשעה
] ר[ברית] 5	8a ולכול גבוריהם אין מעמד ואנו שא[רית
] ׀ ק׀ [6	ברוך] שמכה אל החסדים השומר ברית לאבותינו
1 [...] ... [...]	7b Among the poor in spirit [] a hard heart ,
2 [...] [...]	and by those whose way is perfect shall all wicked
3 [...] ... [...]	nations come to an end;
4 [stub]bornness of heart [...]	8a there will be no place for all their mighty men.
5 [...] ... covenant [...]	But we are the remn[ant Blessed is] Your name,
6 [...] ... [...]	O God of loving kindness, the One who kept the covenant for our forefathers.

categorizing 4Q497 as *War Scroll-like text* (as Duhaime and Tov do) or as a text that has something to do with the War Scroll (as Baillet does) is as disputable as considering it as an M text: there is not so sufficient text left to warrant either conclusion. This question about naming and categorizing this manuscript – and other War Text manuscripts as well – is discussed more extensively in Chapter 8 below.

Although categorizing 4Q497 among the War Texts (or M texts) is extremely uncertain with regard to its vocabulary, one must still pay attention to its significant material similarity to 4Q496: both manuscripts are included in the small group of opisthographs inscribed on the verso side of a hymn text. Because of this, it is still reasonable to keep 4Q497 under scrutiny and not to rule out the possibility that it really belonged to the War Texts. Especially it should be kept in mind that both 4Q496 and 4Q497 are linked with liturgical texts which is probably significant when trying to understand the use of the War Texts in general.

3 The Opisthographic Nature of 4Q496 and 4Q497

As noted many times already, 4Q496 and 4Q497 are the only War Text manuscripts that can be counted among the opisthograph manuscripts. In addition,

they are the only War Texts written on papyrus. Therefore, they can also be studied as a part of the Qumran opisthograph corpus and as a part of the Qumran papyrus corpus. Unfortunately, with regard to both of these groups, there are many challenges in drawing any conclusions about the material in general. Papyrus manuscripts have not been as well preserved as leather manuscripts; Tov notes that there is no complete column of a literary papyrus found at Qumran that has both its top and bottom margins preserved. In addition, none of these literary papyri has preserved endings and beginnings.⁴⁹ What can be said unequivocally is that there are very few documentary papyri found at Qumran;⁵⁰ on the other hand, in the Qumran corpus as a whole the majority of the manuscripts are literary and not documentary, so in this respect the papyrus manuscripts are not in any way an exceptional group among the Qumran texts. The main part of all Qumran papyri are from Cave 4, as are all the opisthographs.⁵¹

Tov notes that there are some compositions at Qumran that have been preserved both in leather manuscripts and in papyrus manuscripts.⁵² Although it must be taken into account that all the material that once existed has not been preserved, according to Tov, it is no coincidence that these compositions are represented 4–8 times on leather and 1–3 times on papyrus. Tov concludes that at Qumran the material used for the literary texts was primarily leather.⁵³ Thus, papyrus manuscripts form a minority in the corpus and the opisthographs are an even smaller minority. Tov defines the majority of the Qumran papyri as “sectarian” or “of special interest to the sect,”⁵⁴ and he also suggests that the

49 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 44.

50 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 44–45. Tov’s table (Table 1) shows that only 8% of Qumran papyri are documentary while at all the other sites in the Judean Desert the proportion of documentary papyri is 93–100%. Tov also notes that while at almost all the other sites papyri form a majority of the manuscripts found, at Qumran, they form a minority, only 14% of all texts. Thus, they are a small group among the corpus – although we cannot know how many manuscripts there originally were.

51 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 46. Other papyrus manuscripts are from Caves 6 and 7, cf. George J. Brooke, “Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin: Cultural Complexity and Multiple Identities in the Qumran Library,” in *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World*, ed. M. Popović, M. Schoonover, and M. Vandenberghe, JSJSup 178 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 119–35 (130–31).

52 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 48; in addition to M, see, e.g., S, D, Hodayot, 4QMMT, Isaiah, Jubilees, Tobit. Cf. also Brooke, “Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin,” 126–8.

53 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 48. See also Falk (“Material Aspects,” 42), who notes the fact that 90% of Qumran manuscripts are written on animal skin and ponders whether this was even a general preference among the Jews in Second Temple times.

54 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 49. As regards the content of the collection of Qumran papyri, Tov also notes that there are many genres represented among them but that eschatological

collection is mainly liturgical.⁵⁵ Falk, for his part, presents some percentages of different genres among the papyrus manuscripts and ends up agreeing with Tov: liturgical texts⁵⁶ – and rule texts – are among the Dead Sea Scrolls most likely to be copied on papyrus.⁵⁷ Furthermore, Falk argues that there probably was “a special desirability for personal copies of these two groups of texts” and that explains why papyrus was favored among the scribes for these genres.⁵⁸ Here as well, Falk agrees with Tov who tends to think that most of the Qumran papyri reflect “personal copies owned by members of Qumran community.” However, Tov also says that “some may have been imported from other sources.”⁵⁹

The idea of manuscripts being private or personal copies has also come out in the discussion concerning the opisthographs. The argumentation on this issue is not, however, very comprehensive. The suggestion of a manuscript being private or personal is usually made when considering its exceptional characteristics: for example, why a text is written on papyrus rather than leather, why a text is written with a very tight script and/or by using very small letters,⁶⁰ why there are so many corrections in a text or why a text is written in illegible handwriting, why there are many texts in one manuscript, or why a manuscript includes only part of a text or a summary of a text. To these questions, the most sensible answer offered has been that the manuscript is not communal but private or personal. For example, Joseph M. Baumgarten suggests 4Q266 (4QD^a) to

and biblical writings form only a small minority among the group of Qumran papyri. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 51.

55 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 51. However, Tov does not provide many arguments for his proposition of the liturgical nature of the opisthographic corpus.

56 Tov does not define the term “liturgical.” For Falk, a more essential concept is prayer, which he uses already in the title of his article (“Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts at Qumran”). He makes a distinction (for the purpose of his article) between prayer in general and liturgical prayer: “Prayer in general refers to human communication with the divine, and liturgical prayer refers to prayer as part of a system of rituals for public or corporate performance as a religious service” (see Falk, “Material Aspects,” 34). Thus, for Falk, liturgy seems to be primarily communal action.

57 Falk, “Material Aspects,” 43–45.

58 Falk, “Material Aspects,” 45.

59 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 51. Similarly, Falk (“Material Aspects,” 43) argues that “literary texts at Qumran written on papyrus are likely personal copies” and he refers here to Michael O. Wise, “Accidents and Accidence,” 103–51. Furthermore, he writes that “it does seem that liturgical texts and sectarian rules are the most likely to be copied on papyrus, and that this probably has to do with special desirability for personal copies of these two groups of texts.” See Falk, “Material Aspects,” 45.

60 See, e.g., Baillet, DJD 7:12, according to whom the small letters and tight lines “indicate a private manuscript.”

be a personal manuscript (or an early draft, which he, however, considers less likely) and he argues for this by referring to Tov's observation that, in 4Q266, there are exceptionally many scribal erasures, cancellation dots and deletions in comparison to Qumran manuscripts in general.⁶¹ Baumgarten considers 4Q266 as belonging to a small group of private drafts instead of being a copy by a professional scribe.⁶² Falk discusses opisthographs at a more general level and argues that they "point to personal copies."⁶³ For him, a clear mark of a

61 Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4 XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*, DJD 18 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 2.

62 Brooke, "Between Scroll and Codex," 136, for his part, argues that some of the opisthographs perhaps had some educational function, and, distinctively, opisthographic collections seem to have cultic or liturgical horizons. Furthermore, Brooke ponders whether opisthographs in general might indicate personal manuscript use and, thus, reflect the Jewish move to private prayer in the course of late Second Temple times. Thus, Brooke links the personal or private use of a manuscript not only with writing exercises but also to some kind of personal meditation – although he does not explain what this personal meditation would mean in practice. The third option could be that the private manuscript was some kind of travel copy easy to carry from one place to another. This option is brought out by Falk under 4Q503/4Q512: see Falk, "Material Aspects," 52–53. Cf. also Philip Alexander, "Literacy among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran" in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. by M.F.J. Baasten and W.Th. van Peursen, OLA 118 (Leuven: Peeters; Dudley, MA, 2003), 3–24 (7), who does not discuss opisthographs but small manuscripts that, according to him, were done "out of choice and for purpose" and most probably because of the need for portability. Alexander argues that "small scrolls could be carried in a fold formed in the cloth above the belt (α κλόπος)" or "in a script or bag hung from the belt." In addition, Brooke, "Between Scroll and Codex," 136, states that the opisthographs written in cryptic script were perhaps manuscripts that could be "easily transported from one sectarian location to another."

None of these options can be directly linked to the War Text opisthographs. The possible liturgical function comes closest since, in the opisthographs, the War Texts are linked specifically to the liturgical texts. However, it still remains unclear what this personal, liturgical use could mean in practice and who could practice it. Note that the term 'liturgical' can be understood in a wider sense than just referring to the temple cult or fixed prayers. For example, for Judith Newman, liturgy is a "constellation of actions, including prayers, as that was understood to reflect a covenantal response to Israel's God." See Newman, "Liturgical Imagination in the Composition of Ben Sira," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*, STDJ 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 325. Newman and also Mika S. Pajunen refer to Stefan C. Reif, who includes in liturgy not only temple cult but also, e.g., benedictions, praise, prayers, amulets, the acts of eating and fasting, and the study of sacred texts. See Pajunen, "The Praise of God and His Name as the Core of the Second Temple Liturgy," *ZAW* 127 (2015): 475 n. 1; Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

63 Falk, "Material Aspects," 50.

personal copy is, for example, the value of thrift over quality.⁶⁴ However, thus far there are no uniform criteria for labeling the manuscript private,⁶⁵ and, unfortunately, it is not very likely that coherent criteria will be available in the near future since the opisthographs and other manuscripts suggested to be private are challenging research objects and there is no certainty that any result is going to be achieved with them. If we attempt to apply the existing sporadic criteria to the manuscripts 4Q496 and 4Q497, one can at least note that both are so fragmentary that it is not possible to estimate the number of scribal erasures in them or the content of the text inscribed on them but the size of the letters and the density of the lines can be observed. The line heights and the letter sizes of these manuscripts do not seem to support the idea of them being private. The size of the letters is about 3 mm in both manuscripts while, for example in 4Q493, the average letter is 2.5 mm high and in 4Q491 manuscripts, the height of ן's is often only 2 mm.⁶⁶ In addition, while the line height in 4Q496 and 4Q497 is 8 mm, in 4Q493 it is less than 6 mm and in 4Q491a and b, 4 mm maximum. Thus, it does not seem that among the M manuscripts, 4Q496 and 4Q497 appear to be especially tightly inscribed. All in all, it is probable that among the M manuscripts, there are representatives of both personal/private and communal copies but it is easier to argue for the private nature of 4Q491a and 4Q491b, for example, than that of the opisthographs.⁶⁷

The explanations for the creation of an opisthograph can be many: In some cases, it seems clear that the documents were reused because they were no longer highly appreciated: for example, when the pieces of a manuscript that contained literary compositions were turned around and used for documentary purposes.⁶⁸ Sometimes it can be argued that one text was written on both sides of one manuscript in order to save space on a costly material.⁶⁹ In case

64 Falk, "Material Aspects," 51. Falk uses 4Q504 as an example. As regards 4Q255, Falk considers it to be private because of its cursive script, its coarse material, its slanted lines and the frequent lack of space between words. See Falk, "Material Aspects," 54–55.

65 This observation is also made by Strawn, "Excerpted 'Non-Biblical' Scrolls," 78.

66 Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 30; Baillet, DJD 7:12. On the basis of small letters and tight lines, Baillet suggests that 4Q491 is "un manuscrit privé."

67 See Section 3 of Chapter 3 below.

68 In some cases, it is possible that, for example, the Roman army reused some Qumran manuscripts, see Brooke, "Between Scroll and Codex," 136. See also Falk "Material Aspects," 51.

69 This explanation is considered to be valid primarily in tefillin and some other manuscripts in which one text continues from the recto to the verso side, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 69, 70. Tov supposes that the custom of inscribing tefillin on both sides of the manuscript was developed "as a space-saver." In the case of tefillin, the opisthographs often include one text that continues from one side to the other, see Brooke, "Between Scroll and Codex,"

of War Text opisthographs, neither of these explanations probable is the best one. Instead, Falk argues that in cases where the genre of the text is similar or compatible on both sides of the manuscript, where similar scribal features can be distinguished on both sides, and where the dates of the manuscript are relatively close to each other, it is probable that there was an intention to create a “collection of valued writings.”⁷⁰ Probable examples of this phenomenon are, according to Falk, 4Q503/4Q512, 4Q255/4Q433a, 4Q415/4Q414 and the manuscripts of interest to this study, 4Q509 + 505/4Q496 + 506 and 4Q499/4Q497. Falk considers the last-mentioned manuscript too fragmentary to say anything about its size or layout.⁷¹ However, he finds it clear that both sides contain prayer or hymnic material since the second person singular forms typical of hymnic texts are found on both sides.⁷² He also takes note of the scripts that are, according to him, written by different hands but in a very similar style and the dates that are not so far from each other.⁷³ For Falk, these facts indicate the intention of creating a collection of hymns or prayers on the manuscript. As regards 4Q509 + 505/4Q496 + 506, in neither case can the situation with the size and layout of the scroll be determined due to the poor condition of the scroll. However, the scripts can be recognized to be of similar style⁷⁴ and the hook-style paragraphos⁷⁵ are used as marginal markings on both sides of the manuscript. Both sides were copied within a fairly short

136. However, Alexander, “Literacy among Jews,” 7, argues that especially papyrus – which had to be imported from Egypt – was probably inscribed on both sides because it was a more expensive material than skin. About the economics of papyrus production, see also Brooke, “Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin,” 122–24, 132.

70 Falk, “Material Aspects,” 52.

71 Falk, “Material Aspects,” 53–54.

72 According to Falk (“Material Aspects,” 54 n. 72), these forms can be found in 4Q497 2 and 4Q499 7 and 48 but I find the second person forms (suffixes or verbal forms) in 4Q497 fragment 14, line 3 (קוֹדֶשׁכֶּה) and not in fragment 2 and in 4Q499, in addition to fragments 7 and 48, also in fragments 1, 2 and 22.

73 Falk, “Material Aspects,” 54. As already noted, according to Baillet, the recto was inscribed about 75 BCE and the verso in the middle of the first century. Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 72) refrains from any strict definitions of the script since there is no enough data, especially on the verso side. As noted above as well, Brooke (“Between Scroll and Codex,” 135) is less cautious and says that 4Q499 and 4Q497 are both written “in the full orthography of the Qumran scribal school” which, according to him, allows the suggestion that the manuscript did not change context between the two stages of its writing.

74 Cf. also Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 72), who interprets that both sides of the document (he mentions 4Q509 and 4Q496) are written according to Qumran scribal practice.

75 Tov notes that the “paragraphos sign – the most frequent sign occurring in the Qumran texts – is usually drawn at the right side of the column between lines of the text, with the greater part of the sign protruding into the right margin, referring to a content division indicated by spacing either in the line above or in the line below.” For a more extensive analysis of the paragraphos sign, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 182–4.

timeframe.⁷⁶ In addition, Falk argues that the prayers found on the two sides of the manuscript are form-critically similar.⁷⁷ Thus, according to Falk, there seems to be a conscious aim to form a collection of hymns and prayers behind 4Q509 + 505/4Q496 + 506 as well. Consequently, Falk concludes that 4Q496 (which he considers to be a “copy” or an “excerpt” of the War Scroll) was probably also understood to be a liturgical text.⁷⁸ This is an important observation when discussing the meaning and use of the War Texts in general and we will return to it in Part 2 (see Section 4 of Chapter 9 below).

All in all, the increasing interest in material aspects of the scrolls has produced studies that aim to discuss the Qumran opisthographic corpus as a whole (cf. Brooke and Falk). However, there are still open questions and an evident need to study the whole corpus in more detail. What can be safely concluded is this: the fact that there are War Texts preserved in the opisthographic papyrus scrolls indicates that parts of what became the War Texts were actively copied already in the first half of the first century and they were considered to be important enough to use the imported papyrus material for them. In addition, it indicates that the War Texts were linked with liturgical texts, which may point to the liturgical use of the War Texts. By contrast, whether the opisthographs were used in a private or in a communal way is difficult to say. However, the number of War Texts that are somehow parallel to each other clearly indicates that the war tradition was important at different levels and they were used both in communal and in more exclusive contexts.⁷⁹

76 It must still be noted that in many cases, there can be 10–25, even 50 years between inscribing the recto and the verso. Therefore, the idea of creating a collection was probably gotten only after inscribing the recto side, perhaps many years after that.

77 Falk, “Material Aspects,” 53. Falk’s arguments for the form-critical similarity between 4Q509+505 (which he considered one text) and 4Q506 are the following: First, their statements of occasion are similar, namely “Prayer for the festival of x” (תפ[לה] למועד) which is preserved in 4Q509 10 ii 8. In 4Q506, this formula is not preserved but Falk probably suggests it on the basis of the parallel text, 4Q504 3 ii, where in line 8 is תפלה ביום 8 הרביעי. Second, the opening formula “remember, O Lord” is preserved both in 4Q506 124 3 and in 4Q509 131–132 ii 5. And third, the concluding formula “blessed be the Lord” (ברוך אדוני) links the texts: It is preserved in 4Q509 3 9 and in fragment 206 in its only legible line. In 4Q506, this formula is not preserved but Falk probably suggests it on the basis of the parallel text, 4Q504 3 ii, where line 5 has ברוך האל. What can be concluded is that Falk’s observation of the similarity of the forms of the hymns is based heavily on reconstructions and thus is not an indisputable fact.

78 Falk, “Material Aspects,” 53. However, there is also skepticism about drawing any conclusions as to why the different texts are on the same scroll. Schultz, for example, asks why 4Q496 and 4Q506 ended up one after the other on the same scroll and his answer is that this “remains a mystery.” See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 25.

79 Cf. Section 3 of Chapter 3 below.

4Q285 and 11Q14: Sefer ha-Milḥamah Texts

Although manuscripts 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milḥamah) and 11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milḥamah) are not labeled with the siglum M or named as *War Scroll-like*, they cannot be passed over when discussing the War Texts of Qumran and not least for research-historical reasons. On the one hand, several scholars have linked these two to 1QM and even speculated whether they might represent the lost end of the Scroll.¹ On the other hand, these two texts are interpreted as representing a text called Sefer ha-Milḥamah, a text that has something to do with war but that differs from what is known as the War Scroll.² In order to join this discussion of the content and the genre of 4Q285 and 11Q14 and their possible textual relationship to the M manuscripts, this chapter aims to study the position of 4Q285 and 11Q14 in the ensemble called the War Texts.

Within the limits of this study, it is not possible to analyze the editions of 4Q285 and 11Q14 as elaborately as was done with M manuscripts and War Scroll-like manuscripts in the previous chapters. Also, what should be noted is that these manuscripts are already deeply studied (e.g., the reconstruction of 4Q285 based on material facts) and that their DJD editions were published relatively recently, at the turn of the 2000s.³ In addition, the readings suggested in DJD are further justified in later articles.⁴ It is easily demonstrated that these two manuscripts are very close textual parallels, and thus it is reasonable to

-
- 1 As Eibert Tigchelaar and many others note, Józef T. Milik was the first one to suggest that the preserved fragments of 4Q285 once belonged to the final parts of the War Scroll. He argued this in his article “Milki-Sedeq et Milki-reša’ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144. See Eibert Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data: The Relation between 4Q285 and 11Q14,” *DSD* 7/1 (2000): 49–56.
 - 2 See, e.g., Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data,” 56: “The differences between the 4QM manuscripts, as well as the composite nature of 1QM ... indicate that there were different compositions or editions dealing with the eschatological war, which were related to one another. 4Q285 and 11Q14 might be copies of one of those editions, or may represent a related composition.”
 - 3 The material reconstruction and the edition of 4Q285: Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, DJD 36:228–46; see *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts*, ed. S.J. Pfann, and *Miscellanea, Part 1*, ed. P.S. Alexander, et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000). Edition of 11Q14: Adam S. van der Woude, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Florentino García Martínez, DJD 23:243–250; see *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*, ed. F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
 - 4 See Philip S. Alexander, “The Material Reconstruction and Genre of 4Q285 (Sefer ha-Milḥamah) Reconsidered,” in *Studia Semitica: The Journal of Semitic Studies Jubilee Volume*,

discuss them together. Therefore, the structure of the chapter deviates slightly from the preceding ones. The chapter proceeds first by analyzing the manuscripts from the material point of view, then turns to examining their possible mutual relationship as textual parallels and finally addresses the main task, the analysis of their content and relation to M traditions.

1 4Q285 and 11Q14 as Material Artifacts

Manuscript 4Q285 consists of 10 fragments which are put together from 20 pieces.⁵ It is a leather manuscript: the brown skin varies in color from light to dark. The skin of the manuscript is fine. The largest fragment, namely fragment 4, is 8 cm wide and 8.5 cm high whereas fragment 5, the smallest one, is 5 mm wide and 8 mm high. There are 2–10 lines in the fragments. The line spacing varies considerably: in general, it is about 8 mm, but in some fragments only 6 mm. However, Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes, the DJD editors of the manuscript, argue that the leather of fragments 6 and 7 is shrunken, which explains the small space between the lines and small letters there. The average height of the letters of the manuscript is 2.5 mm. Upper and lower margins can be distinguished every now and then. There are 10–11 lines in the largest fragments, partly preserved. The line length is 50–55 letters or spaces. The spacing between words varies extensively. The script in the fragments is similar to 1QM, the early Herodian script which can be dated to the end of the first century BCE.⁶

Alexander and Vermes have presented their reconstruction of 4Q285 in DJD 36.⁷ It is based on the observation that the fragments are at least partly similar in shape (see especially the lower parts of fragments 4 and 7 and the middle part of fragment 8). As regards the scrolls in general, it is not probable that any manuscript would decay unevenly or that different parts of a manuscript would deteriorate in different layers. Instead, it is probable that

ed. P.S. Alexander et al., JSSSup 16 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 95–113; Tigchelaar, "Working with Few Data," 49–56.

5 There is only one color photo available of this manuscript in the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, a photo of fragment 7 (B-299261). On the other hand, several PAM photos can be found: For example, in PAM 43.325, all the fragments can easily be found: the arrangement is from the top left corner: 9, 10, 8 (several pieces belong to one fragment), 5, 6, 7, 1, 2, 3, and 4.

6 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:228–9; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 31.

7 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:228–31. See also Alexander, "4Q285 Reconsidered," 98–99. Concerning Alexander and Vermes' thoughts on Harmut Stegemann's method of material reconstruction, see note 10 below.

the forces of decay attacked some parts of the scroll more severely than others; and consequently, some parts of the scroll did not wear out rapidly. Therefore, Alexander and Vermes come to the conclusion that the similar fragments overlapped each other in the original scroll; they represent the best preserved part of the scroll in different layers.⁸ In addition, they study the lines and (sometimes visible) margins in the fragments and the color and texture of the leather⁹ – and also the content of the fragments.¹⁰ On the basis of all this, they arrange the fragments in the following order: in a six-column manuscript 4Q285, fragment 1 belongs to column 1, fragments 2 and 3 to column 2, fragment 4 to column 3, fragments 5–7 to column 4, fragment 8 to column 5 and fragments 9–10 to column 6.¹¹ Alexander and Vermes do not hesitate to use 11Q14 to support their reconstruction and fragment 8 is reconstructed from smaller pieces with the help of the “better preserved parallel,” 11Q14 fragment 1 column 2.¹² This is something that they have been criticized for,¹³ but Alexander has later emphasized that 11Q14 is not “absolutely crucial” to their reconstruction.¹⁴

All in all, the reconstruction of 4Q285 is widely discussed in comparison to many 4QM manuscripts, but there are still some open questions concerning it.¹⁵ It can however, be asked whether there is enough material to form a coherent understanding of the contents of the original scroll and/or to link it to M material or some common war traditions at Qumran. Before discussing this in more detail, let us take a look at 11Q14.

8 Alexander, “4Q285 Reconsidered,” 98. In this article, Alexander explains the principles and the background of different solutions in more detail than in DJD. Although it is only Alexander who argues here, he states that it is “our reconstruction” (p. 98) in question.

9 Alexander, “4Q285 Reconsidered,” 98–99.

10 See, e.g., the placement of fragment 4 and the placement of fragments 1 and 3, Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:231. Studying the content of the fragments is often considered to be a questionable approach in the case of material reconstruction. In his later article, Alexander emphasizes that material reconstruction, although there have been attempts to reduce it to a science, still includes much subjectivity. He states that “material reconstruction of scrolls is an art, not a science” (see Alexander, “4Q285 Reconsidered,” 97). By saying this, he makes it possible to take some liberties with applying the method.

11 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:229–31.

12 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:229.

13 Jonathan Norton, “Observations on the Official Material Reconstructions of Sefer ha-Milhamah (11Q14 and 4Q285),” *RevQ* 21/1 (2003): 3–27.

14 Alexander, “4Q285 Reconsidered,” 99–100.

15 For example, it can be discussed whether the fragments really are similar enough to reach conclusions about their placement. Alexander and Vermes note that fragments 6 and 7 differ from fragments 4 and 8 which is problematic but can perhaps be explained by the shrinkage of the first-mentioned fragments. See Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:231.

As regards manuscript 11Q14, it consists of four fragments which are put together from nine pieces.¹⁶ Fragment 1 consists of four pieces of which 1a is quite large: its width is 13 cm and height 12 cm. The smallest fragment, namely fragment 4, is only 9 mm wide and 13 mm high.¹⁷ The leather of the fragments is thicker than the average and the manuscript is, according to the DJD editors, “extremely well prepared, very smooth” and “very fine grain.” The color of the fragments is light tan but there are spots of darker brown on both sides of the fragment and some of the fragments have darkened. Left and bottom margins (0.6 and 3 cm) are visible in columns 1 and 2 of fragment 1, and the intercolumnar margin between these two columns (about 2 cm) can also be partly distinguished. The left margin is not regular but on the right side the scribe seems to have begun the writing regularly from the ruling. The column width (which can be measured in fragment 1 column 2) is about 12 cm which means that the writing block is relatively small. The script in the fragments resembles both the developed and the late Herodian formal script and it can be dated to the first half of the first century. The letters are on average 3.5 mm high and the distance between lines is about 8 mm.¹⁸

11Q14 was first called 11QBerakhot because it included blessings and the parallel to 4Q285 was not yet known.¹⁹ The first editor of the text was Adam S. van der Woude²⁰ and later, the official DJD edition of 11Q14 was published by him, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Florentino García Martínez. They named the fragment 11QSefer ha-Milḥamah on the basis of its significant textual similarities with 4Q285. This solution has been criticized²¹ and defended,²² but what is certain is that some degree of textual parallelism between 4Q285 and 11Q14 exists.

The reconstruction of this manuscript has also been much discussed. Especially the ensemble of fragment 1 has been under debate. In plate XXVIII

16 There are several photos available of this fragment in the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, see, e.g., the full spectrum color image (B-370948) and the infrared image (B-370949) of fragment 1.

17 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 33.

18 Van der Woude, Tigchelaar and García Martínez, DJD 23:243; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 33.

19 Van der Woude, Tigchelaar and García Martínez, DJD 23:243.

20 Adam S. van der Woude, “Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran (11QBer),” in *Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel und Qumranwissenschaft. Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966*, ed. S. Wagner (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 253–8.

21 William John Lyons, “Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and the Eschatological Victory,” *DSD* 3/2 (1996): 130–51, and “Clarifications Concerning 4Q285 and 11Q14 Arising from *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 23,” *DSD* 6/1 (1999): 37–43.

22 Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data,” 49–56.

of DJD 23, the five pieces suggested to belong together are marked with letters a–e, fragment 1a being the largest one, and arranged to form two more or less preserved columns of text. The most discussed join proposed in the DJD edition is the one between 1a and 1b, just between the two columns.²³ Jonathan Norton suggests – on the basis of, for example, the alignment of the guide lines, the shapes of the ink traces and the inaccuracy of photo plate XXVIII of DJD 23 – that the location of fragment 1b is impossible.²⁴ Philip Alexander has responded to this criticism in his article discussing the reconstruction of 4Q285. He admits that the photo in plate XXVIII is misleading, that the guide lines of the fragments are not joined up in the DJD ensemble, that there actually is just a small point of physical contact between fragment 1a and 1b, and that Norton’s observations in general are valid. However, he argues that these problems can be solved by moving fragment 1b a bit (the solution to which can now be seen in the recent photo available in the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library).²⁵ In addition, he introduces arguments against Norton’s suggestion that 1b must be removed from the right side of fragment 1a by, for example, calling into question his readings of the ink traces.²⁶ Alexander also states that it is not probable (as was already noted in this chapter) that the scroll would have worn out differently in its different parts but it is more likely that all the preserved fragments belong either near each other or in the corresponding point in a different layer of the scroll. The left margin that is clearly visible in fragment 1b restricted the options for the placement and from this point of view as well, Alexander comes to the conclusion that placing fragment 1b to the left side of fragment 1a is the most plausible option.²⁷

23 In addition to DJD 23, cf. also Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data,” 51, who argues that the join is certain. Note that in PAM 43.977, these pieces are not yet joined together.

24 Norton, “Observations,” 4–7.

25 Alexander, “4Q285 Reconsidered,” 100–101. See the photo: B-370948.

26 What is convincing is Alexander’s observation (see “4Q285 Reconsidered,” 103) that if the small trace at the top of fragment 1b is the left top of d – as Norton suggests (see “Observations,” 6) – it means that the ruling of this line does not join up with that of fragment 1a.

27 Alexander, “4Q285 Reconsidered,” 103.

TABLE 39 DJD transcriptions and transformations of 4Q285 8 and 11Q14 11 ii

4Q285 fragment 8		11Q14 fragment 1, column 2	
1	[וברכס בשם אל ישראל וענה]	1	[וברכס בשם אל]
2	[ואמר]לפני [כול בני ישראל [ברוכים אתם בשם אל עליו]	2	[וברכס בשם אל]
3	[וברך] שם קודשו ל[עו]למי עד] וברוכים [תו וברוכים]	3	[ישראל ברוכים אתם]
4	[כול מלאכי קודשו יברך] אתכם אל עליון יואר פניו אליכם ויפתח]	4	[בשם אל עליון]
5	[לכם את אוצרו ה]טוב [אשר] בשמים לו[הוריד על ארצכם גשמי ברכה]	5	[לעולמי עד וברוכים כול]
6	[סל]מטר זו[רה ומלקוחש] בעתו ולהת[לכם פרי תנובות דגן]	6	[מלאכי קודשו vac[at vac]at]
7	[תירוש וי]צוה לרוב והאריץ [תנו]בב [לכם פרי עדינים ואכלתם]	7	[יברך אתכם אל עליון יואר פניו אליכם ויפתח לכם את]
8	[והדשתם] ואין משכלה [ב]א[רצב]ם ולא[ן] מוחלה שדפון וירקון]	8	[אוצרו הטוב אשר בשמים להוריד על ארצכם]
9	[לוא ידאה בתבוא]תיה וא[ין כול גנף] ומכשול בעדתכם ויהיה רעה]	9	[גשמי ברכה טל ומטר יורה ומלקוש בעתו ולתת לכם פרי]
10	[מן הארץ ואין דב]ר בארצב]ם כיא אל עמכם ומלאכי קודשו מתיצבים]	10	[תנובות דגן תירוש ויצה לרוב והארץ תנובב לכם פרי]
11	[וקודשם ושם] קודשו נקרא עו[לבים]	11	[ע]דנים ואכלתם והדשתם vac ואין משכלה בארצכם]
12	[ל]י וקודש וברכבכם]	12	[ולא מוחלה שדפון וירקון לוא ידאה בתבואתיה]

1 [... And he shall bless them in the name of the God of Israel, and he shall answer] 2 [and say] before [all the sons of] Israel: [Blessed are you in the name of the Most High God ...]

3 [... and ble]ss[ed is his holy name for] e[ver] and ever.

1 [...] 2 [...] 3 [I]srael, and he shall bless them in the name of [the God of] 3 [I]srael, and he shall answer [and say ...] Israel: [Blessed are y[ou] 4 in the name of the Most High God ... [...] and blessed is [his] holy name 5 for ever and ever.

TABLE 39 DJD transcriptions and transformations of 4Q285 8 and 11Q14 1 ii (cont.)

4Q285 fragment 8	11Q14 fragment 1, column 2
[And blessed are ...	And blessed are [...] his [...]
and blessed are] 4 [all his holy angels.	and blessed are all 6 his holy angels. va[cat va]cat
May] the Mo[st High] God [bless] you.	7 May the Most High God bless you.
[May he cause his face to shine upon you	May he cause his face to shine upon you,
and may he open] 5 [for you his] good [treasury whi]ch is in heaven	and may he open for you 8 his good treasury which is in heaven,
to [bring down upon your land showers of blessing.]	to bring down upon your land 9 showers of blessing,
6 [dew and] rain, the ea[rly ra]in and the late ra[in] in its time,	dew and rain, the early rain and the late rain in its time,
and to give[you the fruit of the produce of corn,] 7 [wine and o]il in plenty.	and to give you the fruit [f] of 10 the produce of corn wine and oil in plenty.
And [may] the land [prod]uce for [you delightful fruits.	And may the land produce for you [d]elightful fruits.
And may you eat] 8 [and may y]ou [grow fat].	11 And may you eat and may you grow fat. vacat
And may there be no-one miscarrying [in yo]ur [and,] nor[sickness].	And may there be no-one miscarrying in your land, 12 nor sickness.
May [blight and mildew] 9 not be seen in [its] produ[ce.	May blight and mildew not be seen in its produce.
May there be n]o affliction, [or stumbling in your congregation,	13 [May there be no affliction, or stum]bling in your congregation,
for wild beasts have ceased] 10 from the land.	for wild beasts have ceased from 14 [the land.
And may there be no pestil[ence in yo]ur [land].	And may there be no pestil[ence in your land.
For God is wi]th you	For God is with you
and his holy angels are standing in your congregation,	and [his holy] angels 15 [ar]e [standing] in your congregation
and] 11 his holy [name] is invoked ov[er you ...]	and his holy name is invoked over you.
... [...] 12 for a [com]munity.	
And in your midst [...]	

2 Mutual Relationship between 4Q285 and 11Q14

Any understanding of the mutual relationship between manuscripts 4Q285 and 11Q14 largely depends on what one's opinion on the suggested readings of the manuscripts is. If one accepts the readings introduced in DJD, the close textual parallelism between the manuscripts seems clear. Especially 4Q285 fragment 8 and 11Q14 fragment 1, column 2 are easy to compare. As Table 39 (above) demonstrates, there are many completely or partly preserved words that the fragments share. In addition, if one reconstructs the text of the poorly preserved fragment 8 of 4Q285 according to the better preserved fragment 1 of 11Q14, the reconstructions seem to fit into the lines.

At the beginning of the text, there is an introductory formula according to which someone shall bless the people of Israel with certain words (4Q285 8:1–2a / 11Q14 1 column 2:2–3). These words are given in the rest of the text. The persons who are blessed are called “you” and they are blessed “in the name of the Most High God” (8:2b/1 column 2:3b–4a). In addition, God's name and God's holy angels are blessed. Between these two, something else is mentioned but not preserved (8:3–4a/1 column 2:4b–6). After this small digression, the actual blessing concerning “you” starts. This part is in 11Q14 separated from the previous texts with a *vacat* while in 4Q285 the text continues without any breaks. The verbal forms יברך, יאר, and יפתח can be interpreted as imperfects (see the editors of 11Q14) in which case the blessing appears to be more like a promise, or as jussives (see the editors of 4Q285 and the translation in the table) in which case the text is more like a call for blessing (8:4b–5/1 column 2:7–8). In any case, as for verbal forms, this part of the text differs from that in the beginning where participle forms were used (ברוך, ברוכים). In lines 8:4b–5/1 column 2:7–8, there are links to the Lord's blessing (see Num 6:24–25; cf. also Ps 67:2) but while the blessing in Numbers remains on an abstract level, the blessing in 4Q285/11Q14 continues with more concrete promises:²⁸ God will open his heavenly storehouse (אוצר; also known in 1QM 10:12), and give various rains and dew and thereby all kinds of harvest (8:5–7/1 column 2:8–10). Consequently, the people who are blessed will “eat and grow fat” (8:8/1 column 2:11). After describing all these good things which come out of the blessing, the text moves on by enumerating what will not happen in the land of those people blessed: no one will miscarry or become sick, the grain will be clean and proper and wild animals will cause no harm (8:8b–10a/1 column 2:11b–14a). In 11Q14, this part is again separated from the previous one with a *vacat*

28 There are several other examples in the Dead Sea Scrolls of the combination of blessings and concrete promises, see, e.g., 1QSB 3:25–28.

(line 11), although a smaller one than that in line 6.²⁹ At the end of the blessing, it is stated that all the above-mentioned promises/wishes are possible because God and his angels are present in the congregation and God's holy name is called (8:10b–12/1 column 2:14b–15).

The case with 4Q285 fragment 7 and 11Q14 fragment 1, column 1 is the more difficult one since, as Table 40 demonstrates, especially the last-mentioned fragment is very poorly preserved.³⁰

TABLE 40 DJD transcriptions and translations of 4Q285 fragment 7 and 11Q14 fragment 1, column 1

4Q285 fragment 7 ^a	11Q14 fragment 1, column 1
	בום [] 5
	לו [] 6
	צמח ד' [] 7
	[] 8
כאשר כתוב בספר [ישעיהו הנביא] 1	ישעיהו הנביא ונוקפו [] 9
וּנְקָפָ[ו]] 1	סבכי היער בברזל והלבנון באדיר יפול ויצא] 10
סבכי היער בברזל ולבנון באדיר י'פול ויצא חוטר] 2	חוטר] 10
מגזע ישי] 2	מגזע ישי ונצר משרשיו יפרה] 11
צמח דוד [] 3	דויד ונשפטו את [] 12
ונשפטו את] 3	והמיתו נשיא העדה צמח דויד [] 13
והמיתו נשיא העדה] 4	ם ובמחוללות וצוה כוהן הרואש [] 14
צמ[ח]] 4	םפ[] הלאי] 15
בנגעי'ם ובמחוללות וצוה כוהן] 5	דויד] 5
חלאי'] כתיי'ם []] 6	השם] 6

a Transcription of 4Q285 fragment 7 is that of Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:241–3. Transcription of 11Q14 fragment 1, column 1 is that of van der Woude, Tigchelaar, and García Martínez, DJD 23:246–8. The translations are applied mainly from Alexander and Vermes but some solutions are from van der Woude, Tigchelaar, and García Martínez. The translations are purposely harmonized in order to demonstrate the textual parallels as clearly as possible. The three dots were added in order to emphasize that the length of the lacunas is not demonstrated there. Note that there is one difference in the reconstructions that is not harmonized here: 4Q285 fragment 7 line 5b–6a is reconstructed by Alexander and Vermes as השם כוהן whereas 11Q14 fragment 1, column 1, line 14 b is reconstructed by van der Woude, Tigchelaar, and García Martínez by וצוה כוהן הרואש. This reconstruction might be similar as well, one or the other of the options could be chosen to reconstruct both texts – but the dissimilarity is left in the text in order to demonstrate that reconstruction is in many ways arbitrary.

29 Note that the small *vacats* can also be due to the unevenness of the skin.

30 Transcription of 4Q285 fragment 8 is that of Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:241–43. Transcription of 11Q14 fragment 1, column 2 is that of van der Woude, Tigchelaar, and García Martínez, DJD 23:246–48. The translations are applied mainly from Alexander and

TABLE 40 DJD transcriptions and translations of 4Q285 fragment 7 (*cont.*)

4Q285 fragment 7	11Q14 fragment 1, column 1
<p>1 [As it is written in the book of]Isaiah the prophet: <i>'Cut down shall be</i> 2 [the thickets of the forest with an axe, and Lebanon by a majestic one shall f]all. <i>And there shall come forth a shoot</i> <i>from the stump of Jesse,</i> 3 [and out of his roots a sapling will grow.' ...] the branch of David, and they will enter into judgement with 4 [...] ... and the Prince of the Congregation, the bran[ch of David,] shall put him to death 5 [...] with stroke]s and with wounds.^b And a priest [of renown(?)] will command 6 [...] the s]lai[n] of the Kittim[...] ... [...]</p>	<p>5 [...] ... 6 [...] ... 7 [... the bud of Da]vid 8 [...] ... 9 [...] Isaiah the prophet: <i>'Cut down shall be</i> <i>the thickest of the forest]</i> 10 [with an axe, and Lebanon by a majestic one shall fall. <i>And there shall come forth a sh]oot</i> 11 [from the stump of Jesse, and out of his roots a sapling will grow.' ... the bran]ch of 12 [David, and they will enter into judgement ...] 13 [...] and the Prince of the Congregation the branch of David, shall put him to death [...] ... 14 [...] and with wounds. And the chief priest will command] 15 [...]... [...] the slain of</p>

b Alexander and Vermes translate this מוחללה as “wounds,” but since this is its only appearance, the specific meaning must remain undefined.

The text in fragment 7 of 4Q285 starts with a quotation from Isaiah. The reconstruction of the quotation is on a solid basis since the words ישעיהו הנביא are clearly preserved and lead to finding the quotation from the book of Isaiah. Also, there is a five-word-long sequence (יפול ויצא חוטר מגזע ישי) which forms a link between fragment 7 and Isa 10:34b–11:1a. In addition, when studying these five words in more detail, it can be noted that some of them are very rare (חוטר twice in the Hebrew Bible and in the Dead Sea Scrolls only in Sefer ha-Milḥamah manuscripts; גזע three times in the Hebrew Bible and six times in the Dead Sea Scrolls) which makes the link between fragment 7 and Isa 10:34–11:1 even stronger.

Vermes but some solutions are from van der Woude, Tigchelaar, and García Martínez. The translations are purposely harmonized in order to demonstrate the textual parallels as clearly as possible. The three dots were added in order to emphasize that the length of the lacunas is not demonstrated there.

In lines 3b–6, the quotation is probably somehow explained or interpreted. The expression **צמח דויד** (the branch of David) also occurs in 4Q174 (4QFlor) fragments 1–2 column 1, line 11 and in 4Q252 (4QCommGen A) column 5 (fragment 6), lines 3–4 and in these cases too, it is part of an explanation of a Hebrew Bible text: in 4Q174, 2 Sam 7:11 is explained, and in 4Q252, Gen 49:10a and Jer 33:17 are explained (cf. also 4QpIsa^a/4Q161 fragments 8–10 lines 15–29).³¹ Both the passage of 4Q174 and the passage of 4Q252 reflect the anticipation of the kingly Messiah and this is the case also with the passage of 4Q285. There, the Prince of the Congregation (**נשיא העדה**) seems to be identified with the Branch of David (cf. line 4 in which these expressions probably follow one another) and due to this, scholars have often described the Prince as a messianic character.³² The Prince will put somebody to death and since the slain of the Kittim (**חללי כתיים**)³³ are mentioned at the end of the fragment, many scholars have suggested that it is the King of the Kittim who will die at the Prince's hands.³⁴ However, the preserved text does not make this clear. In any case, the verbs **שפט** (*niphal*) and **מות** (*hiphil*) may point to some kind of disagreement or to a conflict.

As regards 11Q14, fragment 1 column 1, its connection to 4Q285 fragment 7 is based on three poorly visible words. Two of them are in fragment 1b (already briefly discussed) and the last one (in line 15) in fragment 1d. According to Tigchelaar, placing the last-mentioned fragment in column 1 is not certain but “much more likely than placing it in another column.”³⁵ Tigchelaar notes the fact that the visible letters **טר** in 11Q14 1 column 1 line 10 can be supplemented in various ways but, actually, there are not so many options in the corpus of the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Since he considers the join of fragments 1a (see column 2 in Table 39) and 1b certain, he suggests that, in this case, the supplementary letters should primarily be sought from 4Q285 where the options are narrowed to two, **חוטטר** or **ומטר**. In addition, Tigchelaar remarks that **טר** in fragment 1 b and **חללי** in fragment 1d are not very common letter combinations in the Dead Sea Scrolls in general. In 4Q285 they occur, and when trying to reconstruct the text between them in 11Q14 fragment 1, column 1,

31 In addition to these two texts and Sefer ha-Milhamah manuscripts, **צמח** occurs only twice, both times in 4Q418 (4QInstr^d).

32 Cf., e.g., Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:239; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 32.

33 There may be different options to translate **חללי כתיים** – especially because the context in 4Q285 is not well preserved. In addition to “slain of the Kittim,” another option could be “slain by the Kittim.” However, in the other (rare) instances of this expression that are known the most suitable translation is always “slain of the Kittim”; see 1QM 18:8; 19:13.

34 Cf., e.g., Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:239; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 32.

35 Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data,” 52.

it can be seen that the text known in 4Q285 (from טר to חללי) fits there.³⁶ This hints that fragments 1b and 1d should perhaps really be joined and, if this is the case, that there may be a parallelism between them and fragment 7 of 4Q285.

All in all, it is highly probable that 4Q285 and 11Q14 are textually very closely parallel – although there seem to be some differences, at least as regards *vacats*. Since there is so much that is missing of the text of 4Q285, the fact that there is no parallelism between fragment 2 of 11Q14 and the preserved fragments of 4Q285 does not necessarily undermine the conclusion of the close parallelism between the manuscripts.³⁷ It is important to note that although the close textual parallelism between the manuscripts is possible, perhaps even probable, this does not necessarily mean that both manuscripts had exactly the same contents: one could include more material than the other. However, it is fairly reasonable to give them a common title – and in the context of this study, to examine them together. Whether they have something to do with the war traditions of Qumran or the M manuscripts is a more difficult question and it is taken up next.

3 Content and Textual Relationship to M Manuscripts

Since 4Q285 and 11Q14 are such close textual parallels, it is possible to discuss their contents by close-reading only one of them. In the following, the content of the manuscripts is scrutinized by reading 4Q285, the best-preserved manuscript of the two. Since the main task of this section is to find out the position of the Sefer ha-Milḥamah manuscripts in the ensemble called the War Texts, their content is discussed primarily with the possible links to M manuscripts in mind. Also, it should be noted that in many of the fragments, only a little text is preserved and thus, analyzing their content without trying to find any textual parallels is challenging if not impossible.

3.1 *Fragments 1–3 and 5*³⁸

In fragment 1 line 3, Michael and probably also Gabriel (only ג and ה are left of the word) are mentioned. In 1QM, Michael and Gabriel are mentioned together in 9:15–16 where the inscriptions of the shields are discussed. The names Sariel

36 Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data,” 52–53.

37 Fragments 3 and 4 of 11Q14 do not contain more than two or three lines and there are two or three letters per line at a maximum preserved. No complete word can be read or even reconstructed.

38 The text of these fragments is introduced below in Table 41.

and Raphael are also mentioned in that passage and probably it is because of this that Alexander and Vermes have reconstructed these names in line 3 of fragment 1 as well. Michael also occurs in 1QM 17, two times in line 6–7, where the “authority of Michael” (משרת מיכאל) is referred to.

In line 4, the word בחריר, a plural construct form, can be distinguished. In 1QM, this word occurs twice, in column 12, where it is in the same grammatical form (בחירי עם קודש “the elect ones of the holy people” in line 1 and בחירי שמים “the elect ones of the heavens” in line 5). However, of the 45 occurrences in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, only three are in the M manuscripts (see also 4Q491 fragment 6). The noun שם (“name”; in line 1) is a very common word; it occurs 416 times in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and 32 times in 1QM. With the second person masculine suffix, there are six occurrences of שם in 1QM. The one in 18:8 is reminiscent of that of fragment 1 since it is preceded by למען, although what follows and what comes before do not overlap.

Fragment 2 includes so few words that nothing can be said of its contents; and the words preserved are very general (עם, אשר) so that it is not possible to argue for any parallels. The same is true with fragment 5. Fragment 3 does not include much text but of the words preserved, many are also known from 1QM. For example, of 69 occurrences of the word חצוצרות (always in the plural in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls), 47 are in 1QM and 67 in M manuscripts. On the one hand, it should be noted, however, that in fragment 3 the word חצוצרות is reconstructed despite the first two letters, which makes the possible lexical link uncertain. On the other hand, there are not so many options as to what can follow after ח and צ at the beginning of the word and חצוצרות is the most common of those words that start with this combination of letters (cf. חצי with 18 occurrences, חציר with 33 occurrences and four other words with one to three occurrences). The verbal root רוע occurs 30 times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, and, of these, 15 are in 1QM and seven more in other M manuscripts (although in M manuscripts, or anywhere else, the verb is never in the infinitive as it is in 4Q285). Of the 45 occurrences of Kittim (כתאים/כתיים), 18 are found in 1QM, seven in other M manuscripts and three in 4Q285. As regards the word לוי, it occurs 12 times in 1QM and 8 in other M manuscripts which make up about one-fourth of the total occurrences (79 times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls).

Although there thus are many possible lexical links between fragment 2 and M manuscripts, there are also words in fragment 2 that occur rarely in M material: יובל occurs 30 times in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls but only one of the occurrences is in 1QM, 7:14 (ובידם שבעת שופרות היובל) “seven ram’s horns in their hands”) and the verbal root בזה never occurs in M manuscripts (14 times in total in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls). Thus, the lexical links between 1QM and 4Q285 fragment 3 are strong, but, again, one cannot find in 1QM or other

TABLE 41 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 fragments 1–3, 5 and M manuscripts

Frag.	Text	Translation
1] vacat? ועל ׀	1 1 [...] and on <i>vacat?</i> [...]
] למען שמכה ומ׀	2 2 [...] for the sake of your name
	את מיכאל ג] בריא ל] שריאל ורפאל	3 and [...] 3 [...] Michael , G[abrie]l[,
] עם בחירי׳	4 Sariel, and Raphael 4 [...] with the elect of [...]
2] ׀ שׁ	1 1 [...] ... [...]
] א שר עמו	2 2 [...] w]ho are with him [...]
] מׁ	3 3 [...] ... [...]
3] ׀	1 1 [...] ... [...]
	הלויא׳ ׀ וחצ] וצרות	2 2 [...] the Levit[e]s and trum[pets]
] יו בל לריע בהם	3 3 of a r]am to blow them [...]
] י כתיים יבזם	4 4 [...] ... of the Kittim he will treat
] עׁ	5 them with contempt/ despoil them[
5] ל׳א׳	1 1 [...] not [...]
] ל	2 2 [...] ... [...]

M manuscripts one particular passage that would be a close textual parallel to fragment 3.

To sum up, in the case of these fragments, the words marked with red text in Table 41 may form a link to M manuscripts.³⁹ The table shows that fragment 3 includes much vocabulary also known in M manuscripts but in the case of the other fragments lexical links are not evident – although it should be noted that these fragments do not include many comparable words at all.

3.2 *Fragment 4*⁴⁰

The first line of fragment 4 includes vocabulary which might form a lexical link between the fragment and M material: The verbal root נגף occurs 14 times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and half of the occurrences are in M

39 The transcriptions and translations in Tables 41–44 are those of Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:232–45 (although in the translations, the three dots were added in order to emphasize that the length of the lacunas is not demonstrated here).

40 The text of this fragment is introduced below in Table 42.

manuscripts. The term רשעה is also a general word in M manuscripts but still only 11 of 77 occurrences are found there and, for example, in Hodayot manuscripts the share is larger (17). However, in 1QM, there is an example of the use of נגף and רשעה together: line 1:13 reads שלושה גורלות יחזקו בני אור לנגוף רשעה (the Sons of Light shall strengthen for three lots and smite wickedness) while fragment 4 line 1 reads [ת תנגף רשעה] (wickedness will be smitten). In 1QM, the verb is in the *qal* infinitive and in fragment 4, in the *niph'al* imperfect – but in both cases the root נגף is followed by רשעה.

In line 2, the Prince of the Congregation (נשיא העדה) is mentioned. This character is possibly referred to in 1QM as well – although in 1QM 5:1, the title is the prince of the *whole* congregation (העדה כל נשיא). The prince of the whole congregation is also mentioned in CD 7:20 and – although the letters are mostly reconstructed – in 4QD^a 3 column 3, line 6, and in 4QD^d 5:4. 4QapocrMoses^b(?) 1 column 3, line 1 mentions הנשיא אשר לכול העדה. The prince of the congregation also occurs in 1QS^b 5:20 and 4QpIsa^a 2–6:19. As regards נשיא in general, 9 of 52 occurrences are in M manuscripts. Thus, although a lexical link between fragment 4 line 2 and 1QM is possible, it is not in any sense certain.

In line 3, the participle form כתוב – preceded by ה ([ה] כתוב) – probably belongs to a quotation formula. Abegg remarks that there is only one case in which ה comes before כתוב in the Qumran literature and that is in 4Q266 2 column 1, line 17. However, it should be noted that there כתוב is mostly reconstructed and that there actually are other examples in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls as well: ה היה כתוב can also be found in CD 1:3 and in addition, 11Q13 (11QMelch) 2:19 reads הוואה הכתוב and 4Q397 (4QMMT^d) 2:13 reads הטהו[רה] כתוב. Although one cannot be sure what word precedes כתוב and although one particular textual parallel cannot be defined on the basis of the preceding ה, it is clear that in general כתוב is often part of quotation formulas. Therefore, it can be considered probable that a quotation follows in lines 3–4 of fragment 4. Abegg suggests that the quotation is from the Hebrew Bible and has checked that the word combination על הרי occurs there 11 times.⁴¹ For Abegg, Ezek 39:4, a verse from the description of the destruction of Gog, is the “most likely candidate,”⁴² and the DJD editors Alexander and Vermes also prefer it. However, none of them explains why Ezek 39:2, for example, would not be as likely an option as well – at least the number of letters and spaces before the phrase על הרי is very near to that of Ezek 39:4. Thus, although there is no cogent reason to deny that Ezek 39:4 is a probable option, one must take into account that this reconstruction is again only one possibility and there are other options as well.

41 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 107. The verses in which על הרי occurs are Gen 8:4; Jer 13:16; Ezek 35:12, 38:8, 39:2, 39:4, 39:17; Amos 3:9; Ps 104:6; Song 2:17, 8:14.

42 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 107.

The expression מלך הַכְּתִיִּים, which is reconstructed in line 5 (מלך הַכְּתִיִּים), occurs only once in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, in 1QM 15:2.⁴³ It is quite natural that scholars have tried to find a probable reconstruction specifically from 1QM since, as already noted, of the 45 occurrences of Kittim in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, 25 are in M manuscripts. The idea that there must be some male person or some masculine noun in question probably comes from the suffixed verbal form in line 10 (וַיָּבִיאֵהוּ) which indicates that a male person or an artifact (in masculine) is brought before the prince.⁴⁴ However, מלך הַכְּתִיִּים is again only one of several options and nothing explains why חיל הַכְּתִיִּים, for example, could not be considered as well (cf. 1QM 17:10). A fact that might make the reconstruction מלך הַכְּתִיִּים more uncertain is that Belial is not mentioned in the preserved text of 4Q285, although he is in the immediate context of the king of Kittim in 1QM 15:2–3. However, since the context of line 5 of fragment 4 is so fragmentary, one cannot be sure whether Belial was mentioned or not.

In line 6, the word ים “sea” appears and, furthermore, in line 9 יבשה “dry land” is mentioned. The term יבשה is quite a rare word and occurs most often in the Hodayot manuscripts (see 1QH^a 4:4, 11:31, 16:4; 4QH^b/4Q428 5:6, 10:12). The word ים occurs more frequently in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls; the largest part of the occurrences are again in Hodayot manuscripts (10 of 59) but there are a few occurrences in M manuscripts as well. In 1QM column 10, God’s creative deeds are described and among them is the “circle of seas” (חוג המים; see line 13). In the next column, the history of Israel is gone through and there is a reference to the destruction of the Egyptians in the Reed Sea (ים סוף; 1QM 11:10). The Reed Sea is also mentioned in 4Q491a 18:5.⁴⁵ In spite of all this, the whole idea of a battle at sea and returning to dry land that is reflected in fragment 4 is unique among the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls – as Alexander notes, Israel has not engaged in naval warfare in any text before this.⁴⁶

An expression of time, בעת ההיא, occurs both in line 7 and in line 9. It is not a very common phrase, elsewhere found only in 1QS 9:5 and 1QM 18:3. One can guess that these phrases in fragment 4 refer first to the time of the battle at sea, and secondly, to the time of returning from the sea to the dry land.

43 See, however, 4Q247 (4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks) line 6 where the similar phrase is without the article and partly reconstructed: מלך [ך] כתיים.

44 Cf. Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:237.

45 See also the Self-Glorification Hymn in 4Q491c, fragment 11 column 1 where line 15–16 reads [מיא הו]א [כבא] ים ישוּבוֹפִיִר (Who, like sea travelers, will come back to tell [...])...?)

46 Alexander, “A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah,” *RevQ* 19/3 (2000): 333–48 (344).

TABLE 42 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 4 and M manuscripts

Fragment	Text	Translation
4	[]	1 [...] wickedness will be smitten [...]
	[]	2 [...] the Prince of the Congregation and all Isra[el...]
	[]	3 [...] as]s written [in the book of Ezekiel the Prophet: 'I will strike your bow from your left hand]
	קשתכה מיד שמאולכה]	4 [and will make your arrows drop from your right hand.]
	[]	On the mountains of I[srael you shall fall, you and all your hordes' ...]
	[]	5 [...] the king of the] Kiritim [...]
	[]	6 [...] the Pr]ince of the Congregation [will pursue them]
	[]	towards the [Great] Sea[...]
	[]	7 [...] and] they [shall flee] from before Israel.
	[]	At that time [...]
	[]	8 [...] and] he shall make a stand against them, and they shall be stirred up (?) against them [...]
	[]	9 [...] and they shall return to the dry land. At th[at] time [...]
	[]	10 [...] and they shall bring him before the Prince[of the Congregation ...]

In line 8, the rare verbal root עבר occurs. This is the only occurrence in the *niphal* in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and the only other occurrence is in 4QRebukes by the Overseer where it occurs in the *hiphil* (see 4Q477 2 column 2, line 6). The root is rare in the Hebrew Bible as well (14 occurrences). The meaning of the verb in line 8 remains unclear as does the meaning of the whole preserved phrase. Alexander and Vermes suggest that the subject of יַעֲמוּדָן is the Prince of the Congregation. Concerning וַיַּעֲבְרוּ they consider whether it might be a mistake and should actually be read וַיַּעֲרֹכוּ. The root ערך and the derived noun מערכה occur in 1QM related to the battle formation and battle lines (see, e.g., 1QM 6:4, 7:9, 9:4, 9:10).⁴⁷ Here, the verb would be related to Israel. However, this consideration must remain speculative due to the fragmentariness of the context.

To sum up, in the case of this fragment, the words colored red in Table 42 may form a link to M manuscripts – but in all cases, the link is very hypothetical and other possible links can be found as well.

3.3 Fragments 6 and 9–10⁴⁸

There are only a few words left of fragment 6 and many of them are very common (see the verbal roots ראה and בוא and the noun לילה, which is, however, exceptionally written with two *yods*, לילה). One verbal root that is not so common is נסע, used in line 3 (12 occurrences in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, never in M manuscripts). This verb often refers to journeying, i.e., taking down tents and rousing oneself, but also to tearing out. Alexander and Vermes note, obviously with the first meaning in mind, that here the destination of the journey was probably not Jerusalem since the verb עלה is one that usually refers to taking a journey there.⁴⁹ It is difficult to conclude anything more about the contents of the fragment. As regards fragment 9, the situation is similar to that of fragment 6: a few words are visible, too common to form any links to other texts (see שנה, עת, קץ, תורה, all well over 100 times in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls).

Fragment 10 includes several words that are not known in M manuscripts. The words בצע and הון (see line 3) never occur in M material. There are, however, passages in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls in which these two terms occur together. For example, in CD, this combination of words, with or without the preposition ל but always in the same order, occurs five times (8:7, 10:18, 11:15, 12:7, 19:19; see also parallels in 4QD^e and 4QD^f). These passages warn

47 Cf. Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:237.

48 The text of these fragments is introduced below in Table 43.

49 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:238.

against vaunting about wealth or about ill-gotten gains (8:7, 19:19) and advise against going to court about property on the Sabbath day (10:18) or profaning the Sabbath for property (11:15). Furthermore, they warn against attacking the gentiles for property (12:6–7). The combination occurs also in 1QpHab 9:5, 1QH^a 18:30, 1QH^a 18:23 (in reverse order), 4QS^d 8:6, 4QapocrJer C^e 2i:8 (with ל) and PAM 43:700 73:1.

The word קבר “grave” (see line 5) is quite rare: there are only 12 occurrences in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, none of these in M material. Most of them are in the Copper Scroll. The term עון is a bit more frequent with 29 occurrences but it is also one of those terms not known from M manuscripts. Nor does רחמים occur in M material (24 occurrences in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls in general). Instead, the use of the word חלל may form a link between fragment 10 and M manuscripts since 41 of this word’s 56 occurrences in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls are in M material. Eibert Tigchelaar too has noted that the word occurs very often in M manuscripts and he argues that in the case of 11Q14 fragment 1 column 1 the use of this word “suggests a relation to the group of manuscripts dealing with the eschatological war.”⁵⁰

To sum up, in the case of these fragments, חלל in fragment 10 line 6 remains the only word that might form a link to M manuscripts. In Table 43, it is thus marked in red.

TABLE 43 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 fragments 6, 9–10 and M manuscripts

Fragment	Text		Translation
6	יִרְאוּ]	1	1 [...] they shall see [...]
	יָנוּ בְּאֵי]	2	2 [...] those who enter [...]
	לְיִסְעוּ אֶל]	3	3 [...] they shall march t[o ...]
] לַיְלִיָּה	4	4 [...] night [...]
] עֲלָיו	5	5 [...] upon/against him/it [...]
9] שְׁנָה וְכֹזֶל]	1	1 [...] year and al[1 ...]
] עַת קֵץ לְ]	2	2 [...] end time for [...]
] יִם אֲשֶׁר]	3	3 [...] which [...]
] וְתוֹרָה]	4	4 [...] and Tor[ah ...]

50 Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data,” 52 (esp. n. 14), 55.

TABLE 43 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 (*cont.*)

Fragment	Text	Translation
10]ה[1 1 [...] ... [...]
]מתוך [ה]עדה[2 2 [...] from the midst of [the] congregation [...]
]עוז ב הו[ו]בצע	3 3 [... he who fors]akes property[and] gain [...]
]ור ואכלתם א[4 4 [...] and you shall eat / and it shall devour them [...]
	ם להם קברי[5 5 [...] for them grave[s ...]
	ם ק[ל חלליה[6 6 [...] ... [...]the[ir] slain (?) [...]
]שבי עון ישובו[7 7 [... those who re]pent from sin shall return [...]
]ברחמים ו[8 8 [...] with mercy and [...]
]ויש[ר]אל עו[9 9 [...] and Is[r]ael [...]
]ש וא[10 10 [...] and [...]

3.4 Fragments 7–8⁵¹

The text of fragment 7 starts with a quotation from Isaiah. In 1QM, there is also a quotation from Isaiah (see 11:1b–12) but it is from chapter 31 (see verse 8) while the quotation in fragment 7 is from the turn of chapters 10 and 11 (see 10:34–11:1). In both passages, the Lord defends Jerusalem but this is not enough to link the passages. The only expression that may form a direct link between fragment 7 and M manuscripts is a very uncertain חללי כתיים “slain of the Kittim.”⁵²

In fragment 8, in lines 1–5, the preserved words are very general (e.g., ישראל, עולם, טוב, שמים) and the same is true in lines 11–12 (e.g., קודש, קרא, יחד, קרב). In the middle of the fragment, the lines offer more unique vocabulary – which does not, however, form a link to M manuscripts. In line 6, various rains are enumerated: מטר “rain,” יורה “early rain,” מלקוש “late rain” occur four to six times in non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, many of the occurrences being in the poetical texts. In lines 7–8, the roots נוב and שכל are rare, the first one having only six occurrences in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls (of which two are in Sefer ha-Milḥamah manuscripts) and the second one having four (of which two are in Sefer ha-Milḥamah manuscripts). In addition, of those words in

51 It was demonstrated above that fragments 7 and 8 probably are close textual parallels to 11Q14 fragment 1. The text of these fragments is introduced above in Tables 39 and 40 and will again be presented below in Table 44.

52 Cf. the discussion of fragment 3 and fragment 4 above.

lines in the end part of the fragment (lines 7–12), which are a bit more general, none occur in M manuscripts (cf. יצהר, נגע, דָּבָר).⁵³

To sum up, in the case of these fragments, חללי כתיים in fragment 7 line 6 remains the only word that might form a link to M manuscripts – and it should be noted that there is no certain letter in this expression. In Table 44, the expression is marked with red text.

3.5 *Summary of the Content of Fragments 1–10*

On the basis of the lexical scrutiny above, it can be concluded that none of the fragments of 4Q285 bears a close textual parallel to any of the known M manuscripts. Of all 10 fragments, fragment 3 includes the largest share of vocabulary similar to M manuscripts, resembling especially the texts known, for example, from 1QM 7–9 and 16–18. However, whether it could be determined to be a remote parallel to the battle descriptions of these chapters is impossible to say since there is so little text left on fragment 3. As regards fragment 4, although it shares a few words with M manuscripts, the naval battle is a unique idea in relation to M material – and to all other Jewish texts in the Second Temple period and before.

In the other fragments of 4Q285, the relatively frequent word that may form a link between 4Q285 and M manuscripts is כתיים. It is also one of the rare words that leads one to think that the text of 4Q285 has something to do with hostilities or even a war; other Dead Sea manuscripts and also the Hebrew Bible demonstrate that Kittim always occurs as expressing adversaries. Another word that clearly refers to the context of battle or of violation – and occurs in M manuscripts as well – is חללים. Beyond these, there are not very clear lexical elements which would link the text to the context of war, at least to the war traditions that are known in M material.

What should be noted is that fragment 8 of 4Q285 (cf. also 11Q14 1 column 2) contains a long blessing that does not have any connection to M manuscripts. In 1QM, there are different speeches and hymns which, if taken out of their context, do not necessarily have anything to do with war (see, e.g., 1QM 10:8b–18) and therefore the hymn containing unique material is not a reason to argue that 4Q285 should be completely separate from the M tradition. However, one would need more context in order to establish the hymn as a genre parallel to some passage of the M material; as of now there is nothing that would link the hymn to any special context.

53 The word תבואה (in line 9) occurs 31 times in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, of which two are in Sefer ha-Milhamah texts and one is in in 4Q509, recto side of 4Q496. However, this is not enough to form a link between 4Q285 fragment 8 and M manuscripts.

TABLE 44 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 7–8 and M manuscripts

Frag.	Text	Translation
7	<p>כאשר כתוב בספר ישעיהו הנביא וְנִקְרָא [ג]</p> <p>סבבי היער בברזל ולבנון באדיר יִפְלֹא ויצא חוטר מגע ישי</p> <p>ונצר משורשיו יפרה [צמח דוד ונשפט את</p> <p>○ והמיתו נשיא העדה צמח [ה]</p> <p>בנגעי: ׀ ומחוללות וצוה כוהן</p> <p>הלל [י] כְּהִיִּים [ל] []</p>	<p>1 [As it is written in the book of] Isaiah the prophet:</p> <p>‘Cut down shall be 2 [the thickets of the forest with an axe,</p> <p>and Lebanon by a majestic one shall] all.</p> <p>3 And there shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse,</p> <p>4 [and out of his roots a sapling will grow.]</p> <p>5 the Branch of David, and they will enter into judgement with</p> <p>6 [... and the Prince of the Congregation, the Branch of David,] shall put him to death 5 [... by stroke(?)]s and wounds(?).</p> <p>And a priest [of renown(?)] will command</p> <p>6 [... the s]lai[n] of the Kittim[...] ... [...]</p>
8	<p>וברכם בשם אל ישראל וענה []</p> <p>ואמר [לפני כול בני ישראל ברוכים אתם בשם אל עליון []</p> <p>תו וברוכים [] ובר [ד] שם קודשו [ל] [ג] למ עז [ו] וברוכים</p> <p>כול מלאכי קודשו יברך [אתכם אל עליון ויאר פניו אליכם ויפתח []</p> <p>לכם את אוצרו ה [טוב [אש] ר בשמים [ן] הוריד על ארצכם גשמי</p> <p>ברכה []</p> <p>סל [ן] [מטר יו] [ר] [ה] ומלקו [ש] בעתו ולות [ל] כם פרי תנובות דג []</p> <p>יתירו וי [צוה] להוה והארץ [תנו] כב [ל] כם פרי עדנים ואכלתם []</p> <p>יהדשנת [ם ואין משכלה [ב] אן [רצב] ׀ ולוא [מוחלה שדפו וירקון []</p>	<p>1 [... And he shall bless them in the name of the God of Israel,</p> <p>and he shall answer] 2 [and say] before [all the sons of I]srael:</p> <p>[Blessed are you in the name of the Most High God ...]</p> <p>3 [... and ble]ss[ed is his holy name for] e[ve]r and ever. [</p> <p>And blessed are ...</p> <p>and blessed are] 4 [all his holy angels.</p> <p>May] the Mo[st High] God [bless] you.</p> <p>[May he cause his face to shine upon you</p> <p>and may he open] 5 [for you his] good [treasury whi]ch is in heaven</p>

TABLE 44 The possible lexical links between 4Q285 7–8 and M manuscripts (cont.)

Frag. Text		Translation
	9	<i>to [bring down upon your land showers of blessing.]</i>
	10	<i>6 [dew and] rain, the ea[rly ra]in and the late ra[in] in its time, and to give [you the fruit of the produce of corn,] 7 [wine and o]il in plenty.</i>
	11	<i>And [may] the land [prod]uce for [you delightful] fruits.</i>
[12	<i>And may you eat] 8 [and may γ]ou [grow fat].</i>
		<i>And may there be no-one miscarrying [in yo]ur [(and, nor[sickness].</i>
		<i>May [blight and mildew] 9 not be seen in [its] produ[ce].</i>
		<i>May there be n[o] affliction, [or (cause of) stumbling in your congregation,</i>
		<i>for wild beasts have ceased] 10 from the land.</i>
		<i>And may there be no pestil[ence in yo]ur [land].</i>
		<i>For God is wi[th] you</i>
		<i>and the angels of his holiness are standing in your congregation,</i>
		<i>and the name] 11 of his holiness has been proclaimed ov[er you ...] ... [...]</i>
		<i>12 for a [com]munity.</i>
		<i>And in your midst [...]</i>

If one, after all, still makes the suggestion that 4Q285 and the M manuscripts can be textually linked, one cannot point to one single part of the M material that would be related to 4Q285. The words that are common between the two texts are from different parts of 1QM and from sporadic parts of the other M manuscripts.⁵⁴ If one suggests that some part of the M material somehow was a source for the author(s) of 4Q285, it is clear that this source was not meant to be copied or even rewritten but rather to be used as a source for inspiration.

In conclusion, the position of 4Q285 and 11Q14 in the ensemble called the War Texts is vague: from the research-historical perspective, categorizing them in the War Texts is a fact but still, any close textual links between these Sefer ha-Milḥamah manuscripts and other War Text manuscripts are difficult to prove and the possible thematic links are challenging to assess due to the poor condition of 4Q285 and 11Q14. Thus, in order to do justice to Sefer ha-Milḥamah manuscripts it would be best to study them without linking them to the group of War Texts.

54 If the possible links to 1QM are taken under closer scrutiny, it can perhaps be said that there are not so many links to the hymn section in 1QM 10–14 but the two other large main sections, namely that of columns 2–9 and that of columns 15–19, both contain words that occur in 4Q285. Cf. the different situation in the case of 4Q491b (4QM^{a/b}) and 4Q493 (4QM^c), as 4Q285 and 11Q14, 4Q491b and 4Q493 are not close textual parallels to any passages in 1QM or other M manuscripts either. However, they clearly have much more in common with 1QM than 4Q285 does: the lexical links are not just sporadic elements but longer combinations of words. Also, one can demonstrate that in 4Q491b and 4Q493 the links are to certain passages to 1QM, not just to 1QM in general. It is clear that as regards the relation to 1QM, 4Q491b and 4Q493 differ from 4Q285 and 11Q14.

PART 2

Discussion



Naming and Categorizing the War Texts

As was demonstrated in Part 1, several names are used of the manuscripts considered to belong to the Qumran War Texts – and the reasons for naming a manuscript are not always very clear (cf., e.g., the *Sefer ha-Milḥamah* texts discussed in Chapter 7 above). In modern scholarship in general, there have been two ways of labeling the Dead Sea manuscripts. Number codes, like 4Q496, are exact but in everyday scholarly work often awkward and difficult to use in discussions, lacking any clue to the content – and also make the field appear exclusive to a select group of experts. Verbal names, like *Milḥamah*, give a quick impression of the main theme of the text in question – and sometimes even of its material, like 4QpapM^f – and help categorize it somehow. On the other hand, verbal names are inexact and sometimes misleading – for example, in the case of 4QpapM^f, the relationship to other M manuscripts is very difficult to define due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscript.¹ In general, however, these verbal names significantly guide one’s understanding of the manuscripts and their content: Scholars and students that are not specialists in Dead Sea Scrolls studies not only form their first impressions of the manuscripts and compositions according to the labels given to them and the categories they are situated in but may also let these names and categories influence their further study. Qumran scholars are usually aware of the differences between manuscripts but they, too, often rely on editions made by somebody else, especially when they want to extend their discussions to a large amount of material and are thus unable to do all the groundwork themselves. Therefore, after now

1 Tov touches upon this question of the challenges of naming the manuscripts in his brief introductory article “Some Thoughts at the Close of the DJD Publication Project” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. A.D. Roitman, L.H. Schiffman and S. Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 1–13 (12): “A common name for compositions is not always meaningful, since the scrolls may represent different editions of the same or similar compositions. Likewise, the different Jeremiah texts reflect two different editions of the book, a long one (4QJer^{a,c}) and a short one (4QJer^{b,d}), differing greatly in scope and sequence. The various copies of the Community Rule, the Damascus Document and the War Scroll also show evidence of different editorial versions of these compositions. As a result, the naming by modern editors of all the texts of S, D, M, or of the Psalms texts or those of Jeremiah with a single name is convenient, but may be misleading for some. Nevertheless, it is a correct procedure since the books that developed in such a fashion in antiquity may have existed in various forms.”

wading through all the War Text material, it is necessary to take a look at the verbal names given to these texts and critically evaluate whether there are any reasons to correct or change the labels.

1 Ancient Titles

As was discussed in Chapter 1, the modern name of 1QM, *Millhamah* (war), was obviously derived from its ancient title which is partly preserved at the beginning of the Scroll. Ancient titles are one of the most reasonable ways to name the texts: if there is already a title in the manuscript, why should modern scholars name the text somehow differently?² The problem is, however, that there are so few manuscripts that have preserved any ancient title – and as regards these few examples, not all of them have preserved the title in its entirety. For example, in 1QM the word *המלחמה* is clearly visible at the end of the probable title but its beginning is not preserved. Thus, whether one should call the text War Scroll or War Rule (or something else) is not evident. The first name of the scroll was given by Eleazar Sukenik and it did not contain either the word “scroll” or “rule” but was content-oriented The War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness.³ However, in the first English edition of the text, the word “scroll” was added to the beginning of this title.⁴ In the French-speaking world, both the word *règle* and the word *rouleau* have been used.⁵ Despite this ambiguity, the name War Scroll probably is the most widely used of the scholarly names for 1QM. War Rule is also known and used but it has not become as popular as *War Scroll*. The frequency of the title Scroll indicates that 1QM has not been interpreted primarily as a rule text but as something else. Its eschatological character has defined it more than its own, multiple claims to be a rule or a compilation of rules (cf. 1QM 3:13, 4:9, 5:3, 9:10, 16:3 which can all be considered to include ancient subtitles for the text of 1QM). It is categorized together with the eschatological texts and not with rules like 1QS – although in

2 Cf. also George J. Brooke, “From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary: The Problem of Re-Naming an Adopted Manuscript,” in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four*, ed. G.J. Brooke and J. Høgenhaven, STDJ 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 129–50 (136): “It would seem to be self-evident that preference in naming a literary composition should be given to its author, compiler, or even copier.”

3 Cf. Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth I*, 3.

4 Cf. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*.

5 *Règle* is used by, e.g., Carmignac, “Concordance hébraïque,” and *rouleau* by, e.g., van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*.

1QM, the word סרך occurs the most often of all Dead Sea Scrolls (19 times; cf. CD 10 times, 1QS 8 times, 1QSa 4 times).

As regards the other manuscripts discussed in this study, no titles have been preserved – except probably in 4Q493 in which line 1 could be the beginning of a new section. As discussed in Section 2 of Chapter 3 above, the first word in line 1, המלחמה, is not part of the first sentence of the sheet in lines 1–2. Since there is no evidence of a preceding sheet, it cannot be proved to be part of the last sentence of the preceding sheet either. Instead, the sheet number in the top right corner of the sheet supports interpreting המלחמה as the title or subtitle of a new section. What is noteworthy is that in 1QM, the same expression occurs in the title. This similarity between the titles shows that the modern scholarly way of labeling 4Q493 and 1QM with the same label *Milhamah* is a fair decision – despite the many differences in content between these two manuscripts. The title probably demonstrates that both texts deal with the same war although the understanding of the course of the battle and its details are different in them.

2 Modern Titles

For modern scholars, the similarity in content to the already known manuscripts has been a central argument in labeling the texts. In the case of the War Texts, Baillet decided that six Cave 4 manuscripts (4Q491–496) were representatives of the work that was also preserved in 1QM – and thus he marked them with the sign M and a superscript letter at the end of the code (M^a, M^b, M^c, M^d, M^e, M^{pap}^f) in order to distinguish the manuscripts.⁶ In the research history of the War Texts, this labeling was crucial; hardly anyone has since then denied that these manuscripts are somehow related. However, the material Baillet had could not be fitted in its entirety into the category of M texts, and Baillet created another label for the very fragmentary manuscript 4Q497, the text of which sometimes seemed to overlap with the text of 1QM. Being uncertain of its reading, Baillet cautiously named this manuscript as *Texte ayant*

6 Cf. also the case of the S texts: Jokiranta notes that *Serekh ha-yahad* (S) is not only an ancient expression but also a modern construct by which present-day scholars label manuscripts for editing and studying. Thus, the term *serekh ha-yahad* is used in at least in three different senses, referring to: 1) a genitive construct structure in texts, 2) the name of a literary work, and 3) the name of a particular type of rule literature. Cf. Jokiranta, “What is ‘Serekh ha-Yahad (S)’?” 612. The case is similar to that of the term *milhamah*; it can refer to: 1) a term used in texts (also as a title), 2) a name of a literary work (the composition *War Scroll*), and the name of a particular type of literature (War Texts, M texts).

quelque rapport avec la Règle de la guerre (?). In English-speaking research, the text came to be known as 4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A. This discrimination between a copy of the composition – signed with a superscript letter – and a version or composition that is very similar but in some way different – signed with a capital letter – is also used elsewhere, and in some cases, the superscript letters have been changed to capital letters as the study has progressed. For example, the Commentaries on Hosea were formerly considered to represent one composition and were thus known as 4QpHos^a and 4QpHos^b, but as they are currently understood to actually represent two different compositions, the titles 4QpHos A and B are now considered better descriptions of the content and relationship between the texts.⁷

In addition to naming the manuscripts, Baillet also gave short descriptions of passages within a manuscript: for example, fragments 1–3 of 4Q491 were called *Ensemble de la Règle* and fragments 8–10 column 1 of 4Q491 included *Action de grâces récitée par les troupes* and *Retour au camp*. The most influential of these descriptions was his calling the text in 4Q491 fragment 11 column 1 *Cantique de Michel et cantique des justes*. Later, this hymn was observed to be preserved in altogether four manuscripts 4Q491, 4Q427, 1QH^a and 4Q471b + 4Q431, and the identity of its speaker became a subject of discussion and the connection between the hymn and the archangel Michael was called into question.⁸ Esther Eshel named the text Self-Glorification Hymn⁹ which then became a generally accepted label. What should be noted is that as a separately named part of the text, Self-Glorification Hymn is quite a rare case among the Dead Sea Scrolls: it is one of those rare hymns that was not known anywhere else before the Qumran discoveries and was given its own name. Other examples of these kinds of hymns are, among others, Hymn to the Creator (see 11QPs^a 26) and Plea for Deliverance (see 11QPs^a 19). However, these hymns are not known outside the Psalm scrolls so in that sense they are not similar to the Self-Glorification Hymn. In addition, there are other hymns that have been used in many different contexts, for example, Psalm 18 (see the Masoretic Psalter, 2 Samuel, 4Q381) and Psalm 122 (Masoretic Psalter and 4QApocryphon of Joshua) which demonstrates, as does the Self-Glorification Hymn, that many hymns were treated as independent pieces that were easy to re-interpret and add to different contexts. However, these examples were known before

7 Cf. Roman Vielhauer, “Reading Hosea At Qumran,” in *The Mermaid and the Partridge*, 91–108 (91).

8 First by Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a,” 185–7. Cf. also Section 1.5 of Chapter 2.

9 Eshel, “4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 175–203. See also Eshel, “Self-Glorification Hymn,” 1924–6.

the Qumran discoveries so there was no need to name them (again) – as was the case with the Self-Glorification Hymn. Thus, although Self-Glorification Hymn is not in any sense a unique case among the Dead Sea Scrolls, as a separately named hymn not known before it is a rare case and brings a significant additional point to the discussion of naming and giving labels to the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁰

Since Baillet's work, three more manuscripts have been considered to belong to the category of the War Texts. 4Q471 was published in DJD 36 (2000) by Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel and they named the text 4QWar Scroll-like Text B. However, in the introductory part of their edition, Eshel and Eshel do not refer to 4Q497, the manuscript earlier named War Scroll-like Text, but to War Scroll the "version" of which the text in question is considered to be. They clearly state that fragment 1 of this manuscript is "part of a version of the War Scroll which is shorter and probably earlier than 1QM 2 or 4QM^d" (i.e., the manuscripts the texts of which seem to overlap with the text of 4Q471 fragment 1). The probable reason for not naming the text as War Scroll or M is that its fragments 2 and 3 "have no exact parallel with any specific part of the War Scroll."¹¹ Still, the name clearly reflects some kind of relationship between 4Q471 and 1QM. In the same DJD volume (36), Sefer ha-Milhamah manuscripts 4Q285 and 11Q14 were also named according to the similarities that the editors Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes saw between these manuscripts and 1QM (that is why Milhamah) and on the other hand, on the basis of the differences between these two texts (that is why Sefer).¹² However, just by observing the text of these manuscripts, the name Sefer ha-Milhamah can be considered to be a slightly surprising choice since neither the word ספר nor the

10 Note that penal codes, for example, can also be seen as text units that have been preserved in two compositions and in several D and S manuscripts; on the penal code, see, e.g., Sarianna Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 33–35, and Charlotte Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 41. However, "penal code" is understood to be a widely known text type or even genre: Metso speaks about penal codes in the plural and notes that the penal codes in S and D "bear similarities with the penal codes of ancient Graeco-Roman voluntary associations" (see Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 33). Thus, "penal code" is not interpreted to be an independent literary work, like the Self-Glorification Hymn that has not been seen as part of the composition it is preserved in but more as a separate unity.

11 Eshel and Eshel DJD 36:439.

12 See Alexander and Vermes, "4QSefer ha-Milhamah," 231, and note also Najman and Tigchelaar, "A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature," 312. As has been shown in Chapter 7 of Part 1, none of the fragments of 4Q285/11Q14 bear a clear textual parallel to any of the known M texts and the lexical links between 4Q285/11Q14 and 1QM are scattered and sporadic.

word מלחמה occur in the manuscripts so named (4Q285, 11Q14). All in all, the purpose of the categories War Scroll-like Text and Sefer ha-Milhamah texts in DJD 36 remains ambiguous: one can ask, for example, that if the purpose of the label War Scroll-like Text was to indicate vague lexical links to 1QM (as Baillet meant), what would prevent giving this label to Sefer ha-Milhamah texts as well – and/or even to 4Q491b and 4Q493 the texts of which do not overlap with 1QM although being quite close to it. What is also noteworthy is that although 4QM manuscripts are titled as M manuscripts, scholars may characterize them as “recensions” or “traditions” different from 1QM – and the same may be done with War Scroll-like Texts.¹³

3 Further Reflection

Concerning the naming of the War Texts, at least three conclusions can be drawn: First, the modern naming of the War Texts is largely based on the best preserved and the first-found manuscript 1QM which is used as a model to which the more fragmentary manuscripts are compared. The naming seems to be guided by a suggestion that there was one well-known and recognized composition which probably was represented by different manuscripts.¹⁴ 1QM has been so predominant that a large group of Cave 4 manuscripts were named on the basis of their suggested relation to it – although the names seem not to describe these relations very coherently. A similar phenomenon can also be seen in the case of the S texts in which ten Cave 4 manuscripts and one manuscript from Cave 5 were named after the supposed similarity with 1QSerekh ha-Yahad.¹⁵ In addition, the dominant position of 1QM reflects the more general assumptions behind the early naming and categorizing of the Dead Sea Scrolls. As Hindy Najman and Eibert Tigchelaar note, when the first Dead Sea

¹³ Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 41.

¹⁴ Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 322, note that in the history of the nomenclature in the DJD series, the question of whether the names of the manuscripts refer to compositions or manuscripts is to be reflected. In the case of the War Texts, the names seem to refer to the composition (or the relation to a suggested composition) rather than manuscripts. However, the case of S demonstrates that choosing one manuscript as a model for naming the others is not unproblematic: for example, 1QSa and 1Qsb are usually not seen as a part of the model of S although they probably belong to the same manuscript as 1QS. Cf. Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 53.

¹⁵ In addition, manuscript 5Q13 was labeled as 5QCiting the Community Rule/5Q(Sectarian) Rule. However, later on, the labeling also raised some critical comments: see, e.g., Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 19–22; Jokiranta, “What is ‘Serekh ha-Yahad (S)’?”,” 623–4.

Scrolls were found and named, scholars had in mind “a pre-existing canon of fixed and authentically ascribed texts.” Scrolls were named according to their relation to this construct so that the texts that were not identified as directly belonging to it were categorized as (apocryphal) versions of known texts or commentaries to them.¹⁶ 1QM was not a part of this suggested canon so it was named according to its content – but the naming of the War Texts found after 1QM seems to go along with the canon-related principles: they were named according to the first-discovered, best-preserved and, thus, established text. However, despite their differences in relation to 1QM, many of the manuscripts were labeled as M and not as pseudo-M or apocryphal M which was the case with many manuscripts resembling the texts belonging to the canon.¹⁷ In general, in the field of Qumran studies, scholars have started to understand textual multiformity – rather than fixity – to be representative of late Second Temple times and the ideas of a fixed text and a locked canon in this period to be quite problematic, even incorrect.¹⁸ Thus, “pseudo,” “apocryphal” and even “rewritten” in the names of the Dead Sea Scrolls have become questionable. In light of all this, the name *Milḥamah* seems suitably flexible and as such, it fits well with the idea of the non-stabilized text – although its relation to the names War Scroll-like Text and *Sefer ha-Milḥamah* is not clear.

Second, the amount of shared textual material and the amount of different textual material seem to have been the most significant criteria in labeling

16 Cf. Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 324.

17 Some of the differences between a “text” and pseudo-“text” or apocryphal “text” are more considerable than those between 1QM and the other M manuscripts. Still, it is relevant to note that there seem to be some differences in naming “canonical” texts and the other Dead Sea Scrolls texts.

18 Cf. Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 324. Najman and Tigchelaar also note that there have been three main transformations of the field since the beginning of naming the manuscripts in the scope of the DJD series: 1) becoming completely aware of the fact that the scrolls were produced before the canonization of the Hebrew Bible, 2) development in the genre theory and 3) the already-mentioned understanding of the textual pluriformity of the time. These should be taken into account when reviewing the nomenclature; cf. Najman and Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature,” 307. Cf., however, Justnes’ observation that sometimes, in order to discuss texts, we might need to use different labels side by side. As an example, he gives the term “biblical” which is also strongly criticized. Justnes argues that “[h]owever in order to have a discussion about the Qumran texts that make up the Hebrew Bible today, regardless of perspectives, it is extremely difficult to avoid using words like ‘biblical’ and ‘Bible.’ We need them simply in order to navigate the material. Still, it is a description from the outside.... The same goes for labels like Apocrypha/‘apocryphal’ and Pseudepigrapha/‘pseudepigraphical.’” Cf. Justnes, “On Being a ‘Librarian,’” 20.

the manuscripts as M texts or something else:¹⁹ for example, since 4Q471 and 4Q285 share some textual elements with 1QM but also contain a significant amount of text that is not parallel to 1QM, they are not named as M texts. The textual similarity is still brought out in the names like War Scroll-like Text and Sefer ha-Milhamah. This kind of focusing on the number of textual similarities and differences often is a reasonable way to study and group the texts but it is not the only one.²⁰ Other options would be to form categories according to, for instance, material issues (e.g., the opisthographs as a category), scribal practices (e.g., texts with similar scribal marks or with similar scripts), purpose of use (e.g., tefillin as a category), dates of the manuscripts (e.g., Hasmonean/Herodian texts) and *Sitz im Leben* of the manuscripts. Already now, names and codes given to texts actually offer diverse information: if the material of the scroll is papyrus, it is revealed in its code (e.g., 4QpapS^a) and similarly, if the language of the scroll is Aramaic or if the text is written in a cryptic script, it is revealed in the code (e.g., 1QapGen ar; 4Qpap cryptA Serekh ha-‘Edah^a). In both cases, the idea is that an abnormal characteristic of the scroll is brought out: usually, one can presuppose that a Qumran manuscript is written in Hebrew and on skin. As regards the War Texts, the material of the scroll is something that was found to be necessary to be mentioned in the codes 4QpapM^f (4Q496) and 4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A (4Q497). However, it would be helpful to ponder what information is necessary to be given in the names and the codes. In the case of War Texts, both papyrus manuscripts are also opisthographs which might be a more significant fact than their physical material: when inscribed as an opisthographic manuscript, a text already has one existing literary context that was undeniably noticed by the ancient readers. Therefore, a code like

19 The number of common features is also something that has been used to divide texts into different genre categories. According to John J. Collins, “the first step in any analysis of a genre is to delimit the relevant corpus, and in order to do that we cannot avoid making a list of features by which the corpus is defined,” see Collins, “Epilogue: Genre Analysis and the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *DSD* 17 (2010): 418–30 (419–20). Obviously, something similar happens when one tries to link the texts under one and the same label or name. Collins continues, “the fact that a group of texts have random features in common may have no great significance.” He requires researchers to “focus on features that have structural importance in the texts in question, and also features that are distinctive to these compositions” (see Collins, “Epilogue,” 420). These kinds of comments are also relevant in the discussion on naming.

20 Considering the amount of textual similarity between the manuscripts as a criterion for labeling them in a similar way, some critical questions have been posed. For example, Jokiranta and Vanonen ask what amount of similar material is sufficient and what types of textual parallels are “the critical elements.” Cf. Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 51.

4QopM^f would probably be more informative than the code 4QpapM^f; or perhaps a code like 4Qpap^oM^f in order to indicate both phenomena.

Third, the order of the discoveries and their publication, the early grouping of the texts, and the progress of the study in general have all had their impacts on naming the texts. In the case of War Texts, it should be noted that there have been several different editors working with these manuscripts and labeling them: Sukenik and Yadin started with 1QM in the 1940s, Baillet worked (after the renunciation by Hunzinger) with the more fragmentary texts in the 1980s, van der Woude, Tigchelaar and García Martínez published the edition of 11Q14 in 1998, and Eshel and Eshel (4Q471) and Alexander and Vermes (4Q285) did not finish their editions until 2000. If one researcher were tasked to name the War Texts now, they would be able to create more defined principles on naming and compare different groups of texts, aiming to follow the same principles within the different groups. In the very beginning, scholars could not know how many scrolls were to be found in the Qumran area or how the study would progress.²¹ In hindsight, it is easy to make critical observations. However, knowing all this should not prevent present scholars from pondering new options for considering names and labels. It is noteworthy that although renaming the texts causes practical difficulties,²² correcting and changing names is not completely unheard of. For example, manuscript 4Q158 was first named “Biblical Paraphrase” by John Allegro but later, Emanuel Tov and Sidney White published manuscripts considered to belong to the same composition and started to call this composition “Reworked Pentateuch.”²³ Actually, renaming has taken place within the category of the War Texts: as noted in Chapter 7, since 11Q14 included blessings and the parallelism between it and 4Q285 was not yet known, the text was first named 11QBerakhot.²⁴

On the basis of the progress of the study in the field, it would be possible to create increasingly strict categories by renaming the texts. For example, it can be stated that manuscript 4Q492 follows quite closely the text that is also known in 1QM whereas in manuscript 4Q493, the textual connections to 1QM are vaguer, and thus, they should perhaps be named differently. However, bearing in mind the textual multiformity characterizing the period, there is

21 John J. Collins notes that genre classifications in Qumran studies have been “largely intuitive” (he comments especially on Armin Lange and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert’s “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre” in DJD 39; see Collins, “Epilogue,” 418). This is also somewhat true of naming and designating the texts.

22 This is noted by Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 51.

23 Cf. Tov (DJD 39:11–12), who also gives some other examples. On renaming compositions/manuscripts see also Brooke, “From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary,” 129–50.

24 Van der Woude, Tigchelaar and García Martínez, “11QSefer ha-Milhamah,” 243.

no clear need to separate these M texts from each other on the level of naming; instead, it is reasonable to use rather looser than stricter categories – and not least in order to give the new scholarly generations freedom to reinterpret the texts. As has been demonstrated in this study, there are no very airtight arguments for making a distinction between M texts and War Scroll-like texts. For example, in the case of 4Q497, naming the text as War Scroll-like can be argued by saying that there is not enough text preserved to confirm the manuscript's belonging to the M texts. However, the same is true vice versa: it can be argued that there is not enough text left to prove that the text should not belong to the M category. Now, the label "War Scroll-like" allows the creation of a link between 4Q497 and 1QM and also between 4Q497 and 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B), neither of which is more justified than linking 4Q497 with 4QM texts. Actually, linking it with 4Q496, for instance, is more reasonable since both texts are inscribed on opisthographic manuscripts also preserving some liturgical texts. Thus, labeling 4Q497 with M and understanding M as a loose category term – which fits with the present scholarly understanding that in the late Second Temple period, textual multiformity was more distinctive than textual fixity – would do more justice to the material. Conversely, naming Sefer ha-Milḥamah texts as M texts is not as defensible and the reason for this is what follows: Within M manuscripts, the close textual parallelisms are always between 1QM and some other M text. There are no close parallelisms between any two 4QM manuscripts preserved. By contrast, 4Q285 and 11Q14 are closely parallel to each other and the text that forms the parallelism is not known in M texts. In addition, as was demonstrated in Chapter 7, the textual links between these Sefer ha-Milḥamah manuscripts and 1QM or other M texts are rather weak (although still detectable). Therefore, it is reasonable that they should have their own name. As already noted, Sefer ha-Milḥamah is somewhat problematic since neither *sefer* nor *milḥamah* occurs in the preserved texts. In order to better describe the preserved text and at the same time, to keep the possible link to the milḥamah tradition, something like "M-related blessings" might come into consideration.

Alternative options to the siglum M are to call the manuscripts "1QM-like manuscript" or "M-like manuscript." When the siglum M is used, it leads one to think that a manuscript labeled with M can be compared with and related to any other M text while, as a matter of fact, for Baillet the point of reference was always 1QM. In this sense, "1QM-like manuscript" would be better than M manuscript. The problem with this label would be that it might lead non-expert scholars to think of other War Texts as copies of 1QM, which they probably are not. The other option would be to call the texts "M-like manuscripts." M (as well as S) does not refer to any particular known manuscript

but is an abstract category which on the one hand is defined by similarity but on the other hand is not strictly restricted with respect to difference. As such, it may actually be close to the ancient understanding: rather than thinking in terms of certain wordings and textual parallels, the ancients may have thought of thematic entities, for example, the rules for conducting the war, which then formed loose categories. This kind of thinking is related to the prototype theory presented in the discussion on genre theory.²⁵ The problem with the label “M-like” may be that while allowing much difference between the manuscripts, it makes it possible to label a manuscript with several loose designations. For example, 4Q285 and 11Q14 could be categorized on the one hand as “M-like” but on the other hand, for example, as “Berakhot-like.” Perhaps in the future, when scholars probably read fewer and fewer hardcopy books and use more and more electronic tools, double or even triple naming of manuscripts is not an impossible idea. On the Internet, different kinds of tags already guide our reading even more than titles given to the sites and their features. The tag “M-like” could well be given to all the texts that are now understood to belong to the War Texts just for research-historical reasons. However, in order to do justice to the Sefer ha-Milḥamah texts, for instance, they would also need other tags.²⁶

25 Cf. *DSD* 17 (2010), issue 3.

26 On the concepts “1QM-like manuscript” and “M-like manuscript,” see Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 53.

Transmitting the Subgenres in the M Tradition

While in the analysis part the manuscripts were analyzed one by one, highlighting them as they are and comparing them mainly to the closest parallel texts that could be found, it is now time to scrutinize the material as a whole. The analysis part already demonstrated that there are some subgenres that can be found in several manuscripts:¹ most of the text preserved in M manuscripts consists of instructive sections in which the progress of the war is described by giving instructions concerning the battle and how to conduct it and hymnic sections, especially the encouragement speeches.² These subgenres are used repeatedly, either in a very similar form or with significant reworking, and they open a window on the transmission of the M tradition. The task of this chapter is to analyze these subgenres, in what forms they are transmitted and how unestablished or stabilized they were, and to point out some cases in which the direction of the literary dependence can be demonstrated.

-
- 1 While the larger genre can be, for example, “war(-related) text” or “*serekh* text,” the term subgenre – as the concept is used in this chapter – refers to smaller parts of the texts that represent these larger genres. For example, in the texts that are categorized as war-related, a subgenre of encouragement speech can be distinguished. When using the term genre, one must note that it is not unambiguous: scholars have identified several different approaches to understanding it: see the recent discussion in, e.g., vol. 17/3 of *Dead Sea Discoveries* (2010). The term “subgenre” can involve similar definition problems as well. Here, the term is understood as a tool that helps scrutinize the content of the manuscripts and make comparisons, not as a definition of text that is set in stone. As regards genres and subgenres in general, I do not advocate strict definitions but my understanding of them is closer to the concept “family resemblance,” which assumes genealogical similarities within a family but also allows differences so that a family may include exemplars that have little to do with each other. Although I am aware of the criticism of this understanding (cf., e.g., Collins, “Epilogue,” 421–422), at least in the case of the War Texts, it has proven to be more useful to understand genres/subgenres/families as not forming strict categories but rather loose groups that can overlap each other as well.
 - 2 This division of the text into two subgenres – instructions and hymns/speeches – is rough. It can be asked whether hymns and encouragement speeches can be categorized as a single subgenre since there are clear differences between them: for example, hymns are addressed to God whereas speeches are addressed to troops. However, it is my aim here to avoid overly detailed categories and make just rough divisions that help to observe the transmission process of the text. As is demonstrated below in this chapter, the battle instructions were carefully transmitted whereas the poetic parts offered a place for literary creativity and provided an opportunity to add new elements to the text.

In this chapter, the discussion is restricted to considering M manuscripts only; as was demonstrated in the analysis part above, the War Scroll-like manuscripts are too poorly preserved to provide any material for this collective scrutiny and Sefer ha-Milhamah manuscripts are probably better understood when studied as their own group. In addition to 4QM manuscripts, 1QM is now taken along as a whole and some passages that have thus far been mentioned only in passing or that have not necessarily been mentioned at all are analyzed.

1 Battle Instructions³

Among the M manuscripts, there are four separate instructive sections related to the progress of the war. Three of them were already closely analyzed in Part 1: the first one in 4Q491a/1QM 16–17 (for close textual parallels, see Section 1.3 of Chapter 2),⁴ the second one in 4Q491b (see Section 1.1 of Chapter 3), and the third one in 4Q493 (see Section 2 of Chapter 3). In addition to these, 1QM 7–9 reflects the progress of the war. Although these passages are all more or less different from each other, they share enough elements to be categorized under a common subgenre, battle instructions. One of these common elements is that in all four cases, the genre of the larger textual entity to which the passage belongs is rule. In 1QM, the battle instructions in columns 7–9 belong to the long rule for arranging the divisions (5:3–9:9) but in addition, the rule is mentioned in lines 7:17 and 8:14 where it is emphasized that both the battle lines (7:17) and the priest (8:14) shall act according to “this rule” (הסרך הזה).⁵ As regards the battle instructions in 1QM 16–17, they belong to the final rule of the Scroll and the whole section of the battle instructions begins with the words *את כול הסרך הזה יעשו* (cf. 16:3). In the parallel text in 4Q491a, these words are not preserved but since the texts follow each other closely in other respects, it is quite safe to reconstruct these words at the beginning of fragment 11 ii. In 4Q491b, the battle instructions belong to the “rule to be observed in their

3 In many studies, this subgenre (although not necessarily understood as subgenre) is named “battle narratives” (cf., e.g., Davies, *1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran*, 74; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 312). However, the passages in question do not primarily tell stories of the battle but rather, at least in the context of 1QM 7–9, give instructions on how to act in the battle situation. Although one can say that the instructions are given in narrative form, the term “narrative” is not specific enough and therefore subject to misinterpretation. The text can be more narrowly characterized as “battle instructions.”

4 Since these two passages are closely parallel, the battle instructions preserved in them is below, for simplicity, sometimes referred to by mentioning only 1QM lines.

5 Note, however, that 1QM 7:17 is a fragmentary line and of the possible word combination (כול מערבה ומערבה יצאו ככול הסרך) only the letters *הס* are preserved there (הסרך הזה).

encampments” (הסרך בהנותמה) (see fragments 1–3 line 6 and also line 19). In 4Q493, no certain rule is named but it is said that the Levites shall be signaling at the proper time “according to this entire rule” (ככול הסרך הזה) (cf. line 9).

Other elements common to all battle instructions are that those who participate in the war are skirmishers (אנשי הבינים), priests (כוהנים) and Levites (לויים), and that the battle will be conducted by blowing the trumpets (חצוצרות). The battle lines (מערכות) are also mentioned in all instructions. In addition to these common features, there are elements that join two or more instructive sections as well as elements that appear differently in different texts. In Table 45, these elements are itemized and compared.⁶

1.1 *Weapons and Trumpets*

The weapons for the war vary from one instructive section to another – as is demonstrated in the table. In the instructions preserved in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a, the arms are plainly “weapons of war” (כלי מלחמה). Probably these weapons are some kind of thrown objects since it is stated that before raising their hands to these weapons, the soldiers take place “within throwing range” of the battle line of the enemy, in this case, the Kittim (see 1QM 16:6; 17:12). However, in the encouragement speech which is embedded in the middle of the instructions, it is said that weapons of war are sharpened (שנן) and that they will not become blunt (כהה) which seems to refer to a weapon like a sword or javelin. In 1QM 7–9, weapons are described in a much more detailed way:⁷ in these columns, shields (מגן; 7:15), sling(men) (קלע; 8:1) and javelins (זרק; 8:11) are mentioned and in addition to the skirmishers, the cavalry (רכב; see, e.g., 9:6) will participate in the war. In 4Q493 line 5, two peculiar words probably referring to weapons occur: חרף is often translated as “catapult” and מאבן as “ballista.” As was noted in Section 2 of Chapter 3, these fit into the two main classifications of Greco-Roman artillery: ballistas were used for throwing stones and catapults for shooting arrows.⁸ If חרף and מאבן are rightly interpreted, it can be noted that throwing and shooting are present both in 4Q493 and 1QM 7–9 – and throwing also in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a where the “throwing range” (כדי הטל ירימו) of the line of the Kittim is mentioned (see 16:6, 17:12). In contrast, in 4Q491b no weapons are described, at least in the preserved parts of the text, but what is important in these battle instructions is setting up an ambush (אורב; see fragments 1–3, lines 12–13). An ambush is mentioned in passing in 1QM 9:17

6 When reading the table, one must again take the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts into account: the fact that something is not preserved in the text of a manuscript does not automatically mean that it could not have once been there. However, the fragmentary nature of the texts must not hinder all comparison – it just has to be borne in mind.

7 Although weapons of war are once mentioned, see 8:8.

8 See Chapter 3 and Gmirkin, “The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered,” 122 n. 168.

TABLE 45 Battle instructions in the M manuscripts

	Weapons	Gates of the war	Trumpets	Encouraging	Enemies	Losses	Purity	Priests' war garments	Laymen directing the war
1QM 7-9	shields, slings, javelins (7:15; 8:1; 8:11)	the middle gate (7:9), the first gate (7:17), skirmishers go through the gates (7:17; 8:4)	summoning, memorial, alarm, pursuit, gathering, withdrawal, slain	the first priest encourages (7:12)	enemy (7:9; 8:10-13; 9:2-6); nations of vanity (9:9)	slain of the enemy (9:7-8)	priests shall not come to the midst of the slain so that they would not become defiled in the unclean blood; priests shall not profane their office with the blood of the nations of vanity (9:7-8)	mentioned in line 7:10-11	people with ram's horns blow together with the Levites (8:9-10)
1QM 16-17 / 4Q491a	weapons of war (16:6-7; 17:12)	are opened at the beginning of the war (16:4)	memorial, slaying, summoning	the chief priest encourages (16:13-15), encouragement speech embedded (16:15-17:9)	Kittim (16:3, etc.)	slain of the Kittim (16:8), slain of the skirmishers (16:11)	-	-	people with ram's horns (16:7-8)

TABLE 45 Battle instructions in the M manuscripts (*cont.*)

	Weapons	Gates of the war	Trumpets	Encouraging	Enemies	Losses	Purity	Priests' war garments	Laymen directing the war
4Q491b	-	-	alarm	- (but the battle instructions are perhaps preceded by an encouragement speech/hymn; 1-3:1-5)	enemy (1-3:8?, 14?)	slain of guiltiness (1-3:13)	purity of the war camp (1-3:6-8); purity of the battle field (1-3:10)	mentioned in line 1-3:18	camp commanders (1-3:9)?
4Q493	catapult and ballista (line 5)	priests open the gates for the skirmishers (line 2-3); withdrawal to enter the gates (lines 8-9)	memorial, battle, withdrawal, alarm, Sabbaths	-	Gentiles (line 4) 4)	slain (line 4)	priests shall not profane their office (line 5)	-	-

(in the rule for changing the order) but in the battle instructions discussed above, it is an unknown theme. If we were to make a hypothesis on the basis of weapon instructions only, it seems that of those four passages presented in the table above, 1QM 7–9 is the one which combines the information known from 4Q493 (throwing and shooting) and 1QM 16–17/4Q491a (throwing, sharp weapons). It also gives names for the arms that in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a are introduced just as “weapons of the war.”

When the gates (שער) of the war are taken into the discussion one can see that they too are mentioned in all battle instructions except 4Q491b which strengthens the supposition that the idea of the battle was slightly different there. According to every other instruction section, the battle starts with opening the gates.⁹ 1QM 7–9 pays the most attention to these gates: it identifies which gates are in question (middle, first) and lets the reader understand that they played some part in different phases of the war. Thus, the case is similar to that with the weapons: in 1QM 7–9, the description seems to be the most inclusive and sophisticated.

One element that is integral to every battle instruction section but is different in all of them is the description of the trumpets. Trumpets of alarm (חצוצרות התרועה) occur in all passages except the one preserved in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a– but there, too, the word תרועה occurs together with the idea of blowing the trumpets (cf., e.g., 1QM 16:5, 6, 9; 17:11, 14). Thus, in all battle instructions, the task of the trumpets is considered to be signaling or alerting the soldiers. This is not surprising since the trumpets of alarm are known in Numbers (31:6; see also 2 Chron 13:12), which probably has influenced the description of trumpets in M manuscripts.¹⁰ In 4Q491b, at least in the text that has been preserved for us, the trumpets are used *only* for the purpose of alarm; the signals are not itemized and the trumpets are not divided into different groups and named as they are in the other battle instructions. It is just stated that the trumpets of alarm are used in order to give signals. This may have to do with the fact that the main tactic for the battle in 4Q491b is to lay an ambush – continuous trumpet sounds do not fit in with the idea of stalking and therefore the instructions related to the trumpets are very simple.

The second simplest system of trumpets is introduced in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a. There, blowing the trumpets of memorial (חצוצרות הזכרון) starts the battle

9 In the Hebrew Bible, the word שער often denotes to the gate of the city, the gate of the tabernacle or the gate of the camp. When connected with the war, the word probably refers to the border of the area in which the war is waged.

10 Cf., e.g., Jean Carmignac, “Les citations de l’Ancien Testament dans ‘La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contra les Fils de Ténèbres’” in *RB* 63 (1956): 234–60 (245). Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 24, 47; Wenthe, “The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM,” e.g., 290–91, 295, 311.

(1QM 16:3–4), and the soldiers go to the war in relays one troop after another. When it is time to change the relay, the trumpets for summoning (חצוצרות המקרא) send new troops to the battlefield and the signal for withdrawal (שוב) calls back those who have done their share (1QM 16:12–13). Connecting trumpets with summoning and remembering are both known in Numbers (see Num 10:2, 9–19). In the actual battle in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a, the only trumpets that are named are the trumpets of the slain (חצוצרות החללים; 1QM 16:7, 17:12–13), but alarms of different kinds and of different length that are sounded by the trumpets are described in detail (1QM 16:5–9; 17:10–15).

In 4Q493, too, the trumpets of memorial are used to open the battle (line 2) and the trumpets of withdrawal (חצוצרות המשוב) call the troops back (line 8). Between the beginning and the withdrawal, a group of trumpets that is unique in M texts is mentioned in line 3, namely, the trumpets of battle (חצוצרות המלחמה). In the second phase of the war, the trumpets of alarm (line 11) are brought out and at the end, another unique group of trumpets, the trumpets of Sabbaths (חצוצרות השבתות) is mentioned (line 13). As was noted in Section 2 of Chapter 3, the trumpets of the slain and the trumpets for summoning have often been reconstructed in the text of 4Q493 (lines 7, 10)¹¹ but it is equally possible that there are no other trumpets than those preserved; Section 2 introduced one model according to which the trumpets of memorial (line 2) start the war, the trumpets of battle (line 4) give a sign to advance, the trumpets of alarm (line 7; reconstructed) are used to warn the soldiers and finally, the trumpets of withdrawal (line 8) call soldiers back. In the second phase, the trumpets of battle (line 10; reconstructed) again give the sign to advance and with the trumpets of alarm (line 11), the soldiers are warned. Other models of the trumpet system could also be presented but the speculation in Section 2 demonstrates that there is no compelling need to include all the trumpets known elsewhere in this passage. Instead, it may be more probable that the system was relatively simple.

In 1QM 7–9, the instructions concerning the trumpets recall much of those in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a. 1QM lines 8:8b–13a include a description very similar to that in 1QM 16:5b–9: the priests blow on the six trumpets of the slain a shrill staccato sound, the Levites and the people with trumpets blow a great sound, the soldiers bring down the slain, and the sound of the horns cease but the buglers keep blowing the trumpets. Both in 1QM 7–9 and in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a, a phase of the war ends with a signal for withdrawal (8:13b, 16:13). The trumpets of summoning, instead, have in 1QM 7–9 a more focal position than they do in 1QM 16–17. In 1QM 7–9, they seem to start several different phases of the war

11 See Section 2 of Chapter 3 and, e.g., Baillet, DJD 7:50.

(see 7:15, 8:3, 9:3). The trumpets of pursuit (9:6) are put into operation when the cavalry comes to the battlefield and they are also mentioned in the small trumpet list at the beginning of the battle instructions in line 7:13. The trumpets of pursuit, like the trumpets of gathering which are also part of the list, do not occur in other battle instructions but are not unique either: in the larger trumpet lists in 1QM 3, both of these groups are mentioned.¹²

All in all, it seems that as regards the trumpets, the battle instructions in 1QM columns 7–9 combine elements from columns 16–17 and column 3 and in this way, builds a more coherent unity of the whole text in the Scroll. The trumpets of pursuit, the trumpets of gathering and the cavalry are taken from the preceding columns and the model of the battle directed with the trumpets of remembrance, summoning, the slain, and withdrawal is derived from the end part of the scroll. In addition, the trumpet lists in 1QM 3 probably have their own reworking process behind them: As regards the inscriptions in 1QM 3:2–11, most of them consist of 1–4 words and only four of 13 inscriptions are longer. It is probable that the longer inscriptions include some explanation: there can be distinguished the name of the trumpet (2–3 words) and its explanation which was possibly added later (see 3:5–6, 3:6, 3:8, 3:8–9). What may be noteworthy as well is that all the explanations include the idea of strong contraposition – while none of the actual inscriptions mentions any enemies at all. Thus, it seems that the list of the trumpets was reworked at some stage.¹³

This kind of active literary work behind the trumpet lists probably indicates that when compiling 1QM, the compiler did not *primarily* have in mind any concrete battlefield. Instead, for him, it was important to collect the War Text material together and to work with it. What had some power here and now was the text – and working with the text was something that produced sense

12 There is a long list of trumpets in 1QM 2:16–3:11. The conspicuous element of this list is the inscriptions that are prescribed for every group of trumpets in lines 3:2b–11. The trumpet groups listed there are the trumpets for every group of trumpets in the congregation, the trumpets for summoning the commanders, the trumpets of enrollment, the trumpets of the men of renown, the trumpets of the camps, the trumpets for breaking them, the trumpets of the battle formations, the trumpets for summoning the skirmishers, the trumpets of the slain, the trumpets of the ambush, the trumpets of the pursuit, the trumpets of withdrawal, and the trumpets of the way of withdrawal. Before this list, there is still another list (in lines 1–2a) in which the preserved trumpets are the trumpets for summoning them, the trumpets of alarms of the slain, the trumpets of ambush, the trumpets of pursuit, and the trumpets of gathering. Of the trumpets of these two lists, only some are known in the later columns.

13 See also Vanonen, “Vastakkainasettelun aika,” 261–64.

of security. Especially the text in 1QM columns 3–4 is mainly “text about text”¹⁴ and the inscribing appears to be as important a part of the war as the battle itself. Simon Schama and George Brooke have also paid special attention to the lists of equipment and the detailed instructions for inscriptions.¹⁵ Brooke argues, after quoting Schama, that the “text might have been perceived by its authors as a forceful speech act which ... was at least able to create a sense of anticipated victory involving God and his angels.... The enemy will be ... texted into defeat.” In 1QM, long lists with inscriptions are in a pronounced position in comparison to other M manuscripts, and this may indicate that “texting into defeat” became especially important in 1QM. At the same time, it is probable that when compiling 1QM, the actual war was as Brooke suggests; the idea of the power of writing may also have something to do with the multiple M manuscripts. According to him, manuscripts functioned as weapons for marginalized people and the creation of new manuscripts is “a security system, a set of reassurances that all will be well in the end.”¹⁶

1.2 *Enemies and Losses*

The fifth column in the table above shows the list of enemies in the battle instructions: In 1QM 7–9 and in 4Q491b, the enemies are simply called enemies (אויב)¹⁷ while in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a the enemy is identified as the Kittim. In 4Q493, the enemy does not get much attention but in line 4 it is called “gentiles” (גויים). The word גוי as denoting enemies also occurs all over 1QM: in the beginning part of the scroll, it occurs especially in the combination גוי הבל (see 4:12, 6:16, 11:9; not known in the end part of the scroll) and always referring to

14 This expression is taken from George J. Brooke, “Text, Timing and Terror: Thematic Thoughts on the *War Scroll* in Conversation with the Writings of Martin G. Abegg, Jr.” in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature – Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. K. Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 49–66 (52–53 n. 12).

15 Simon Schama, *The Story of the Jews: Finding the Words 1000 BCE–1492 CE* (London: The Bodley Head, 2013), 161–70; Brooke, “Text, Timing and Terror,” 51–53.

16 Brooke, “Text, Timing and Terror,” 53. See also George J. Brooke, “The Visualisation of the Sacred at Qumran,” in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*, ed. J. Baden, H. Najman, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, JSJSup 175/1 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 225–40 (238), and Haigh, “Oral Aspects,” 203–4, who argues that “like the theophany at Sinai or Belshazzar’s banquet in Daniel, in oral pronouncement, writing gains effective power. For instance, within the ritualistic act of inscribing divinatory names on the trumpets or banners, there is an immediate performativity latent in the text’s metalinguistic cues which constructs an ‘as if world.’ In naming themselves the ‘called of God’ the Yahad becomes so, and, in naming ‘the peace of God in the camps of his saints’ or proclaiming that ‘God has struck all the Sons of Darkness’ it becomes reality (1QM 3:2, 9).”

17 Although once in 9:9 they are “nations of vanity” (גוי הבל).

enemies (see also 2:7); and in the end part, it also refers to enemies without any exception (12:11, 12:14/19:6, 14:5, 14:7 גויי רשעה, 15:1, 15:2 גויי רשעה, 15:13, 16:1, 19:10). Thus, while Kittim is restricted to columns 1 (4 of 17 occurrences are in these columns) and 15–19 (11 of 17 occurrences are in these columns), אַויב occurs all over the scroll (see columns 3, 6, 8–12, 14, 18–19) – and consequently, Kittim seems to be something special among the descriptions of the enemy. However, as regards the word אַויב, it can be noted that its occurrences are not evenly distributed: only three of 26 occurrences are in the last *serekh* in columns 16–19 and in column 1 this word does not occur at all. In columns 3–14, the word is seen quite regularly. The third word for the enemy, Belial, is frequent in the hymn section of the scroll: half of the occurrences are in columns 11–15. In column 1, it occurs almost as often as Kittim, namely three times.

The differences in the terms used for enemy are probably to be explained by different sources behind 1QM: Kittim was dominant in the source behind the end of the Scroll while elsewhere the enemy was not explicitly named.¹⁸ In columns 1 and 13, which were probably created at a late stage, Belial had become more important (although Belial had occurred here and there in 1QM even before that) and the Belial tradition was combined with the Kittim tradition which probably reflects the time when the Seleucids were the main threat in the minds of those who create the text.¹⁹ Columns 7–9, which also represent a quite late stage in the M tradition were interested in enemies on a general level and thus, they were not named specifically.

A similar element is the losses in war: in every battle instruction section, it is mentioned that the battle causes losses but only 1QM 16–17/4Q491a says explicitly that there will be slain on both sides, among the enemies and among

18 About the meaning of the Kittim in 1QM, see George J. Brooke, “The Kittim and Hints of Hybridity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *People under Power: Early Jewish and Christian Responses to the Roman Empire*, ed. M. Labahn and O. Lehtipuu (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018), 17–32 (23–27, 29–30).

19 Schultz’s theory (presented in *Conquering the World*) seems to fit together with the idea that the view of the enemies was changing towards the general: according to him, the first stage of the war (cf. 1QM 1, 15–19) is to be waged against the Seleucids while in the second stage (cf. 1QM 2–14) the troops are up against the whole gentile world. In the footsteps of Schultz, Brooke is convinced that “whoever composed 1QM, possibly in the late second century B.C.E., almost certainly had the Seleucids in mind when using the epithet Kittim,” see Brooke, “Kittim,” 26. Brooke continues that he is, however, “inclined to think that as the text of 1QM was variously edited and reused, there was nothing in the second half of the first century B.C.E. to prevent the later reader or hearer of 1QM 1 from understanding that the text referred to the Romans.” My observations are aligned with this: the epithet Kittim was probably linked with the Seleucids by those who are behind the text of 1QM 16–17/4Q491a but possibly already during the compiling process of 1QM, a need to interpret the enemy more broadly emerged.

the army's own skirmishers. If, as was hypothesized on the basis of weapons, trumpets, and encouragement, 1QM 7–8 represents the later phase of the textual development of 1QM, it seems that there, the enemies are made more general and the idea of the losses among one's own troops is suppressed.

Although it is likely that the creators of the War Texts anticipated that the actual war would be waged in the near future and thus had certain concrete enemies in mind, it is as probable that the texts that they produced could and were meant to function at different levels.²⁰ As the transmission process of the texts proceeded, it seems that different images of the enemies were combined without any problems, and consequently, in the long run, their meaning (to whom they refer) became more complex and open. At the same time, it seems that when the war traditions were compiled in 1QM, the viewpoint of the soldiers became more prominent. On the one hand, this could indicate a more realistic grip on the preparation for the actual war, but on the other hand, as the enemies in these texts, the soldiers may have more symbolic meanings. To me, this is the more likely option, and the soldier seems to be a rather usable object of identification for a member of a marginalized community. Just as a soldier is ready to sacrifice his physical and material comfort in order to ensure the survival of his community, so are community members ready to give up their property (and perhaps at least part of their social network) for the common good and to live a communal life. Just as a soldier is willing to control his body in order to reach his goal, so are community members willing to follow strict bodily restrictions in order to ensure their own purity, as well as that of their community. Moreover, when undergoing suffering and privation (despite the promises that God and the community have made to them), community members can see that, in line with soldiers' sacrifices, they are on an inevitable journey towards victory.²¹ When reading the war instructions given to the sol-

20 Martti Nissinen, "Apokalyptiikka: Mitä, miksi ja milloin? (Apocalypticism: What, Why and When?)," in *Vartija* 113 (2000): 13–19 (in Finnish), argues that behind apocalyptic thinking (which 1QM obviously represents, although it is not an apocalypse as such) we can find several religious-social tensions, such as the tension between the center and the periphery (cf. Judaism in Hellenistic times), the tension between the mainstream culture and the counterculture (cf. early Christianity), and different internal tensions (e.g., within the Judaism of the late Second Temple times and during early Christianity). To elaborate this idea, these tensions may motivate the creation of the apocalyptic literature; not only one at a time, but also simultaneously: internal and external tensions can both be a reality at the same time (as is already suggested by, for example, early Christianity being considered an example of a movement that meets both internal and external tensions). Consequently, I do not see it in any way impossible that the War Texts could be motivated by several different factors, and also function on several different levels.

21 Cf. John F. Shean who demonstrates how the union of soldier and churchmen after the Constantinian shift functions in a symbolic level. See Shean, *Soldiering for God:*

diers from this perspective, the purpose of the text seems to be to build an identity for the community and its members, and to offer a sense of security when suffering the setbacks that are an unavoidable part not only of war, but also of life.²² By providing an object of identification outside the conventional religious hierarchy (something other than priests and Levites), 1QM possibly makes itself more accessible and applicable than the oldest War Text traditions (cf. priestly-oriented 4Q493).

1.3 *Priests and Laymen*

In addition to the Kittim and the possibility of being on the losing side, there are some other elements that seem to separate 1QM 16–17/4Q491a from the other battle instructions. One is its zero interest in purity. In all other cases, something is said about purity issues: In 4Q493 and 1QM 9, the purity of priests is in focus and as was noted in Section 2 of Chapter 3, it seems that in 1QM 9, the description of the purity requirements known in 4Q493 is widened and further explained. In 4Q491b, the camp and the battlefield are clearly separated from each other and purity is discussed through the requirements for those who go to the battle. In the parallel passage – which is situated before the beginning of the actual battle instructions in column 7 (see 1QM 7:3b–7) – similar requirements apply to those who are in the camp. Thus, as was discussed in Chapter 3 above, in 1QM, at least in its first part, the idea of sacredness is probably broadened and purity issues are expanded on. By contrast, in the tradition preserved in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a, purity is not an issue. Also, this tradition seems not to be interested in the priests' garments that are under scrutiny both in 1QM 7–9 and in 4Q491b.²³

Christianity and the Roman Army, History of Warfare 61 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 14. Of course, the pre-era Judaism and the Christianity in the late antiquity are not comparable as such, neither are their sociocultural and political contexts; but when bearing this in mind, Shean's analysis may give some food for thought also for understanding the War Texts.

22 Note that Alison Schofield has suggested, following critical spatial theory, that communities can also produce meaningful imagined spaces. Schofield argues that the members of the Yahad felt themselves conceptually marginalized and they probably also lived in the periphery in relation to Jerusalem. When these concrete and conceptual experiences of space were linked together, a new figurative place came into existence: the desert camp that was produced with the help of disciplined actions (by following strict bodily rules) was a symbolic space, independent from any certain physical location. See Schofield, "Reading Sectarian Spaces: Critical Spatial Theory and the Case of the Yahad," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Study of the Humanities. Method, Theory, Meaning: Proceedings of the Eighth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (Munich, 4–7 August 2013)*, ed. P.B. Hartog, A. Schofield, and S.I. Thomas, STDJ 125 (Leiden: Brill, 2018) 176–94.

23 In 4Q491b the description of the garments seems to be somewhat shorter than in 1QM 7 and its context is not exactly the same; there is no encouragement speech after the list

At the same time, 4Q493 is the only one of the battle instruction sections that does not describe laymen as participating in directing the battle. 4Q493 seems to reflect the priestly war while in other instructions, some laymen (in addition to the skirmishers and/or other combatants) are given a role in the conduct of the battle. In 4Q491b, the camp commanders are described as acting together with the priests and the Levites (4Q491 1–3 9) – but it is not clear whether these commanders take part in blowing the trumpets. In 1QM 7–9 and 1QM 16–17/4Q491, on the other hand, it is said that the people with ram’s horns (8:9–10; 16:7–8) take part in directing the war. It seems, thus, that in 4Q493 and 4Q491b the sacredness is exclusive and only the priests and Levites are qualified to lead the troops by means of the trumpets. The fact that 1QM 16–17/4Q491a is not so priestly-oriented – although priests play an important role in it as well – and that it takes into account the possibility of losing some battles and finds explanations for that (see, e.g., 16:11: God is testing his people) make it stand out from the other battle instructions – although 1QM 7–9 also describes laymen as acting next to priests and Levites. As noted above, when 1QM was compiled, the focus of the texts seemed to shift from the priests to the soldiers (although overall, the priests still hold a central position in 1QM). This probably made it relatively easy to integrate the tradition represented in 4Q491a into the older, more priestly-oriented tradition.

1.4 *Towards Stability*

All in all, the four different battle instruction sections are at least partly related: It can quite easily be demonstrated that 1QM 14–17 was copied from the text that is preserved in 4Q491a, just modifying it a bit.²⁴ Also, it is plausible to think that 1QM 7–9 probably is the latest one of the known battle instruction sections: it clearly aims to collect and combine things related to the war and develop them further (by naming the weapons and widening the use of trumpets and gates). However, it is not so easy to fit 4Q491b and 4Q493 into this simplified model of textual growth – or one could also say that the *textual* questions do not stretch to explain the similarity and variation between the texts at this point. The textual point of view is just one – although by no means insignificant – perspective that can be used when trying to explain

of garments as in 1QM 7, but it seems that one list of rules ends here and something else follows. Note also that before enumerating the garments in 4Q491b, there is a (mostly reconstructed) list which in 1QM occurs in columns 13 and 15 (chief priest, his brothers, priests, Levites, men of the army) while in 1QM 7, seven priests of the sons of Aaron are mentioned at this point.

24 Cf. Section 1 of Chapter 2. The greatest modification is the addition of the text of lines 15:4–16:1. It is not preserved anywhere in 4QM texts but seems to be unique.

relations between texts. Another perspective is the *thematic* viewpoint: as was argued above, some kind of thematic change can be seen when comparing 4Q491b, 4Q493 and 1QM 7–9 (assuming that its lateness in comparison to 1QM 16–17/4Q491a may indicate its lateness in comparison to 4Q491b and 4Q493 as well): it seems that in 1QM 7–9, the idea of sacredness is widened and the laymen are given a role to play in directing the war side by side with priest and Levites.²⁵ In these cases, the changes cannot be explained just by saying that a scribe has copied a text of another scribe and made some textual additions and modifications. Rather, several scribes have worked with similar themes, probably inspired by each other's texts but not having any intent to preserve the source of inspiration in an entirely recognizable fashion. In addition to these two perspectives, a third point of view, the *material* one, should also be taken into consideration: one needs to ask whether the material of the manuscripts or their location in Cave 4 have any significance when explaining the relationships between the texts.

As already noted in the analysis part, Charlotte Hempel has supposed that the texts of Cave 4 were “reserved for a more restricted readership than the content of the remainder of the library” and that Cave 4 material represented “a learned and eclectic medley of materials and data.”²⁶ This proposal is based on the following observations: first, almost all cryptic texts that belong to the Dead Sea Scrolls are found in Cave 4; second, most of the references to the Maskil are found in the Cave 4 texts; third, technical calendrical material is mostly preserved in Cave 4; and fourth, a great amount of Cave 4 material represents “workaday quality” (like collections, notes, rosters, registers) – while in Cave 1, the developed and refined “showroom quality” is more predominant. Hempel also notes that of those works that are preserved in multiple copies, the largest number is in Cave 4.²⁷ While testing her idea with *serekh* material (1QS and other manuscripts labelled with S), Hempel shows that each of her four points can be demonstrated with 4QS manuscripts.²⁸ In the case of M manuscripts, the situation is not so clear: there is no calendrical material among them, no preserved reference to the Maskil and no cryptic texts.²⁹ Only the criterion

25 Also, it might be possible that one of the enemy names, the gentiles (גויים) in 4Q493, is further developed in 1QM (cf. גוי רשעה, גוי הבל).

26 Hempel, “The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4,” 82. See also Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 303–37.

27 Hempel, “The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4,” 82–84.

28 Hempel, “The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4,” 85.

29 In S material, according to Hempel, “4Q259 (S^e) contains two phrases written in cryptic letters in successive lines.” See further: Hempel, “The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4,” 86.

concerning the workaday quality clearly fits in with the Cave 4 M material; it is especially seen in the opisthographic manuscripts 4Q496 and 4Q497 but it should be noted that 4Q491b and 4Q493 include very tight script (as does 4Q491a) and 4Q491b has exceptionally long lines. Although the criteria that have more to do with the content of the texts are not realized, Hempel's general idea of Cave 4 manuscripts representing a more restricted readership seems to be fully established after scrutinizing the differences between different battle descriptions: in Chapter 3, it was shown that in their strict priestly orientation, 4Q491b and 4Q493 – which are not closely parallel to 1QM but share many elements with it – seem to be addressed to a more restricted audience than 1QM. Also, these two manuscripts seem to include some unique, exploratory ideas of the war – like setting up an ambush in 4Q491b and using some kind of artillery as weapons in 4Q493 – so they could well represent the restricted material that was, according to Hempel's suggestion, stored in Cave 4.³⁰ The text and/or themes of these manuscripts probably had an influence on the middle part of 1QM which aimed to collect and organize the material concerning war. Not all of the exploratory ideas that were introduced in these manuscripts were accepted – or considered to be necessary – to the version aimed at a larger non-elite audience. However, this does not mean that the unique ideas could not be read or even developed further within the smaller circle of readers.

To conclude, it seems clear that battle instructions were used in order to connect the text to the general idea of war. There was no requirement to keep the instructions entirely similar and exploratory visions existed side by side with the general one – but it seems that this subgenre was developing towards stabilization. This becomes even clearer when the next subgenre, encouragement speech, is taken into consideration.

2 Encouragement Speeches and the Hymnic Material

Encouraging the soldiers in the battle is an element that occurs in 1QM 7–9 and 1QM 16–17/4Q491a. By contrast, in 4Q493, it is lacking, at least if the instructions did not continue in other sheets not preserved for us. As regards 4Q491b, encouragement does not occur in the text as it is preserved but the option that there was an encouragement speech in lines 1–5 of fragments 1–3 cannot be excluded. In 1QM 7, the one who encourages is *הַכֹּהֵן הָאֶחָד* while in 1QM 16–17/4Q491a it is *כֹּהֵן הַרֹאֵשׁ*;³¹ and the actual encouragement speech is also

30 Cf. Hempel, “The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4.”

31 On this reading in 4Q491a, see Section 1.4 of Chapter 1.

embedded in the instructions (contrary to 1QM 7). Without Cave 4 material, it could be reasonable to argue that the passage in 1QM 7, the one without actual words of encouragement, would have given an inspiration to later redactors of 1QM to write the speeches in the end of the Scroll. However, the passage in 4Q491b demonstrates that there existed quite similar regulation lists without the element of encouragement. Therefore, it is more sensible to ask whether the encouragement in 1QM 7 is a late element which was created in order to link different units of 1QM together. The vocabulary of the encouragement passage in column 7 can also be used as an argument for the separate nature of this passage in its context: there are expressions, for example, “the men of the battle line” (אנשי המערכה) and the idea of one + six priests that occurs only here in 1QM. In addition, this conclusion about the encouragement is in line with the hypothesis that was already made on the basis of weapons and trumpets: there are many reasons to believe that 1QM 7–9 includes elements that are late in the textual process behind 1QM.

In the analysis part above, the encouragement speeches were separated from thanksgiving hymns (e.g., 13:7–16, 14:2–15) and some other hymns (e.g., hymns in 1QM 10–12; Self-Glorification Hymn in 4Q491 11 ii + 12), although still taking into account the option that all the hymns were meant to be somehow encouraging (that, e.g., the Self-Glorification Hymn was added to its context in order to emphasize the connection between human and divine beings and thus, to motivate and encourage the soldiers).³² In this chapter, the scrutiny is limited to those passages that were already above called encouragement speeches and in which it seems clear that a priest or priests encourage the men going to war. The passages that do not include sufficient text that the context of the speech can be analyzed are omitted in this scrutiny (see 4Q491a 13 1–3a; 15 1–3, 5–12; 4Q491b 1–3 1–5a;) although it was suggested above that they were encouragement speeches. Consequently, five speeches remain, three in 1QM and two in 4Q491a, and, in addition, there is one encouragement situation in 1QM in which the speech is not written down. All these encouragement passages are closely related to the battle instructions and thus, some of them were already briefly discussed above.

In Table 46, the textual elements of the encouragement passages are itemized and compared.³³

³² See Section 3 of Chapter 1.

³³ When reading the table, one must again take the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts into account: the fact that something is not preserved in the text of a manuscript does not automatically mean that it could not have once occurred in that text. However, the fragmentary nature of the texts does not prevent us from doing comparisons – as long as these factors are borne in mind.

TABLE 46 Encouragement speeches in the M manuscript

	Situation	Encourager	Those who are encouraged	Enemies	Words of encouragement
1QM 7:12	Before describing the actual acts of war	The first of the seven priests	All the men	–	–
1QM 10:2–5	In the collection of pentateuchal war legislation	The priest (10:2) + the officers (10:5)	Israel (10:3) + the mighty men of worth (10:6)	אויבים (10:3)	From Deut 20:2–4 (10:3–4)
1QM 15:4–16:1	Before describing the actual acts of war	The priest assigned for the appointed time of vengeance (15:6)	The men in the battle lines (?)	Wicked congregation, those whose works are in darkness (15:9)	There is no reason to be afraid because the enemy is wicked but weak. (15:10–11)

TABLE 46 Encouragement speeches in the M manuscript (*cont.*)

	Situation	Encourager	Those who are encouraged	Enemies	Words of encouragement
1QM 16:13b–17:9	Between the instructions concerning the actual acts of war	The chief priest (16:13)	The men in the battle lines (16:13)	The commander of the dominion of wickedness (16:7–8)	God is testing his own people but finally, he will send a heavenly mediator. (16:15, 17:1, 17:6)
4Q491 fragment 11 column 2:11–18	Between the instructions concerning the actual acts of war	The chief priest (2:11)	The men in the battle lines (?)	?	God is testing his own people but he will also save his people. (2:12, 14)
4Q491 fragment 10 column 2:7–14	After describing the actual acts of war	The priest designated for the battle (2:13)	The men in the battle lines (?) (2:13)	The wicked assembly (?) (2:17)	Consuming fire one of the themes? (2:15, 17)

The first time that encouragement is encountered in 1QM is in column 7. The encouragement is situated after the description of the clothing of the priests (7:10–11) which was noted above to have a parallel in 4Q491b. The encourager in 1QM 7 is one of the seven priests mentioned as present,³⁴ and those who are encouraged are “all the men of the line” (7:12a). It is said explicitly that they are encouraged for the battle but nothing more is said about the need for encouragement or, for example, about enemies. The actual encouragement speech is not described at all. After the brief remark of encouragement, the text moves on by describing the other tasks of priests and Levites, especially their duties as blowers of the trumpets (7:12b–).

The second encouragement situation occurs in column 10, at the beginning of the section of hymns/prayers (in columns 10–15). The author refers to Moses’ words according to which a priest has to encourage the people while approaching the battle (10:1–5a). Here, the encourager is not very explicitly defined: he is just a priest. Those who are encouraged are a wider group, the people of Israel (10:3) – and not a group of soldiers within it as above. It seems that while in column 7 encouragement is applied to a more specific situation – to the need of a specific group – here it concerns all Israel. On the other hand, in addition to the priest, the “officers” (שוטרים 10:5) are those who are urged to encourage – and not all but the “mighty men of worth” (גבורי חיל 10:6) who are “ready for battle” (עתודי המלחמה 10:5). This is also something different from column 7 where the officers are not mentioned until after the encouragement – and with an emphasis on their being Levites (cf. 7:14–16). In addition, contrary to column 7 where the adversary is totally absent, enemies are mentioned in column 10 line 4. By ordering the people not to tremble or to be terrified because of them, it is hinted that they may be very intimidating. Finally, as in column 7, here in column 10, too, the encouragement is followed by the order to sound an alarm with the trumpets – an idea that probably originates in Numbers 10:9.

The third encouragement passage in 1QM is situated in column 15. In line 4, the chief priest, his brothers, priests, Levites, and all the men of the army are brought to the stage. After the chief priest has read the prayer and thanksgivings, the priest “assigned for the appointed time of vengeance” (בוהן החרוץ)

34 Yadin translates the expression הכוהן האחד as “one priest” and supposes that it refers to the appointed priest mentioned in line 15:6 (see Yadin *The Scroll of the War*, 292). Wise et al. (“1Q33”) follow the same line. However, it seems more reasonable that הכוהן האחד is here just used in order to say that one of the seven priests encourages while the other six hold the trumpets (cf. lines 12b–13a: המקרא יהיו חצוצרות). Duhaime and García Martínez and Tigchelaar see the text this way and translate “the first priest shall/will walk...,” see Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 113; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 124–25.

לְמוֹעֵד נִקְם (15:6) encourages the soldiers. In the actual encouragement speech (15:7b–16:1), the soldiers are ordered not to fear or to panic because of the enemy but in addition the enemy is described as being very wicked but on the other hand, weak. After the speech, the priests are again ordered to sound the trumpets and the text moves on to describe the actual acts of war (16:3–).

The fourth encouragement passage (16:16–17:9) is situated between the two passages that describe the acts of war and have parallels both in column 8 and column 15. Here, the chief priest is the one who encourages (16:13). Those who are encouraged are not explicitly described but it is said that the chief priest stands “in front of the line” (16:13). Enemies are depicted as ending up in nothingness (17:4), but there are also many other things included in the speech: First, the idea that God is testing his own people in wartime is introduced in line 16:15. This indicates that the encouragement is not only needed in case of panicking before the enemy but also in case of panicking when one’s own side is suffering losses.³⁵ Second, the idea of some kind of leading figure of the enemy side, the “commander of the dominion of wickedness,” comes up in column 17, lines 5–6. And third, the idea of some kind of angelic character is introduced in line 17:6 (“He has sent an everlasting help ... through the might of the majestic angel.”).

In sum, in addition to always having a priest or priests as those who encourage, the encouragement situations in 1QM have at least one other feature in common: the encouragement is always followed by sounding trumpets.³⁶ By contrast, the actual words of encouragement and, for example, the description of the enemies varies considerably: in column 7, enemies are not even mentioned and the speech of encouragement is not written down. In column 10, the author follows Deuteronomy 20 and warns not to be afraid of enemies. In two more encouragement situations in columns 15–17, the speeches get much space and the enemies are described in many different ways.

35 Cf. also the discussion above in which it was noted that the battle instruction section in columns 16–17 is the only one that includes the idea of losses on both sides, not only among the enemies but also among the army’s own skirmishers.

36 In addition, the passages share the following things: a) Columns 7 and 15 have in common the verbal root הלך which describes the priest’s action. b) In columns 7, 15 and 16, the situation is set somewhere near the battle line(s). These columns also have in common the verbal root חזק which describes the priest’s action. c) Columns 15 and 16 have in common the introductory formula וְעֵנָה וְאָמַר “do not be terrified.” e) Columns 10 and 15 also share the sentence וְאֵל תַּחֲפֹזוּ וְאֵל תַּעֲרֹצוּ מִפְּנֵיהֶם “do not be alarmed and do not tremble before them.” f) Columns 7 and 16 share the expression בְּמַלְחָמָה יְדֵיהֶם “their hands for the battle” (the last-mentioned reads: בְּמַלְחָמָתוֹ יְדֵיהֶם “their hands for his battle”).

The text in 4Q491a 11 ii is in many ways a close textual parallel to what is preserved in 1QM columns 16 and 17. The situation before the speech is very similar in both of them: there is an order to blow a signal to return, and the chief priest is the one who approaches and stands before the battle line and encourages the soldiers. The beginnings of the speeches are also very similar: testing the people's heart in the crucible and obeying the mysteries of God are mentioned in both speeches and the order to be courageous and not to fear is also given in both. Instead, what follows differs. In 1QM, the idea of the angelic character dominates the end of the speech while in 4Q491a, the speech concentrates on the battle between the God of Israel and Belial. The idea of the covenant, however, occurs at the end of both speeches. As was demonstrated in Section 1.4 of Chapter 2, it is probable that 1QM shows here literary dependence on 4Q491a—the speech is radically reworked but still based on what was known in the Cave 4 manuscript. This shows that in the midst of the battle instructions that were transmitted without any significant changes, it was still possible to introduce new ideas – and speeches provided a good framework for this.

4Q491 10 ii also includes the encouragement passage but very little is left of it. However, it can be noted that as with the previously discussed fragment 11, this fragment also is parallel to 1QM columns 16 and 17. As concluded in Section 1.2 of Chapter 2, the text in fragment 10 column 2 probably describes the phase of war preceding the phase that is described in fragment 11. In 1QM, this phase is omitted and the text of column 15 is taken in its place. Here again, the instructive part of the text includes many textual similarities with 1QM 15 and 16 but the words that are left of the encouragement speech do not indicate textual parallelism to any other speech that is known in the M manuscripts.

To conclude, contrary to battle instructions, encouragement speeches were not developing towards stabilization – although the subgenre of encouragement speech with certain elements was clearly established. Instead, the speeches specifically offer a place for literary creativity and provided an opportunity to add new elements to the text. This was needed in order to make the texts dynamic and usable again and again – and thus, the hymnic material could bring an urgency to the war material in general during its transmission. What is noteworthy is that the preserved speeches are mainly in 1QM and in 4Q491a, and at least 1QM was probably targeted at a larger audience (and not only to the learned elite who transmitted and even created the text). 4Q493 does not, at least in its preserved form, include any encouragement – which probably has to do with the fact that the viewpoint in this manuscript is strongly that of priests. In its exploratory war vision of 4Q493, which probably was quite early in the ensemble of the War Texts the encouragement was not

yet an important element. Later, when the war visions became more communal, the encouragement also became more central.

When the scrutiny is extended from the encouragement speeches to the hymn material in general, some important observations of the function of these poetic texts and the War Texts in general can be made. In 1QM 10–11, there is a long hymn section that is unknown outside 1QM. This hymnic section is characterized by several references to the Hebrew Bible, also including citations and citation formulas. Its first main purpose is to introduce teachings from the past: it collects war-related instructions from different parts of the Pentateuch (10:1–8a), describes the creation and the creative acts of God (10:8b–18), refers to David and Goliath and the victorious kings (11:1–5a), and quotes the prophets (11:5b–12a). The second essential aim is to describe God as a war hero – and this too is done by taking inspiration from the “biblical” traditions, in this case from Ezekiel 38–39 (see 1QM 11:12b–12:18). It is probable that when 1QM was compiled in its present form, it became important to show that the ideas of the war texts were in line with God’s elementary deeds in history. Since reworking and replacing hymnic material was generally accepted in the end part of the Scroll (see 1QM 16–17), it was probably also easy to add hymns in the middle of the scroll.

The large amount of hymnic material in 1QM (and in some other M manuscripts as well) leads one to ask how prayer and warfare are related. For Falk, these two elements are indivisible. He notes that the same language is used when describing the mustering of armies for war and when describing the gathering of the community for worship. For example, the units of thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens are used when describing military units (1QM 3:12–18) and when describing the liturgical procession in the covenant renewal ceremony (1QS 2:19–23).³⁷ He also gives many other examples in which the language related to warfare is intermingled with that of worship or vice versa.³⁸ Consequently, he argues that worship was understood as a kind of warfare: with prayers, it was possible to wage war against demons and seek protection against the attacks of diseases and other types of harm.³⁹ In addition, according to Falk, the large number of war-related manuscripts, the fact that some of the M texts are inscribed in the manuscripts also containing liturgical prayer texts (4Q496, 4Q497), the evident re-use of prayers (e.g., 1QM 12 and 19), and the use of prayer formulas that are also known from liturgical prayers⁴⁰ all

37 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 285–6.

38 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 286–7.

39 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 288–9.

40 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War” 278–80.

point to a liturgical context behind the M manuscripts.⁴¹ Both this liturgical interpretation and Brooke's idea of the importance of writing⁴² lead one to think that what 1QM gives to its readers and users are concrete tools to protect themselves from evil. While on the surface these tools seem to be war tactics and weapons, after a closer look they prove to be writing and praying. This does not mean, however, that the audience of 1QM would not anticipate the actual war – worldly and otherworldly – as well. However, while waiting and trying to ride out the smaller storms, writing and praying were also easily accessible to the marginalized. Furthermore, through the image of a soldier, these people were given ingredients to build their (communal) identity which was continually tested in the setbacks of life.

Earlier in this study, it was argued that 1QM should be understood primarily as a rule text or a collection of rules. It may seem difficult to reconcile this view with a liturgical interpretation. However, the idea of resisting evil forces can well be one leading principle according to which the rules were formulated and compiled – and, from this point of view, understanding 1QM as a rule and interpreting it as being used liturgically are not mutually exclusive. When considering all the M material, the liturgical grasp seems to be strongest in 1QM: the amount of hymnic material is largest there. However, 4Q491a contains extensive hymnic material too, including hymns that are unique in comparison with other M manuscripts. In 4Q493, no hymnic material is preserved but there as well, the focus that is strongly on priests, the discussion on purity issues and the importance of the right order of the trumpets' alarms indicate that ritual or liturgical interpretation is well possible. What should also be noted is that 4Q496 and 4Q497 are inscribed together with liturgical texts (4Q505, 4Q506, 4Q509 and 4Q499), which indicates that the possibility of interpreting the war traditions liturgically existed already in the early phase of their transmission.

3 Chief Priest Tradition and the Lateness of 1QM 13

One separate theme that comes into consideration when reading the encouragement speeches is the encourager. As already noted, he is always a priest but

41 Falk, "Prayer, Liturgy, and War," 293.

42 Note that Brooke seems to speak about two different acts of writing: writing as a "magical" act (in trumpet inscriptions) and the psychological and social significance of the multiple writings (M manuscripts). Writing as a magical act included power, and written texts bore authority, gave encouragement, and strengthened hope among their readers and users.

not always the same priest: often he is the chief priest, but in some cases some other priest. The role of different priests is in any case an interesting question which may shed some light on the literary process behind the War Texts as well. Therefore, in the following, it is given close scrutiny.

The title “chief priest” (כֹּהֵן הַרִאשׁוֹן) does not occur very often in the M manuscripts; only five times in 1QM (2:1, 15:4–5a, 16:13b–15a, 18:5b–6a, 19:11b–13) and twice in 4QM texts (4Q491 fragment 11 column 2, line 11; 4Q494 line 4), the 4QM passages being parallel to those in 1QM.⁴³ In addition, it is very probable that the chief priest was also mentioned in 1QM 13:1: on the basis of its similarities with 1QM 15:4, Jean Duhaime concludes that in the lost beginning of the sentence in column 13, “the chief priest must have been mentioned” as in column 15.⁴⁴ This conclusion seems plausible but of course, there always remains a question mark when trying to read something that is not explicitly in the text. However, since there are also other features that link 1QM 13:1 to the passages mentioning the chief priest – and since the position of column 13 in 1QM is in general an interesting question – it is carried along in this analysis.

Very often, the chief priest occurs as part of lists that enumerate different groups taking part in the liturgical activity, blessing or praising God. These kinds of lists occur only in 1QM: at least in the preserved war text material, no parallels to them can be identified in the other M manuscripts. That they were something special is also indicated by the fact that one of them is in 1QM 15, the column which is in the middle of the section (1QM 14–17) that has a parallel in 4Q491a. With this parallel, it is possible to demonstrate that there was a version of the text that followed quite clearly the text of 1QM 14:4–18 and 1QM 16 but deviates from the text in lines 15:4–16:1. What is also noteworthy is that when comparing the text of 1QM and its parallel in 4Q491a, something has changed just before lines 15:4–16:1: as was already discussed in Section 1.3 of Chapter 2, in 1QM 14 the hymn section is linked to its context, the battlefield, before the hymn starts (lines 2–3) but in 4Q491a, it is stated only after the hymn that it was to be recited outside the camps (fragments 8–10, line 17). Thus, this part of the texts was clearly undergoing some changes – and the text in lines 15:4–16:1 is unique in comparison to other known M manuscripts.

43 4Q491 11 ii 11 reads כֹּהֵן הַרִאשׁוֹן and is parallel to 1QM 16:13 (although there is a minor difference in reading either רִאשׁוֹן or רִאשׁוֹן; cf. Section 1.6 of Chapter 2) and 4Q494 line 4 reads כֹּהֵן הַרִאשׁוֹן which is parallel to 1QM 2:1.

44 See Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 43. Note also that the link between 1QM 13:1 and 15:4 is picked up by many: see, e.g., Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 224, 318; van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 149; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 320. Cf. also 1QM 18:5–6.

What may be noteworthy is that in three cases the chief priest is spelled with ו (הרואש), cf. in 1QM 16, 18 and 19)⁴⁵ but in column 15 it is spelled as הראש (cf. also 1QM 2:1). In addition to these four cases, the word רֹשׁ occurs 22 times in 1QM and 21 of them are written as ראש (18 of 20 occurrences in columns 2–11). The one remaining occurrence offers one more spelling, namely ראוש. This reading is also reconstructed in 4Q491 11 ii (see line 11 [כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ]). Another possibility would be to reconstruct החרוש according to 4Q491 8–10 ii 13 which reads הכֹּהֵן הַחַרוּשׁ. In that case, the question arises whether the author actually meant to write הכֹּהֵן הַחַרוּץ (cf. 1QM 15:6). All these options for speculation and the possible existence of even three different spellings of רֹשׁ hint that there was something going on with these passages and a discussion on the role of the chief priest and other possible priests with special roles was underway. In Table 47 the passages that mention the chief priest or the appointed priest are gathered together and compared.⁴⁶

In the table, every passage has been taken under scrutiny on its own but when discussing at the manuscript level, the following general overviews take shape: In 4Q491a 11 ii, the chief priest (or, if the word is reconstructed differently, the appointed priest) draws near the line, takes his position and strengthens the soldiers' hands by giving an encouragement speech. In fragment 10 ii, the priest appointed to the battle draws near the line and takes up his position there. He strengthens the soldiers' hands by giving an encouragement speech. Since the arrangement of the fragments is not clear, the order of these two encouragement situations is also undecided – but if Davis' preliminary arrangement introduced in Section 1.2 of Chapter 2 is followed,⁴⁷ the order of these characters is similar to that of 1QM 15: there, the chief priest, together with some others, like priests and Levites, takes his position and reads the prayer (15:4–5a), and after that, the appointed priest walks and strengthens the soldiers by giving an encouragement speech (15:6b–7). Later in 1QM, the chief priest draws near the line, takes his position and strengthens the soldiers' heart and hands (i.e., encourages them) by giving an encouragement speech (16:13b–15a). Afterwards, the chief priest and others bless God (18:5b–6a) and

45 Cf. also 4Q494, line 4.

46 The following notation is used: words colored red are common to 1QM 13:1–2, 1QM 15:4–5a, 1QM 16:13b–15a, 4Q491 10 ii and 4Q491 11 ii; words colored green are common to 1QM 13:1–2 and 1QM 18:5b–6a; words colored brown are common to 1QM 16:13b–15a, 1QM 19:11b–13, 4Q491 10 ii and 4Q491 11 ii; words marked with bold are common to 1QM 15:4–5a, 1QM 16:13b–15a, 1QM 18:5b–6a and 1QM 19:11b–13; words colored blue are common to 1QM 13:1–2, 1QM 16:13b–15a, 1QM 18:5b–6a, 1QM 19:11b–13, 4Q491 10 ii and 1QM 15:6b–7a; words colored purple are common to 4Q491 10 ii and 1QM 15:6b–7a.

47 See Davis, "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour."

at the end, the chief priest again draws near alone (and probably does something else that is, however, not preserved in the text: see 19:11b–13).

What then can be concluded from this? It is probable that there are two priests both in 4Q491a and in 1QM, namely the chief priest and the appointed priest; although the number of the different spellings may indicate that their roles were not very clear to all the authors or redactors who transmitted the text. In 1QM, in general, the chief priest seems to have more tasks: in addition to encouraging (16:13), he recites a prayer (15:4–5). Also, it can perhaps be said that at least in column 15, the chief priest's role is more liturgical in comparison to 4Q491a: he recites the prayer while encouraging is primarily the task of the appointed priest (15:6–7). The appointed priest moves (התהלך) while the chief priest stays (עמד), and the verb denoting drawing near (נגש) is absent from column 15. The possibility arises from this that there was a need to make it clear that the chief priest is not to go to the battlefield.

For what the appointed priest is appointed is different according to the two manuscripts: in 4Q491a, he is appointed “for the battle” and in 1QM, “for the time of vengeance according to the decision of all his brothers.” It seems that the simpler description in 4Q491a has demanded further explanation in 1QM. The word נקם (vengeance) occurs in the speech that the appointed priest gives in 4Q491a (see 10 ii 15) so “for the time of vengeance” is not a far-fetched explanation.⁴⁸ In addition, in 1QM 15 it is emphasized that the appointed priest is appointed “according to the decision of all his brothers.” The brothers are mentioned in M manuscripts only in 1QM 13 and (twice) in 1QM 15.⁴⁹ Mentioning them in column 15 might have to do with the development from the priestly-oriented group to the wider audience and the probable lateness of column 13, which is further discussed below.

וחזק את לבבם (“he shall strengthen their heart”; see 1QM 16:13–14) is a unique expression; elsewhere in M manuscripts חזק (in qal) occurs together with hands or without any object (see 1QM 1:13; 7:12; 15:7). It is not impossible to reconstruct ווחזק את לבבם in 4Q491 11 ii 11, but if the expression is not there, one option is that it comes to 1QM 15 from the following encouragement speech which discusses testing of hearts (see 15b: ל[ב]ב עמו יבחן במצורף). If this is the case, it is possible that the idea was to make encouraging more emphatic every time and that is why the heart was added before the second encouragement speech.⁵⁰

48 Note also that in 1QM 7:5 the “day of vengeance” (יום נקם) is mentioned.

49 However, see also War Scroll-like text 4Q471 fragment 1 line 2.

50 Note that hands are also mentioned in 1QM 7:12 together with חזק (לחזק ידיהם) where the first priest (הכוהן הראחד, [the first] one of the seven priests) encourages the soldiers.

TABLE 47 The similarities between the passages that (very probably) mention the chief priest or the appointed priest^a

1QM 13:1-2	1QM 15:4-5a	1QM 16:13b-15a	1QM 18:5b-6a	1QM 19:11b-13
ואחיו ה' (כ) ה' ה' והלויים וכול זקני הסדר עמו וברכו על עומדם את אל ישראל ואת כול מעשי אמתו והלמו 2 שם את ב' [ל] על ואת כול רוחי וגדלו וענו ואמרו	ועמד כהן הראש ואחיו הכ' (הונים) והלויים וכול אנשי הסדר עמו וקרא באזניהם 5 את תפלת מועד המלה [מה] ספר סדר עתו עם כול דברי הודותם	ונגש כהן הראש ועמד לפני המערכה וחזק את 14 לבבם ב' א' [א] ואת ויהיה במלחמתו 15 וענה ואמר]	אזיג השמש לבוא ביום ההואה יעמד כהן הראש והכוהנים וה' (לוי) אשר 6 אתו וראו שי [הסדר וברכו שם את אל ישראל וענו ואמרו	ונגש שם כהן ה' (אש) [הוא] 12 [מלחמה וכול ראשי המערכות ופקוד' (הם) 13 [ע'] ח' ל' ל' כתי' (ה) [ה] ללו שם [א] את אל'
[...] 1 his brothers the [pri]ests, the Levites, and all the elders of the rule with him. They shall bless, from their position, the God of Israel and all his truthful works. They shall denounce 2 there Be[li]al and all the spirits of his lot. They shall speak up, saying,	Then the chief priest shall take up position, his brothers the pri[ests], the Levites, and all the men of the rule (being) with him. He shall read in their hearing 5 the prayer of the appointed time for wa[r ... the b]ook (?) of the rule of that time, with all their words of thanksgiving.	The chief priest shall draw near and take up position in front of the line; he shall strengthen 14 their heart ... [... of Go]d and their hands for his battle. vacat 15 He shall speak up, saying,	[...] the sun shall hasten to go down, on that day, then they shall take up position, (namely) the chief priest, the priests and the [Levite]s who 6 (are) with him, the chief[s ... of] the rule. They shall bless there the God of Israel. They shall speak up, saying,	There, the chi[ef] priest shall draw near [...] ... [...] 12 [...] of] the war and all the chiefs of the lines and [their] numbered (men) [...] 13 [...] bes]ide [the s]lain of the Kitt[im]. They [shall p]raise there th[e] God of [...]

a Different markings are used in order to demonstrate some of the similarities that (very probably) mention the chief priest or the appointed priest

TABLE 47 The similarities between the passages that (very probably) mention the chief priest or the appointed priest (*cont.*)

4Q491 fragment 10 column 2	4Q491 fragment 11 column 2	1QM 15:6b-7a
<p>13 והגש הכהן החרדש למל- חמה ועמד [ל]פני 14 וחזק את ידיהמה בגבורות פלאו וענה ואמר</p>	<p>והגש כהן הראש ועמד 12 [א]ת ידיהמה במלחמתו 13 [כ]</p>	<p>והתהלך הכהן החרדן למועד נקם על פי 7 כול אחיו וחזק אמן וענה ואמר</p>
<p>13 The priest appointed for the battle shall draw near and take up position [in] front of [...] 14 He shall strengthen their hands with his wonderful mighty deeds. And he shall speak up, saying, "...]</p>	<p>The [chi]ef pries[t] shall draw near and ta[ke up position ...] ... [...] 12 their hands for his battle [...]</p>	<p>The priest shall walk along, the one assigned for the appointed time of vengeance according to the decision of 7 all his brothers, and he shall strengthen ... [...] He shall speak up, saying:</p>

The introductory formula which is typical of the passages mentioning the chief priest and/or the appointed priest is in the plural only in 1QM 13 and in 1QM 18 (וענו ואמר). The singular form (וענה ואמר) has to do with encouraging, the plural form with blessing. Blessing (ברך) does not occur as a finite verb in 4Q491 or anywhere else in 4QM manuscripts.⁵¹ In other respects, too, it seems that as regards the vocabulary, 1QM 13 and 18 somehow belong together (the chief priest as a part of the group of people, blessing) and 1QM 16 and 19 belong together (the chief priest alone draws near and in column 16, also strengthens). Drawing near and strengthening obviously come from the text known in 4Q491a. 1QM 15 brings some entirely new elements like reading the prayer for the appointed time of the war, and these elements are probably late in the M tradition. In addition, blessings and curses (1QM 13:1–6) were possibly something that was added to the text in the late phase of its development process. One option to explain this is that column 13 was formulated on the basis of column 14. In Section 2 of Chapter 2 it was already suggested that column 13 is separate from its context: the absence of military vocabulary and the presence of a unique, heavenly character (שר מאור) indicate this and the lexical and structural similarities between 1QM 13 and 14 and many echoes of other columns of 1QM point to the likelihood that the text of column 13 was formulated on the basis of column 14 at a late stage of the development of 1QM (see further discussion in Section 2 of Chapter 2). If there were some additional evidence – in some 4QM texts that are clearly earlier than that of 1QM – that columns 12 and 14 were connected without column 13 in between, it would give more support to the theory that column 13 is an interpolation. However, this kind of evidence cannot be found.⁵² Instead, the fact that the text of column 14 has slightly divergent parallels in 4Q491 8–10 i and 1QM 19 shows that the material known in 1QM 14 was somehow a “work in progress” at the time 1QM was written down. Although this does not directly support the idea that column 13 was developed on the basis of column 14, it does not speak against it – the author of column 13 perhaps preferred to use the text which was otherwise under discussion.

As has been argued above, the battle instructions in 1QM columns 7–9 probably represents the battle instruction tradition in its latest form and aims to gather different elements together. Since hands occur most often before the speeches, it is natural that it was chosen to be mentioned in column 7.

51 4Q496 fragment 26 line 1 may be an exception while reading [נברך] but the case must remain unclear since the letters are not very readable and there is no context.

52 4Q492 fragment 1 lines 1–8 should be considered as a parallel to 1QM 19 rather than separate evidence for connecting the material of 1QM 12 and 1QM 14 directly together.

What should also be noted is that there is probably a part of the hymn similar to that of column 13 preserved in 4Q495 fragment 2 (see 13:9b–12a). This indicates that although 1QM 13 might have been developed on the basis of 1QM 14, its material is not completely unique and it is possible that the addition of column 13 to 1QM was done already before the final compilation of 1QM.

4 1QM in the Light of the 4QM Manuscripts

The starting point for this study was to analyze the Qumran War Text material without considering the best-preserved manuscript – which in this case is undeniably 1QM – to set out what the primary model of the War Texts could be. 1QM was understood as one example of the War Texts, not a prototype through which all the other material must be seen. However, while the study has progressed – and as the previous sections also demonstrate – it has become clear that scrutinizing War Text material in general gives some perspective on 1QM as well. Therefore, this section takes a brief glance at 1QM and introduces some points through which the development behind it can be sketched.

Table 48 demonstrates the different degrees of parallelism that can be distinguished between 1QM and the other M manuscripts. As was noted in the analysis part, defining possible parallels between two texts is not always easy and often requires making reconstructions that must remain hypothetical. Therefore, the table below is more or less a simplification. The degree of parallelism is expressed with the terms “close” and “remote” which were already used in the analysis part.⁵³ While close parallels, above all, reflect textual similarity even on the level on wording, remote parallels allow for variation in the arrangement of the text material and include parallelisms on the thematic level. In the third case, namely, in the (rare) case of genre parallel, the content of the texts can be different but the parallelism occurs on the level of genre. All in all, the function of this tripartition is not to create strictly defined criteria and categories: the varied degree of parallelism cannot be demonstrated by putting the text passages in pigeonholes but rather, it should be described as a continuum. However, the table is meant to take note of the broad lines of the comparison.

53 This terminology is not the only possible one, but it was created in order to help the comparison between the texts in this study. For the definition of the terms as used here, see Section 4 of the Introduction.

TABLE 48 The textual parallels between 1QM and 4QM manuscripts

1QM	4QM	The degree of parallelism
1	4Q496?	impossible to define
1:E	4Q494:1-3	close parallel?
2:1-3	4Q494:4-5	close parallel
2:5-E	4Q496?	impossible to define
3:1-E	4Q496?	impossible to define
4	4Q496?	impossible to define
5:16-17	4Q491b fragments 1-3:11	remote parallel?
6	-	no parallels
7:3b-12	4Q491b fragments 1-3:6b-18	remote parallel
8	-	no parallels
9:1-9	4Q496?	impossible to define
9:7b-9	4Q493 4b-6	remote parallel
10	-	no parallels
11	-	no parallels
12	4Q492 and 1QM 19	close parallel
13:9b-12a	4Q495 fragment 2	close parallel?
14:2-3	4Q491a fragments 8-10, column 1:17-E	remote parallel?
14:4-15	4Q491a fragments 8-10, column 1:1-12	close parallel
14:16-18	4Q491a fragments 8-10, column 1:13-16	close parallel
15	-	no parallels
16:3-14	4Q491a fragment 11, column 2:1-12a	close parallel
(/8-14)	4Q491a fragment 10, column 2:8-14a	remote parallel
16:15- ?	4Q491a fragment 11, column 2:12b-18	remote parallel
	4Q491a fragment 10, column 2:14b-17	genre parallel
17:10-14	4Q491a fragment 11, column 2:19-23	close parallel
18	-	no parallels
19	4Q492 and 1QM 12	close parallel

The table once more recapitulates many observations already made above: towards the end part of the scroll, namely columns 14 and 16-19, the close parallelism with M manuscripts is strongest and easiest to demonstrate. In these columns, the battle instructions alternate with the encouragement speeches given by the chief priest, the trumpets of memorial, the trumpets of the slain and the trumpets of summoning are used to direct the battle against the Kittim, and people with ram's horns participate in this directing together with priests

and Levites. 4QM manuscripts show that this war scenario was known and actively copied and reworked. Furthermore, on the basis of the existing material, it seems that this part of all the 1QM material probably was under active discussion for the longest period of time. 4QM manuscripts demonstrated that the battle instructions were considered to be worth transmitting more or less as they were while the speeches and hymns could be more freely chosen and reworked, created and rejected. The stabilized position of the instructive material is also demonstrated by the fact that although there is a kind of updated version of the battle instructions in column 8, the end part of the Scroll was still considered worth preserving.

The war cry preserved in 1QM 12 and 19 and in 4Q492 is an interesting example of material that was considered to be important and actively studied and copied. In the manuscripts, different phases of this material have been preserved: 4Q492 can be understood as a “study copy” where the hymn known in 1QM 19 was studied. After that, the hymn was reused in a new context in 1QM 12. Although, for example, both 4Q491a and 4Q492 can be seen as “earlier versions” of something that is later copied to 1QM, it is clear that the manuscripts cannot be understood only by situating them in the chronological model of “textual history”: it is very probable that all these manuscripts had different purposes of use and/or different audiences. While 1QM was a “showroom copy” and aimed at a large audience, 4Q491a was probably targeted at a narrower (elite) group of people – and 4Q492 can be defined mainly as a draft version.

Manuscripts 4Q491b and 4Q493 have preserved material that can be classified as representing remote parallels to 1QM. They both include battle instructions which are, however, somewhat different from those known in 1QM. For example, in 4Q493 there are weapons and trumpets that are not known in any other M text and in 4Q491b, the ambush is an important part of the war tactic while in 1QM it is mentioned only in passing. In both texts, purity is one of the themes whereas in 1QM 16–17 it is not discussed at all and in 1QM 7–9, it seems to have demanded detailed explanation. Thus, it can be said that manuscripts 4Q491b and 4Q493 represent alternative and more exploratory visions of the war in comparison to 1QM. Their influence can be distinguished in 1QM but they were not copied as they were and they were not considered to be relevant as such for the audience of 1QM.

The late parts of 1QM are probably at least a part of the encouragement speech in column 17, column 13 (which includes the idea of the heavenly savior figure as does column 17, as well), column 1 (which introduced readers to the compiled composition) and the battle instructions in column 7–9 (into which different traditions describing the progress of the battle were compiled). Probably the compilation of columns 7–9 was made first and the heavenly

figure and column 1 were added in the latest phase. What should be noted, however, is that in its present form, 1QM is specifically a compilation and it is probable that its compilers/redactors and readers also understood it to be such. This means that the compilers/redactors did not necessarily aim at complete coherence but were particularly interested in compiling the material. Still, some of the differences between the closely parallel text passages can be explained by noting that some of the reworkings were needed in order to inject a passage into a new context in the compiled 1QM.⁵⁴

What is here concluded about 1QM is based on a thorough reading of Cave 4 M manuscripts, not on literary-critical scrutiny of 1QM itself. The observations made on 1QM are a by-product of studying the other War Text material, not the main result of it. In this sense, this study differs considerably from the most recent published monograph concerning the War Texts, namely Brian Schultz's *Conquering the World*. Schultz's study is important in the respect that it is one of the few monographs which have been published on the War Texts since the publication of 4QM manuscripts. Contrary to this study, Schultz concentrates on the study of 1QM and reviews the other War Text material on the basis of the observations made on it. According to him, 1QM columns 1 and 2 include a description of a two-stage eschatological war, based on the prophecy of Micah 5:4–7. He states that column 1 describes the beginning of the war whereas column 2 seems to suggest that one stage of the war had already passed before it. Also, Schultz argues that the list of enemies preserved in column 2 is only complete if it is suggested that the enemies mentioned in column 1 are already destroyed.⁵⁵ After perceiving this model of the two-stage war in columns 1 and 2,⁵⁶ Schultz argues that, actually, the text in columns 3–19 and the text in 4QM manuscripts fit into it as well and all their text material can be placed either in the first stage or the second stage.⁵⁷ According to him, the two-stage war was first introduced in 1QM columns 1–9, soon after the Maccabean Revolt or just at the beginning of the Hasmonean period. This first

54 See, e.g., the reworkings of the text of 1QM 19 before adding it to 1QM 12.

55 See, e.g., Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 236–39.

56 Schultz argues that behind these two phases, three different traditions can be distinguished. The first tradition is the tradition concerning the war of the divisions. It was first represented by column 2 and later, columns 3–9 enlarged it (only after columns 1 and column 2 were joined together). Two other traditions are related to the war against the Kittim: The second tradition discusses the initial war against the Kittim and is based on Dan 11. Column 1 reflects this tradition. The third tradition, the universal war against the Kittim, is based on Ezek 38–39 and is represented by columns 15–19. See, e.g., Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 323–26.

57 See, e.g., Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 385: "Only with a proper understanding of the relationship between cols. 1 and 2 it is possible to correctly read the rest of M."

vision was strongly dependent on Dan 11:40–45 and the enemy was understood to be the Seleucids.⁵⁸ The second stage of the war was further developed when the Roman occupation became a real threat, and consequently, columns 10–19 were added to columns 1–9 soon after the middle of the first century BCE.⁵⁹

Contrary to the present study, Schultz presupposes that 1QM was meant to be a logical description (of the two-stage war), not just a compilation of material discussing the same theme. However, the wide range of material preserved in the Scroll demonstrates that 1QM cannot be placed under one genre or one definition⁶⁰ – and if anything, its own multiple claims to be a *serekh* or a compilation of *serekhs* should be taken into account when considering the genre question. Also, copying several war visions simultaneously indicates that there was no particular need to produce a single coherent war vision. In addition, many of Schultz's conclusions differ from what is suggested here. For example, according to Schultz, it is more probable that the instructive section of columns 7–9 was shortened in columns 15–19 than that the instructions of columns 15–19 were further developed in columns 7–9.⁶¹ Also, the conclusion about the lateness of columns 15–19 differs from what was achieved in this study. Schultz's results reflect his premise that the amount of preserved material is not an interesting factor when evaluating the evolution of the texts. In other words, his understanding is not based so much on the manuscript evidence as a whole but on the study of 1QM and the theory that was developed on the basis of it. Schultz's strength is that he creates a model in the light of which all the War Text material can be reviewed and that he aims to tie the text of the Scroll to the historical situations.⁶² On the other hand, Schultz's weakness is that in his study the theoretical model becomes even more significant than the actual material.⁶³ In the present study, much remains open

58 See, e.g., Schultz *Conquering the World*, 392–93.

59 See, e.g., Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 401–2.

60 Alex Jassen shares this opinion when arguing that “the *War Scroll* is a complex text that defies simple categories” and “we should avoid trying to identify a single genre and function for the text.” See Jassen, “Violent Imaginaries and Practical Violence in the *War Scroll*” in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*, 175–203 (2003).

61 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 385.

62 However, one can ask whether a text like 1QM was ever intended to be situated in any particular historical context – or whether its symbolic character and creative use of old traditions rather indicate that it was meant to be applied in different contexts.

63 The model can be characterized as theoretical since it is based on the close reading of two columns only, namely 1QM columns 1 and 2. The text of the whole Scroll does not proceed coherently according to this model: especially in the case of the hymnic section in columns 10–14, Schultz has to study each part of the section and decide whether it

to discussion, but the study aims to take the manifold material seriously: all the pieces are important and any of them can provide new information on the multiphase transmission process.

Another important study of the 1QM and 4QM manuscripts, unfortunately unpublished, is Rony Yishay's dissertation *The Literature of War at Qumran* (ספרות המלחמה בקומראן). Yishay's starting point is similar to that of the present study: instead of 1QM, she places the Cave 4 M manuscripts under the microscope (although 1QM is also included in the analysis). In many respects, Yishay's conclusions are close to those of this study. For example, she discerns two "literary models" (דגמים ספרותיים),⁶⁴ which she treats as focal when analyzing the texts and their transmission – and this is reminiscent of the way in which the present study scrutinizes the text by way of two subgenres, battle instructions and encouragement speeches (although these "models" and "subgenres" are not directly equivalent to each other). For Yishay, these central models are "war descriptions" and "thanksgiving hymns." In regards to the former, Yishay argues that three war narratives (which in the present study are labelled "battle instructions") reflect one tripartite model of the war description, which consist of (1) the first battle (with several stages), (2) an encouragement speech, and (3) the second battle (with several stages). This model is preserved in its entirety in 4Q491 11 ii/1QM 16–17 and partly in 4Q491 10 ii/1QM 16 and 4Q491 13/1QM 17, and is also modified in 4Q493.⁶⁵ As regards prayers that have been preserved very similarly in different manuscripts (those in 1QM 12/1QM 19/4Q492, 1QM 14/4Q491a and 1QM 13/4Q495), Yishay suggests that they are all based on hymns that already existed before the War Texts preserved for us, and thus defines them as "independent units" (יחידות עצמאיות).⁶⁶

While on the one hand, the present study confirms Yishay's many observations of the similarities and differences between the M manuscripts, on the other hand, I regard suggesting common literary "models" for explaining the similarities as questionable. According to Yishay, the authors of the War Texts seemed to be piecing together a jigsaw puzzle, or as she puts it, putting together "building-blocks".⁶⁷ They used existing literary models and prayers and composed their texts on the basis of these (although they reworked some parts for their own purposes when required). The presents study aims to draw

belongs to the first or the second stage of the war (see, e.g., Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 255–8). Thus, the critical question is whether Schultz is actually creating a coherence by categorizing the material in order to fit it into one or the other of the two stages of the war.

64 Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 323.

65 Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 324.

66 Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 323.

67 Yishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," 310.

a more nuanced picture of the similarities and differences between the texts, analyzing the material as it is and avoiding the use of theoretical sources that are not in any way verifiable. This is also true for terms such as “recension” and “edition”: While Yishay argues that it is impossible to discern the different “recensions” or “editions” of the War Texts due to the fragmentariness of the material,⁶⁸ the present study seeks to understand this material primarily as concrete manuscripts, as opposed to abstract products of independent textual development. Furthermore, the present study aims for greater accuracy in using terms in any case. For example, the term “description” (תיאור) is not especially apposite when defining texts that are clearly instructive, divided into different lists and/or instructions, and often understand themselves as *serekhs*, rather than as narratives or visions.

The undeniable strength of Yishay’s study is that she gives priority to the previously overlooked (long unavailable) Cave 4 material and takes the fragmentary nature of this material seriously, being careful not to draw overly bold conclusions. Yishay’s weakness is that her carefulness leads her to base her explanations mostly on theoretical models rather than on concrete material, and this often leads to more questions than answers. For example, defining certain prayers as “independent units” calls for more detailed discussion on how and for what purposes these units were created and in what form they were available to the authors. However, Yishay’s study is in many ways an important pathfinder for all who aim to accept the challenge of explaining the multiple M manuscripts.

68 Yishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” 323. See also the English abstract in which Yishay argues: “Due to the paucity of remains extant from cave 4 manuscripts and their fragmentary condition, it cannot be determined whether they contain different recensions, editions or only slight reworking of the basic sources.”

Section Markers in M Tradition

The paragraph division of 1QM was already discussed in Section 3 of Chapter 1 and the *vacats* of other M manuscripts were briefly dealt with in the analysis section as well. It was demonstrated that *vacats* are not the only way to divide the text into paragraphs: in the case of 1QM, for example, the titles given to different rules form an important way to outline and understand the text. The difference between the small (half-line) and large (full-line) *vacats* in 1QM is not clear but it should be noted that of the six named rules in 1QM, only half are preceded by an empty line.¹ This means that of 11 preserved empty lines in 1QM,² only about one-quarter precede a new rule section while half of the rules are preceded by a smaller, half-line *vacat*. The fact that the larger *vacats* do not go hand in hand with the *serekh* sections indicates that the empty lines do not necessarily have to do with the contentual division of the text.³ Instead, it seems that at least some of these large *vacats* have more to do with the sources the author/compiler of 1QM used and the changes he possibly made to the text. This can be demonstrated with the five empty lines in the final part of the scroll (i.e., columns 9–19):

- 1) The *vacat* in 1QM 12:6 precedes the war cry which is known in two different manuscripts (1QM and 4Q492) and three different sheets (1QM 12, 1QM 19, 4Q492). As was demonstrated in Section 2 of Chapter 2, 1QM 19 and 4Q492 represent an earlier version of this hymn while in 1QM 12, some changes were made in order to fit the hymn into its present context. Thus, in the case of 1QM 12, it is clear that a source was used and the source is even preserved for today's scholars. What precedes the *vacat* in line 12:6 (i.e., 1QM 10:1–12:5) is something that is not known from Cave 4 manuscripts.
- 2) What follows directly after the *vacat* in 1QM 13:17 cannot be exactly determined because of the fragmentary condition of the manuscript at this point. What is noteworthy is that soon after the fragmentary lines, there

1 See 2:15 before the rule of the trumpets, 3:12 before the rule for the banners of the whole congregation, 16:2 before the rule that shall be carried out.

2 Note that the number of empty lines is not necessarily exact: in some cases, it is possible that the *vacat* was not meant to be long but since the text comes to its end very near the end of the line, there was no choice other than leaving the following line empty (see 1QM 5:15, 6:7, 6:18).

3 Note also that in 4Q491 fragments 1–3 the *serekh* is not preceded by a *vacat* (cf. line 6).

- follow a rubric and a thanksgiving hymn which have parallels in 4Q491 fragments 8–10 i. As demonstrated in Section 1.3 of Chapter 2, the rubric is in a different place in 4Q491: while in 1QM, it precedes the hymn, in 4Q491 it follows the hymn, it seems that there was a point of change shortly after the large *vacat* in column 14. What precedes the *vacat* in line 13:17 (i.e., 1QM 13:1–16) may be at least partly parallel to 4Q495, but as demonstrated earlier (in Section 3 in this chapter), there are several reasons to suggest that column 13 was a late part of the compilation of 1QM.
- 3) The *vacat* in 1QM 16:2 precedes the section which has its parallel in 4Q491 11 ii. What is noteworthy is that what precedes fragment 11 column 2 is totally different than what precedes 1QM 16:3: in 4Q491, there are the self-glorification hymn and the song of praise (in fragment 11 column 1) while in 1QM, there is column 15 (or to be more precise, lines 15:4–16:1) which seems to be a unique passage in comparison to other M manuscripts.
 - 4) The *vacat* in 1QM 16:10 has its equivalent in 4Q491a, namely, in fragment 11 column 2 line 8, although in that manuscript, the *vacat* is smaller, only a small space in the middle of the line. What may also be noteworthy is that quite soon after this *vacat*, there is an encouragement speech (1QM 16:15–17:3/4Q491a fragment 11 column 2 lines 11b–18) that was clearly reworked when the text known from 4Q491a was used in 1QM.
 - 5) In the case of the *vacat* in line 18:8, it is difficult to evaluate what the empty line is for; there is no other manuscripts preserved where there are parallels to the text around the empty line. It seems that the *vacat* here separates two hymns. It is quite possible that these two hymns came from different sources, but, as already mentioned, there is no evidence to validate this suggestion.

To sum up, in three cases, the *vacat* precedes a part of the text that is known from somewhere else but that has been modified (cases 1, 2 and 4). In two or three cases, the *vacat* follows a unique part of the text and precedes a text that is also known somewhere else (cases 1, 3 and perhaps 2). All in all, it seems that most of the large *vacats* can be explained as indicating different sources⁴ and/or changes made in the text following the *vacat*.

When scrutinizing the beginning of 1QM, the task of determining the meaning of the large *vacats* is more difficult since there is no manuscript evidence for the possible sources and/or changes made to them. However, the suggestion that the empty lines have to do with the sources and the changes is quite easily applied to the beginning of the scroll (columns 1–8). There, the empty

⁴ A source it not necessarily an existing literary source; it is equally possible that the author/compiler of 1QM created some parts of the text himself while compiling the material.

lines separate different lists. It seems logical to think that, for example, the list of the trumpets and the list of the banners may be based on different sources: the banners do not occur elsewhere in 1QM so it is not far-fetched to think that they came from a source not known elsewhere. Similarly, the rule for the trumpets may come from an unknown source: there are trumpet lists in other manuscripts and sheets but they are not similar to that in lines 2:16–3:11.

In addition to the large, whole-line *vacats*, there are some other cases in which the use of *vacats* may indicate changes that were made to the texts. An illustrative example is the poetic text unit preserved in 4Q492, 1QM 19 and 1QM 12. As noted in Chapter 2, the texts of 1QM 19 and 4Q492 follow each other closely and the text in 1QM 12:8b–16 is a slightly modified version of them. However, even the texts of 1QM 19 and 4Q492 are not entirely similar: while in 1QM 19, the hymnic part of the text proceeds without any breaks, in 4Q492, the hymnic part is divided into three sections: small *vacats* in the middle of lines 5 and 7 separate three poetic passages (4Q492 fragment 1, lines 1–5a, 5b–7a, 7b–8). In 1QM 12, the corresponding part of the text (12:8b–16) proceeds without *vacats* as well. What is noteworthy is that the small additions made to the text of 1QM 12 in comparison to that of 1QM 19/4Q492 are made near the parts in which 4Q492 has *vacats*. In the second and the third poetic passages, the small additions or changes come shortly after the *vacat* (cf. 4Q492 5–6/1QM 12:13b, 4Q492 7/1QM 12:15b) and, in the case of the first poetic passage, there are two additions before the *vacat* (4Q492 4–5/1QM 12:12–13).⁵ This suggests that the *vacats* and the additions and changes could have something to do with each other. Since the same hymnic part of the text occurs two times in 1QM, it obviously is something that was considered to be important, and the additions and changes made in this part of the text may have required its study. In 4Q492, the text is divided into smaller units which may indicate this kind of study: before making any changes to the text, it was thoroughly analyzed and the modifications were situated near the beginning or the end of each part of the text. Also, it is possible, that the *vacats* were used to indicate in which places the additions were to be placed.⁶

5 In addition to these, there is a larger addition in 1QM 12 lines 8–9. Whether it comes shortly after a *vacat* in 4Q492 is impossible to say since there is no text preserved (cf. 4Q492 1).

6 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 64, suggests that both 1QM and 4Q492 were copied by the same scribe. He considers them as an example of the diversity of sense divisions that are used in M manuscripts: “even the same scribe can record different sense divisions for a [*sic*] same text.” According to Schultz, it is clear that 4Q492 is chronologically earlier than 1QM and he explains that the scribe of 1QM “thought it useful to keep that third sense division” (i.e., the one in line 4Q492 4–5/1QM 12:12–13) since the third break “reflects a much greater

TABLE 49 Themes in 4Q491 fragments 1–3, lines 6–11 and 1QM 7:3b–7^a

4Q491 fragments 1–3	1QM 7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Groups that are not allowed to enter the camp: children, women (line 6b) – Craftsmen, smelters, appointed men in the war + <i>vacat</i> (7a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups that are not allowed to enter the camp: children, women, lame, blind, crippled, blemished, unclean; requirements for war: voluntariness, perfection, readiness (lines 3b–5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Distance between camp and latrine (7b–8a) – Taking care of the daily duty during the war, gathering to the house of meeting + <i>vacat</i> + passing in front of the troops (8b–10a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction and its reasons: seminal emission; angels are present in the war (6a)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Restriction and its reasons: seminal emission; angels are present in the war (10b) – Proceeding towards the battle (11a–) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance between camp and latrine (6b–7)

a The arrows demonstrate where the similar themes are discussed

As regards 4Q491b, within the rule for the encampments there, there are two *vacats* (see lines 7 and 9). Both *vacats* are within the part of the text that forms a remote parallel to the 1QM section 6:19(?)–7:7 discussing purity issues. As was demonstrated in Section 1.1 of Chapter 3, the texts in 4Q491 fragments 1–3 lines 6–11 and in 1QM 6:19(?)–7:7 resemble each other but what is different is that the purity issues in question are presented in a different order. Table 49 illustrates this.

As the table shows, all three purity issues that are common to both passages are delimited in their own sections with the help of *vacats* in 4Q491b. In 1QM, by contrast, the purity theme is discussed in the same section treating the restrictions imposed on the soldiers (1QM 6:19–7:7). As was concluded in Section 1 of Chapter 3, the different order of the themes probably reflects a different understanding of the presence of angels: In 1QM, the whole camp served as the tent of meeting and the presence of angels was not limited to the battlefield only. In 4Q491b, the angels are not present in the camp but only

thematic shift” than the other two (cf. Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 65). However, this does not explain the relationship of the three occurrences of the hymn.

on the battlefield, and therefore, before going to the battlefield, the gathering to the house of meeting is needed. It may be possible that the text material known in 4Q491b (and later in 1QM 7) is another example of a text that was studied and outlined with the *vacats* in order to collect and reorganize the important issues concerning purity. It should also be noted that the small hyphens written at the right edge of fragments 1–3 of 4Q491b were probably meant to serve as section markers,⁷ and this makes it very likely that the *vacats* were there for some other purpose.

If the suggestions introduced above are on the right track,⁸ it means that studying and outlining a text with *vacats* could lead to quite different results. It could lead to copying the text almost as it was, just making a few additions in order to fit it to its new context. Or it could lead to picking up the themes that were found to be important and reorganizing them into the new context. In the case of 4Q492, the copying was more faithful since the text that was studied was already accepted as a part of a larger compilation (1QM). 4Q491b, for its part, represents one of the exploratory visions of the end-time war and the purpose was not to copy it. However, the purity theme was found to be important and it was further developed in 1QM.

⁷ Cf. Section 1 of Chapter 3 and Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 180–84.

⁸ It should be noted that these suggestions are still speculative. One way to make them less hypothetical could be to find some support by referring to other manuscripts of antiquity. Within the limits of this study, this was not possible. In the future, studies discussing the section markers in antique manuscripts in general (and not only within the Qumran material or parts of it) would perhaps be fruitful.

Summary and Conclusions

The object of this study was the Qumran War Text manuscripts, especially those found in Cave 4 (4Q471, 4Q491a, 4Q491b, 4Q492–4Q497) that have not yet received the scholarly attention they deserve. There has been a clear need to study the Cave 4 M manuscripts in detail and in their own right, not just as additional evidence of the large and well-preserved War Scroll, 1QM. In addition, the larger aim of the study was to figure out what the study of the War Text manuscripts – which were known to be at least partly parallel to each other on the textual level – contribute to our understanding of the lively scribal culture as reflected in the manuscripts found in the caves at and near Qumran.

The study was divided into two main parts, analysis (Part 1) and discussion (Part 2). In the first main part, the manuscripts were studied one by one, and in the second part the whole ensemble was put under scrutiny. The analysis part began with a brief introduction to 1QM. Although this manuscript is not the main focus of the study and although it has been much studied previously, it was determined to be reader-friendly to start with it: 1QM was shown to be such an important point of comparison when analyzing the other War Texts that it was necessary to outline its features and contents to the reader before going to the main material of the study. The main conclusion in Chapter 1 is that as a large manuscript, which is also beautiful to look at, 1QM represents “showroom quality” among the scrolls and in this sense, it clearly stands out from the other War Texts. These observations already reflected the idea that in the later chapters became substantial: that literary dependence is not the only aspect to explain the mutual relationships between the manuscripts but material factors and possible different purposes of use are also something to pay attention to.

After the short overview of 1QM, attention in Part 1 was focused on the Cave 4 War Text manuscripts. The fundamental task of the study was to produce a close-reading analysis of these fragments and manuscripts. The results of the analysis were reflected in the order in which the discussion on the manuscripts was arranged: The manuscripts with close textual parallels to other War Texts were studied first in Chapter 2, and in Chapter 3 the manuscripts representing more unestablished war visions were discussed. In both of these groups, the manuscripts were relatively well preserved. From Chapter 4 onwards, more poorly preserved manuscripts were analyzed: first, the two manuscripts that were earlier considered to overlap with 1QM 2, then the very poorly preserved manuscript 4Q495, and third, the two opisthographic manuscripts in which something considered to belong to the War Texts is inscribed on the verso sides

of papyrus scrolls. In Chapter 7, the so-called *Sefer ha-Milhamah* manuscripts from Caves 4 and 11 were taken under discussion.

In Chapter 2, before going into the detailed analysis of each fragment of 4Q491a and the text preserved on it, it was necessary to take a glance at the fragments Baillet gathered under the designation 4Q491 and their research history. This ensemble of fragments has been one of the most problematic cases in characterizing manuscripts among the War Texts, and the principles according to which the fragments are joined together (or not) and located in the supposed manuscript and the question about the definition of the term “manuscript” become very acute with it. During the history of the study of the War Texts, this group of fragments has been understood as belonging together as one manuscript, or divided into two or three different manuscripts. In this study, the third option, namely separating manuscript 4Q491c (fragment 11 column 1 and fragment 12) from 4Q491a was shown to be worthy of criticism: the shape and size of the fragments indicate their belonging together with 4Q491a, and the counter-arguments considering the varying line spacing, a script different from that of 4Q491a, and the deviating content are not convincing, all of these being phenomena that can be demonstrated to exist in other unbroken manuscripts as well. In contrast, a definite answer to the question of whether manuscripts 4Q491a (+4Q491c) and 4Q491b should be understood as only one manuscript or as two separate ones was not given. There are valid arguments for both options and the final decision between them still needs more materially oriented work. In this study, manuscript 4Q491 was divided into two, 4Q491a (+4Q491c) and 4Q491b, without losing sight of the possibility that these two might still belong together.

Further study of 4Q491a in Chapter 2 demonstrated that the arrangement of the fragments considered to belong under this designation also remains open. However, the preliminary results of the study using the method of material reconstruction (Davis) demonstrate that Baillet’s arrangement needs reworking. This is not surprising since Baillet himself already said clearly that his arrangement was only based on the fragments’ apparent textual parallelisms with 1QM and not on any material study. Although the arrangement is not certain, it was possible to make some material conclusions: It was noted that 4Q491a is a relatively small manuscript with small and neat scripts and tight line spacing, and that the two scripts preserved in the manuscript indicate that 4Q491a was not written by one scribe. Furthermore, it was concluded that since there was more than one scribe and since the script is neat and small, inscribing this manuscript probably took some time. However, it was stated that the manuscript was probably not meant to be any kind of showroom copy;

the size of the scroll and the script used in it do not indicate any ease of seeing and reading aloud.

As regards the content of 4Q491a, most of it can be quite easily subsumed under two subgenres, battle instructions and hymns/speeches. These subgenres were later shown to be useful in the analysis of the War Text manuscripts as a whole as well. The battle instruction sections were demonstrated to mainly follow the same pattern, the one that is also known especially in 1QM 16–17, and many of them were noted to be close textual parallels with certain 1QM sections. This subgenre was somewhat stabilized and faithfully transmitted in the second half of the first century BCE, although minor changes could still be made. The hymns and speeches, by contrast, formed a subgenre that was easy to modify to suit the prevailing purpose. Another observation was that hymns and speeches appear in sections independent in many senses and it was possible to insert them in completely different contexts as well. The so-called Self-Glorification Hymn (fragment 11 column 1 and fragment 12) is a good example: it was also transmitted as a part of 1QH^a.

When comparing 4Q491a to the other War Text manuscripts, it was noted that some of its themes became more important when the war traditions were compiled and targeted to a new audience: in 1QM parallels, the connection between human and divine beings is further emphasized and the boundary between them is even loosened or eliminated, probably in order to make the encouragement more effective and to whip up the battle spirit.

As is 4Q491a, 4Q492 was also noted to be a manuscript the text of which is in many parts closely parallel to certain sections of 1QM. However, unlike 4Q491a, 4Q492 was shown to be an example of a manuscript that was probably concretely used when collecting the war material for 1QM. It was noted that the text of 4Q492 was written on leather that probably was already in poor condition at the time of inscribing and that this may indicate that the manuscript was meant to be a draft version. Large spaces between lines were also suggested to indicate that this manuscript was probably prepared for study purposes; and what was studied is a hymnic section known in 1QM 19:1–13 – the preserved text of 4Q492 is almost identical with it. The result of this ancient study was noted as being on view in 1QM 12:7–16. This section also closely follows what is known in 4Q492/1QM 19:1–13 but some additions were made, probably mainly in order to fit the text into its present context. In the compilation of 1QM, the section was used to connect different materials with each other: the end part of the Scroll (from column 14 onwards) contains material that was mainly copied from the text that is known also in 4Q491a while the material in the beginning part of the Scroll probably came from different sources.

Studying 4Q491a and 4Q492 together demonstrated that although both of them include close textual parallels to 1QM, their relationship to that larger scroll was probably not similar. While 4Q492 probably was a concrete part of the compilation process of 1QM, the same is hardly true of 4Q491a. The relationship of 4Q492 to 1QM is direct and the author/compiler probably knew the manuscript. What 4Q491a rather demonstrates, together with 1QM, is that certain traditions were carefully transmitted while some of them were more open to change. This does not require that the author/compiler of 1QM should have known the actual manuscript 4Q491a.

In Chapter 3, the discussion turned to less firmly established war visions, i.e., the texts that do not have as clear textual parallels with other War Texts as those discussed in Chapter 2. 4Q491b was first into the focus of attention. It is written with a script which is also known in fragment 11 column 1 and fragment 12 of 4Q491a. The small and neat style with tight line spacing characterizes both manuscripts. Two parallel systems of section markers, small *vacats* and tiny hyphens in the right margin, probably indicate that the text was a subject of study or in the process of being structured differently. Regarding the contents, the text of 4Q491b recalls in some places the text of 1QM, especially that of 1QM 7:3b–7. However, these texts cannot be defined as close textual parallels and 4Q491b also includes much material that is not known in 1QM or any other War Text manuscript. It was nevertheless considered to be probable that, at least in some parts, 1QM rewrites the text of 4Q491b and some thematic changes can be identified between these texts: while in 4Q491b the camp and the battlefield are clearly separated from each other, in 1QM, this border is blurred and angels are not only present on the battlefield but also in the camp. It is possible that since in 1QM the perspective is widened from the priestly characters to the laymen (who now participate in conducting the war together with the priests and the Levites), there was no need to confine the presence of sacredness so strictly any longer. However, both 4Q491a and 4Q491b were noted as indicating that the role of the divine beings in the war was a question with no stabilized answer. This may reflect the general interests of Second Temple Judaism, one of which was the fascination with angels and the heavenly world.

Another manuscript discussed in Chapter 3, namely 4Q493, is written with a somewhat small and tight script, although not as small as 4Q491a and 4Q491b. It was noted that the \imath in the right top column of the sheet may indicate that the sheet on which 4Q493 was inscribed was part of a larger manuscript in which the sheets, perhaps including texts with different themes, were numbered. The wider context of the text preserved in 4Q493 was considered, however, to remain a mystery. The war vision in 4Q493 is strongly concentrated on the

priests' tasks and no soldiers are mentioned at all. Also, the text of 4Q493 introduces weapons that are not known from anywhere else. Nevertheless, many of the themes of 4Q493 are also discussed in other War Texts and it is probable that especially 1QM is somehow related to it: both begin with a title including the word *המלחמה* which may indicate that these texts were consciously intended to be linked. Furthermore, when comparing 4Q493 to 4Q491a and 1QM, it can be noted that in the parts of the texts that mainly relate to priests, the will to fight is not so important since the main task of the priests is to lead the battle, not to participate in the actual fighting. This is even more prominent in 1QM where it is highlighted that the priests are not to go to the battlefield at all (1QM 9:7b–8a).

At the beginning of Chapter 4, it was observed that the manuscripts 4Q494, 4Q496, 4Q497 and 4Q471 are even more fragmentary than manuscripts 4Q491(a, b)–4Q493, and their purposes of use are even more difficult to determine. What is preserved of the text of 4Q494, the latest of the manuscripts labelled with M, was demonstrated to be a close parallel to the text known in 1QM 2. This implies that the material known in the beginning part of 1QM was also transmitted after the compilation of 1QM was ready, in the first half of the first century BCE. In comparison to 1QM, 4Q494 was observed to include one extra *vacat* which may indicate the prevailing ambiguity about the roles of the priests and Levites (whether they are separate groups or not), not only in war but also in general. Another manuscript discussed in Chapter 4, namely 4Q471, is often considered to be a textual parallel to 1QM 2, and has even been labeled as an earlier “version” of 1QM 2. In this study, it was demonstrated that this suggestion must be regarded with suspicion; the possible lexical links are very vague and they are mainly concentrated in fragment 1. Because of the fragmentary nature of 4Q471 and the general nature of the vocabulary preserved in it, it is difficult to conclude anything more substantial about it. In Chapter 5, 4Q495 was shown to be a challenging case as well, only a few partially preserved lines being visible in two small fragments. However, it is probable that there is some degree of textual parallelism between fragment 2 and 1QM 13:9b–12a—and this indicates that although column 13 is probably a late part in 1QM, its text was transmitted in the second half of the first century BCE.

In Chapter 6, 4Q496 and 4Q497 were shown to stand out from the other War Text manuscripts as far as their material is concerned: they are the only papyrus manuscripts among the War Texts. In addition, they belong to the relatively small group of opisthographic manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Both of them are written on the verso side of manuscripts that contain other text(s) on their recto side. 4Q496 and 4Q497 are both very fragmentary but in the case of 4Q496, it was possible to show that it and 1QM are probably

somehow related textually. Although in the case of 4Q497 textual connections to any other manuscripts were impossible to demonstrate, it was noted that the significant material similarity between it and 4Q496 hints that 4Q497 may be somehow related to the M tradition as well. What also became clear in Chapter 6 was that the opisthographic corpus of Qumran still needs further study – and that would probably offer some additional information about 4Q496 and 4Q497 as well. What was possible to conclude about 4Q496 and 4Q497 is that active copying of the War Texts was underway already in the first half of the first century and that these texts were considered to be important enough to be copied on imported papyrus material. The fact that 4Q496 and 4Q497 were copied in the same manuscripts with liturgical texts is noteworthy: there clearly was no hindrance to connecting the War Texts with liturgy, and this may well point to the liturgical use of the War Texts. In general, the manuscripts discussed so far have shown that the war tradition was significant on different levels: it was used both in communal and in more exclusive contexts and probably it was understood to be related to liturgy as well. This theme was further discussed in Section 3 where it was noted that the large amount of hymnic material in 1QM and some other M manuscripts may give further support to the idea that M manuscripts were interpreted liturgically: praying – and inscribing more and more war-related manuscripts – could be understood as concrete weapons with which one could protect himself and others from evil.

The structure of Chapter 7 departed from the structure of other chapters of the analysis part: 11Q14 was shown to be a close textual parallel to 4Q285, at least as regards the main parts that have been preserved of 11Q14, and thus, it was reasonable to discuss the manuscripts together. Also, it was noted that these manuscripts are already much studied, including from the material point of view, and their DJD editions are more in line with more recent editorial principles than those of the 4QM manuscripts. The main conclusion of Chapter 7 was that any relationship of these Sefer ha-Milḥamah manuscripts to other War Texts is difficult to demonstrate: the vocabulary of 11Q14 and 4Q285 does not point to any close textual links between them and other War Texts and as far as the text in the manuscripts is preserved, common themes are also non-existent or at least rest on very thin ice. It was concluded that if one wants to do justice to Sefer ha-Milḥamah texts, they should be studied without linking them to the other War Texts but by continuing to study them as they are.

Throughout Part 1, the study demonstrated the similarities and differences between the editions of the War Texts. In consequence, one clear observation was that when the manuscript is extremely difficult to read, the consensus among the editors is the greatest. This is something that should be taken into account when studying the Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts in general: at least

in the case of the War Texts, differences between the editions usually indicate that there is a relatively well-preserved manuscript in question whereas in the case of much deteriorated manuscripts, the editors tend to trust their predecessors. This easily gives the impression that the most fragmentary manuscripts would be the easiest to read, but although all the editors might agree about a reading, this does not mean that this reading would be certain.¹ This study has also demonstrated the constant need to make clear one's own editorial principles and presuppositions and to give arguments for the chosen readings as well as to inform readers of the photographic sources used in editions.² In the case of the Cave 4 M manuscripts, Baillet set an example for this but not all the later editors have followed it. Duhaime's edition, which was mainly used in this study was proven to be a relatively reliable but not very independent work; it strongly leans on Baillet's pioneering work. Every now and then, there is something to correct, and these corrections were presented in the footnotes of the Hebrew texts in Chapters 2–6.

In Part 2, the War Text material was studied as a whole and along with it the important themes were expanded. The first theme was naming and categorizing the War Texts, which was already shown in Part 1 to be a somewhat vague area. On the basis of the scrutiny in Chapter 8, three conclusions were drawn. The first was that the modern naming of the War Texts is largely based on the best-preserved and the first-found manuscript 1QM. Thus, 1QM has guided both the general interpretation of other War Text manuscripts and their naming. The second conclusion was that the amount of shared textual material and the amount of different textual material seem to have been the most significant criteria in labeling the manuscripts as M texts or something else. Physical facts, for example, have had a lesser impact on labeling. The third conclusion was that the order of the findings and their publication, the early grouping of the texts, and the progress of the study in general have all had their impact on naming the texts. Consequently, it was suggested that in the present situation it would be necessary to give up the distinction between M manuscripts and War Scroll-like manuscripts. Although it is understandable that the two

-
- 1 Of course, what is here demonstrated to hold true for the editions of the War Texts is not necessarily in force for the editions of other texts. However, the case study on the War Texts indicates that it may be necessary to clear up whether the large consensus in the case of the most fragmentary manuscripts is a general tendency.
 - 2 For example, in the general introduction to his editions, Qimron, *The Hebrew Writings*, xv, writes about the photos used on a very general level: "Our readings are based on photographs of the scrolls which were made at different times, using different technologies." Later, in the introduction to the editions of the War Scroll, *The Hebrew Writings*, xxxi–xxxiii, no mention of the photos used is made.

categories may have been considered necessary in order to indicate which manuscripts were extremely difficult to read (those called War Scroll-like), the division into these two manuscript categories causes more confusion than it provides help. For example, while manuscripts 4Q497 and 4Q471 are linked together by referring to both as War Scroll-like, there are no reasons to think that these manuscripts have something in common. Therefore, it is proposed that the siglum M should be used instead of War Scroll-like. With regard to the Sefer ha-Milhamah manuscripts, it was noted that they should not be directly categorized together with the manuscripts labeled with M. However, their present name is not very representative either, and new suggestions would be welcome. One option suggested in Chapter 8 was “M-related blessings” which would preserve the research-historical link with M manuscripts but describe the content of 4Q285 and 11Q14 better.

In this study, paying attention to similarities was taken as a more important goal than paying attention to differences. With this emphasis, it was possible to observe what kinds of subgenres of the War Texts were actively transmitted and to what extent it was possible to change them. In Chapter 9, this was done by taking into account all the M material. At least three different types of relationships between the manuscripts can be distinguished. First, it can be said that some manuscripts show literary dependence. When comparing 1QM 14–17 and 4Q491a, it was demonstrated that the author/compiler of 1QM has used the text known in 4Q491a, modified it a bit (in the case of battle instructions) and sometimes extensively reworked it (in the case of encouragement speeches). It is not clear whether the author/compiler of 1QM actually had the exact manuscript 4Q491a in front of him but he clearly knew its text and used it, aiming at preserving its style and its main content. It can be said that the text known in 4Q491a was a source for the author/compiler of 1QM. Second, it was discovered in the analysis that there are manuscripts that were produced in the process of producing another manuscript. When comparing 4Q492, 1QM 12 and 1QM 19, it was demonstrated that 4Q492 probably is a draft version used in order to modify the text of 1QM 19 to fit in 1QM 12. Third, there are manuscripts that are not copied from each other but that yet have much in common and have probably been somehow related, at least on the level of common themes. For example, it was demonstrated that 4Q493 and 1QM may have been developed without any direct literary dependence but similar themes interested the authors of both texts and the author/compiler of 1QM probably knew a text or texts that was at least reminiscent of 4Q493. The titles given to the texts indicate that both authors clearly thought to represent one *Milhamah* tradition, but they also felt free to modify it for their own purposes, for their own audiences – which probably were different.

Traditionally, scholars have thought that textual growth is a more likely development than abbreviating and/or simplifying texts. According to the material of this study, this assumption is still valid. A general tendency to compile material and organize it in lists and collections characterizes 1QM, which was shown to rewrite several other M manuscripts, most evidently 4Q491a, and very often the changes made to the text are enlargements of some sort. However, the assumption of textual growth should not mean that there would be just a single coherent model of chronological development into which every manuscript can be placed, one after another. In addition to a chronological literary-critical model, other conceivable models are needed. Above, it was noted that, in the case of the War Texts, some of the manuscripts were probably made when studying the war traditions and these study copies may be important simultaneously – just as different studies today can open different but simultaneously significant viewpoints on the same topic. What should also be noted is that a manuscript was not the only significant factor – the act of writing was probably also considered to be something that had importance and influence. By constant writing, the main message of the war visions – i.e., in the end, everything is in God's hands – was made real again and again. On a social level, producing manuscripts was probably one way to make one's own understanding of reality visible. By writing, scribes were able to create trust in the anticipated victory. Also, the different purposes of use and different audiences may explain the parallel existence of different manuscripts. In the case of the War Texts, at least liturgical use and study purposes may have created a need for producing different manuscripts that may still be simultaneously important.

In Chapter 9, Charlotte Hempel's ideas of the possibility of analyzing the profile of different caves and of using this analysis in order to better understand fragmentary manuscripts was discussed. These ideas were already referred to many times in the analysis section. Hempel emphasizes the great number of manuscripts found in Cave 4 and the diversity of their content and gives an explanation for these observations by suggesting that Cave 4 was reserved for the material studied and transmitted by the learned elite of Qumran, in other words, devoted to a more restricted readership than the contents of the other caves. Hempel has tested this suggestion provisionally with the S material. In this study, it was asked what the Cave 4 M manuscripts would look like in the light of this suggestion. Small script, exceptionally tight or exceptionally uneven line spacing and the use of rare and sometimes deteriorated materials are all features that could at least partly be explained by the fact that the manuscripts were not meant for a wider audience – while in the case of 1QM, large bottom and top margins, fine calligraphy, and a limited amount of scribal

intervention indicate that it was a copy made to be on view. After concluding this, it must still be stressed that in many cave 4 instances not enough material – margins, signs, or any other elements – is preserved to prove Hempel's idea conclusively. A good test case would be to thoroughly investigate not only the well-preserved scrolls from cave 1 but also the very fragmentary manuscripts from this cave.³ This issue is here deferred in the expectation of further studies.

Reading the 4QM manuscripts as they are and trying to understand them on the basis of their own premises led to some conclusions with regard to 1QM as well. These conclusions were somewhat different from Brian Schultz's recent study where 1QM was interpreted through the model of a two-stage war which Schultz created according to its columns 1 and 2. Contrary to Schultz, in this study, 1QM was seen as a compilation of war traditions rather than a coherent narrative of the final war. Also, the manuscript evidence from Cave 4 was used to demonstrate which parts of 1QM were actively transmitted, not to offer evidence for a given understanding of the war. The comparison between Cave 4 M manuscripts and 1QM demonstrated the stable position of the battle instructions in the second half of the first century BCE and introduced the hymns and speeches as a subgenre that still allowed literary creativity. Consequently, Schultz's idea of the lateness of 1QM columns 15–19 was not found completely convincing; the overall manuscript evidence leads to the scrutiny of the text in smaller blocks and tracing the possible changes within them.

Although M manuscripts cannot be squeezed into a tight chronological model of textual development, some trends across time can be recognized in the literary development of the M manuscripts: The polarization seems to be stronger in 1QM than in many 4QM manuscripts: the enemies are not described at all in the early priestly-oriented manuscript 4Q493, for example; but in many 1QM passages that are not known in Cave 4 – the blessings and curses in 13:1–6, the encouragement speech in 1QM 15:7b–16:1, and the encouragement speech in 1QM 17:4–9 – the juxtaposition of the righteous and the enemy is very strong. This probably has to do with the different audiences of the manuscripts. The explanation for the emphasis on polarization has often been that it welled up from the actual growing threat, but that is not necessarily the case. It may also be a way for the community's ideologists to strengthen their position and to build up common identity in the community. Among the audience of 1QM, this kind of strengthening may have been possible, whereas the audience of 4Q493 was probably more restricted. It is likely that the emphasis on enemies

3 This was pointed out to me by Annette Steudel.

is better explained through the different audiences of the texts than through the textual development – although these two are not mutually exclusive.

Polarized thinking can be used to boost the will to fight – both in the real war and in building the community's identity. However, in the ensemble of the War Texts, an even more important way to do this was to make promises about the angelic presence in the war and to blur the boundary between human and divine beings. An increased interest in heavenly beings was visible in 4Q491a and in the changes made between 4Q491b and 1QM 9 and between 1QM 13 and 17. Especially the idea of the divine rescuer seems to become more important when the war traditions were combined. The constant assurances of angelic presence among human beings were probably harnessed for psychological encouragement – either of soldiers or of any audience of the manuscripts. Nevertheless, the emphasis given to angelic forces and heavenly intervention probably indicates that the texts were not found to be violence-provoking. What was most important was to trust in God, not to take the law into one's own hands; and following the carefully defined instructions was not primarily to ensure the victory but to give glory to God. In this sense, the M tradition follows in the steps of ideas presented in the Hebrew Bible, for example, in Ex 14:10–14, Ex 23:20–33, Deut 1:27–31, Josh 23:1–16, 2 Kgs 19:20–37, and 2 Kgs 6:8–23.

What can also be noted is a growing interest in laymen and people other than priests which apparently has to do with the aim of making the war traditions accessible to a wider audience. Whereas in 4Q493 the perspective is that of priests, in 1QM the laymen clearly play an important role in conducting the war. It is also likely that the small differences between 4Q494 and 1QM reflect the general ambiguity in interpreting the role of the priests and the Levites that was typical of the era. The task of priests and the role of laymen were probably themes under discussion during the transmission of the M traditions.

Throughout the study, many material details that can be distinguished concerning the manuscripts were taken into consideration. Paying attention to manuscripts as material artifacts is a rising trend: a manuscript is no longer seen as a witness of some literary work but as an interesting research subject in itself. This trend has not yet strongly influenced the scrutiny of the War Texts but this study demonstrates that there are several material facts that are worthy of attention. When interpreting *vacats* and other section markers, it was noted that the ancient understanding was not necessarily similar to the modern one: a modern reader prefers to distinguish a clear division into paragraphs and easily interprets *vacats* as indicating such a division while ancient scribes probably used these blank spaces – at least in the case of M manuscripts – mainly to separate texts from different sources and to study and rework the

text. In Chapter 10 it was suggested that studying and outlining a text could lead to different results, either copying the text and making just a few additions or picking up themes and reorganizing them.

For future research, including with text groups other than the War Texts, this study raises several issues that must be given due consideration. The first one is the need for studying the manuscripts and fragments as they are. This study has shown that 1QM as a model for reconstructing other M manuscripts has in some cases led to all too bold reconstructions and probably also to incorrect arrangements of the fragments. Also, when manuscripts are studied just as “parallels” to 1QM, many other things which might have some significance are easily ignored. For example, the location of discovery of manuscripts is not yet much studied in the case of the M manuscripts and the influence of the profiles of the caves in interpreting the manuscripts is in its infancy. The question of the possible profiles of the caves also opens questions of possible different target groups and users of different manuscripts and possible different purposes of use.

Second, comparing the manuscripts to each other is an important method when studying very fragmentary material, but the points of comparison must be widened. Up to now, in the case of the War Texts, the comparison has been mainly between fragmentary manuscripts from Cave 4 and 11 and the quite well-preserved 1QM. However, there is a clear need to make comparisons between different material groups, for example, opisthographs, and to pay attention not only to the contents of manuscripts but also to their purposes of use. Also, comparing different groups of “multiple” manuscripts, for example, M and S, would be useful. What all this requires is that there must be several conceivable models in scholars’ minds and a chronological literary-critical model cannot be considered the only allowable theory to explain all the issues.

When studying ancient manuscripts, scholars must accept the fact that eventually the texts will always slip through their fingers. Scholars make categories and models in order to better understand their material but all of these will leave some gaps and some questions to which there are no definitive answers. However, this is the very reason why the texts are so intriguing and important: time after time they force us to reevaluate our own thinking and our ability to see alternative options.

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin. "The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4." PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1993.
- Abegg, Martin. "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness." Pages 61–73 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Literacy among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran." Pages 3–24 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Martin F.J. Baasten and W.Th. van Peursen. OLA 118. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Alexander, Philip S. "The Material Reconstruction and Genre of 4Q285 (Sefer ha-Milhamah) Reconsidered." Pages 95–113 in *Studia Semitica: The Journal of Semitic Studies Jubilee Volume*. Edited by Philip S. Alexander et al. JSSSup 16. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Alexander, Philip S. "A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah)." *RevQ* 19 (2000): 333–48.
- Alexander, Philip S. "The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–56.
- Alexander, Philip S., and Geza Vermes. *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad*. DJD 26. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Alexander, Philip S., et al., in consultation with James VanderKam and Monica Brady. *Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Askin, Lindsey A. "Scribal Production and Literacy at Qumran." Pages 23–36 in *Material Aspects of Reading in Ancient and Medieval Cultures: Materiality, Presence and Performance*. Edited by Anna Krauß, Jonas Leipziger and Friederike Schücking-Jungblut. *Materiale Textkulturen*, 26. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020.
- Baillet, Maurice. "Débris de textes sur papyrus de la grotte 4 de Qumran." *RB* 71 (1964): 353–71.
- Baillet, Maurice. *Qumrân Grotte 4.III. (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, and Józef T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Qumran Cave 4 XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. DJD 18. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The Sabbath Trumpets in 4Q493 M^c." *RevQ* 12 (1987): 555–59.
- Beale, G.K. *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.

- Becker, Jürgen. *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in Qumran und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Brooke, George J. "Between Scroll and Codex: Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs." Pages 123–38 in *On Stone and Scrolls: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*. Edited by James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Brooke, George J. "Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin: Cultural Complexity and Multiple Identities in the Qumran Library." Pages 119–35 in *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World*. Edited by Mladen Popović, Myles Schoonover, and Marijn Vandenberghe. JSJSup 178. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Brooke, George J. "From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary: The Problem of Re-Naming an Adopted Manuscript." Pages 129–50 in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven. STDJ 96. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Brooke, George J. "The Kittim and Hints of Hybridity in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 17–32 in *People under Power: Early Jewish and Christian Responses to the Roman Empire*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Outi Lehtipuu. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018.
- Brooke, George J. "Physicality, Paratextuality and Peshet Habakkuk." Pages 175–93 in *On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures*. Edited by Sydney H. Aufrère, Philip S. Alexander, Zlatko Pleše. OLA 232. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Brooke, George J. Review of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. *JTS* 48 (1997): 576–79.
- Brooke, George J. "Some Issues behind the Ethics in the Qumran Scrolls and their Implications for New Testament Ethics." Pages 83–106 in *Early Christian Ethics in Interaction with Jewish and Greco-Roman Contexts*. Edited by Jan Willem van Henten and Joseph Verheyden. STAR 17. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Brooke, George J. "Text, Timing and Terror: Thematic Thoughts on the *War Scroll* in Conversation with the Writings of Martin G. Abegg, Jr." Pages 49–66 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Kipp Davis, Kyung S. Baek, Peter W. Flint, and Dorothy M. Peters. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Brooke, George J. "The Visualisation of the Sacred at Qumran." Pages 225–40 in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*. Edited by Joel Baden, Hindy Najman, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, JSJSup 175/1. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

- Carmignac, Jean. "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans 'La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contra les Fils de Ténèbres.'" *RB* 63 (1956): 234–60.
- Carmignac, Jean. "Concordance hébraïque de la Règle de la Guerre." *RevQ* 1 (1958): 7–49.
- Carmignac, Jean. *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils des Ténèbres: Texte restauré, traduit et commenté*. Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1958.
- Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Collins, John J. "Epilogue: Genre Analysis and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 17 (2010): 418–30.
- Collins, John J. "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic." *VT* 25 (1975): 596–612.
- Collins, John J. "A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in pre-Christian Judaism." Pages 43–58 in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by John J. Collins and Michael Fishbane. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2019.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Davies, Philip R. *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran. Its Structure and History*. BibOri 32. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.
- Davis, Kipp. "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Colour: Re-Imag(in)ing the Shape and Contents of 4QM^a." Available through www.academia.edu.
- Davis, Kipp. "'There and Back Again': Reconstruction and Reconciliation in the War Texts of 4QMilḥama^a (4Q491^{a-c})." Pages 125–46 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Kipp Davis, Kyung S. Baek, Peter W. Flint, and Dorothy M. Peters. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance." Pages 171–83 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. By Devorah Dimant. FAT 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Dorman, Johanna. "The Blemished Body: Deformity and Disability in the Qumran Scrolls." PhD diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2007.
- Duhaime, Jean. "Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran." *CBQ* 49 (1987): 32–56.

- Duhaime, Jean. "Étude comparative de 4QM^a fgg. 1–3 et 1QM." *RevQ* 14 (1991): 459–72.
- Duhaime, Jean. "War Scroll (1QM, 1Q33); Cave 1V Fragments (4QM1–6 = 4Q491–496); War Scroll-Like Fragment (4Q497)." Pages 80–203 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth with Joseph M. Baumgarten et al. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Duhaime, Jean. *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Fragments*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. "«Règlement de la guerre des fils de lumière»: Traduction et notes." *RHR* 148 (1955): 141–80.
- Eshel, Esther. "471b. 4QSelf-Glorification Hymn (= 4QH^e frg. 1?)." Pages 421–32 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon et al. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Eshel, Esther. "4Q471B: A Self-Glorification Hymn." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 175–203.
- Eshel, Esther. "Self-Glorification Hymn." Pages 1924–26 in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013.
- Eshel, Esther, and Hanan Eshel. "4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll." Pages 277–81 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991, volume 2*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11/2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Eshel, Esther, and Hanan Eshel. "Recensions of the War Scroll." Pages 251–63 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- Eshel, Esther, and Hanan Eshel. "4QWar Scroll-like Text B." Pages 439–45 in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Edited by Stephen J. Pfann, Philip S. Alexander et al. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Falk, Daniel K. "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Study of Ancient Jewish Liturgy." Pages 617–51 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Falk, Daniel K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Falk, Daniel K. "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts at Qumran." Pages 33–87 in *Literature or Liturgy? Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity*. Edited by Clemens Leonhard and Hermut Löhr. WUNT 11/363. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Falk, Daniel K. "Prayer, Liturgy, and War." Pages 275–94 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour*

- of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. Edited by Kipp Davis, Kyung S. Baek, Peter W. Flint, and Dorothy M. Peters. *STDJ* 115. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Feldman, Ariel. "Review of *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Writings*. Vol. 1." *JSJ* 58 (2013): 201–2.
- Fields, Weston. *Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- 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." Pages 140–58 in *Qumran and Apocalypticism*. Vol 1 of *Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. Trans. by Azzan Yadin. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Frey, Jörg. "Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany." Pages 529–64 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. *STDJ* 99. Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 2012.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The 'T' of Two Qumran Hymns." *ETL* 78 (2002): 321–39.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Rethinking the Bible: Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research and Beyond." Pages 19–36 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. *JSJSup* 141. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Review of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, VII: Qumran Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520)*, by M. Baillet." *JSJ* 15 (1984): 157–64.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 Volumes. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.
- García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, eds. *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–31*. *DJD* 33. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Gmirkin, Russel. "The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered." *DSD* 3 (1996): 89–129.
- Haigh, Rebekah. "Oral Aspects: A Performative Approach to 1QM." *DSD* 26 (2019): 189–219.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*. TSAJ 183. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Damascus Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4: The Community Rule Manuscripts as a Test Case." In *The History of the Caves of Qumran*. Edited by Marcello Fidanzio. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies*. TSAJ 154. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Reflections on Literacy, Textuality, and Community in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 69–82 in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*. Edited by Maria Cioată, Ariel Feldman, and Charlotte Hempel. *STDJ* 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

- Hempel, Charlotte. "Review of *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*, by Brian Schulz." *JSOT* 34 (2010): 206–7.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "סַרְעַק *særæk*." Pages 1111–1117 in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*. Band 11. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Damen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 207–24 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Emile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. *JSJSup* 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Sources and Redaction in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Growth of Ancient Texts." Pages 162–81 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*. Edited by Maxine L. Grossman. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Hunzinger, Claus-Hunno. "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran." *ZAW* 28 (1957): 131–51.
- Jassen, Alex. "Violent Imaginaries and Practical Violence in the War Scroll." Pages 175–203 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Kipp Davis, Kyung S. Baek, Peter W. Flint, and Dorothy M. Peters. *STDJ* 115. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Johnson, William A. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Studies in Book and Print Culture. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Johnson, William A. "The Literary Papyrus Roll: Formats and Conventions. An Analysis of the Evidence from Oxyrhynchus." PhD diss., Yale University 1992.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "Quoting, Writing, and Reading: Authority in Peshar Habakkuk from Qumran." Pages 185–211 in *Between Canonical and Apocryphal Texts: Processes of Reception, Rewriting and Interpretation in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Claire Clivaz, Tobias Nicklas, in collaboration with Jörg Röder. *WUNT* 419. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "What is 'Serekh ha-Yahad (S)'? Thinking about Ancient Manuscripts as Information Processing." Pages 611–35 in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*. Edited by Joel Baden, Hindy Najman and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Jokiranta, Jutta, and Hanna Vanonen. "Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of the S and M Documents." Pages 11–60 in *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Mika S. Pajunen and Hanna Tervanotko. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 108. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015.
- Jongeling, Bastiaan. Review of *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*, by Philip. R. Davies. *JSJ* 8 (1977): 197–8.

- Justnes, Årstein. "On Being a 'Librarian': Labels, Categories, and Classifications." Pages 15–29 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 116. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by David Maisel. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.
- Kugler, Robert. "The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites." Pages 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.
- Lange, Armin, and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert. "Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaeen Desert Classified by Content and Genre." Pages 115–64 in *The Text from the Judaeen Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert Series*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD 39. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
- Lundhaug, Hugo, and Liv Ingeborg Lied. "Studying Snapshots: On Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology." Pages 1–19 in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology*. Edited by Liv Ingeborg Lied and Hugo Lundhaug. TUGAL 175. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.
- Lyons, William John. "Clarifications Concerning 4Q285 and 11Q14 Arising from Discoveries in the Judean Desert 23." *DSD* 6 (1999): 37–43.
- Lyons, William John. "Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and the Eschatological Victory." *DSD* 3 (1996): 130–51.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Biblical Quotations in the Community Rule." Pages 81–92 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaeen Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library, 2002.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Serekh Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9/LSTS 62. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles." Pages 165–80 in *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke. JSPSup 7. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Studies in the Temple Scroll." *JBL* 97 (1978): 501–23.
- Milik, Józef T. "Milkî-Sedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens." *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Review of *Osar ha-megilloth ha-genuzoth* by Eleazar L. Sukenik (in French)." *RB* 62 (1955): 64–76.
- Mroczek, Eva. "Thinking Digitally about the Dead Sea Scrolls: Book History before and beyond the Book." *Book History* 14 (2011): 241–69.
- Müller, Reinhard, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny. *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*. RBS 75. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

- Murphy O'Connor, Jerome. "La genèse littéraire de la *Règle de la Communauté*." *RB* 76 (1969): 528–49.
- Najman, Hindy, and Eibert Tigchelaar. "A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature and Text Designation in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *RevQ* 26 (2014): 305–26.
- Nati, James. "The Rolling Corpus: Materiality and Pluriformity at Qumran, with Special Consideration of the *Serekh ha-Yahad*." *DSD* 27 (2020): 161–201.
- Newman, Judith. "Liturgical Imagination in the Composition of Ben Sira." Pages 323–38 in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. Edited by Jeremy Penner, Ken Penner, and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 98. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Nissinen, Martti. "Apokalyptiikka: Mitä, miksi ja milloin?" (Apocalypticism: What, Why and When?). *Vartija* 113 (2000): 13–19 (in Finnish).
- Norton, Jonathan. "Observations on the Official Material Reconstructions of Sefer ha-Milhamah (11Q14 and 4Q285)." *RevQ* 21 (2003): 3–27.
- Orlinsky, Harry M. "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll II." *JNES* 11 (1952): 153–56.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der. *Gott und Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*. SUNT 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Pajunen, Mika S. *The Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381*. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Pajunen, Mika S. "The Praise of God and His Name as the Core of the Second Temple Liturgy." *ZAW* 127 (2015): 475–88.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader. Volume 5: Poetic and Liturgical Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Pfann, Stephen J., Philip S. Alexander, et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts*. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Perrot, Charles. "Petuhot et setumot: Étude sur les alinéas du Pentateuque." *RB* 76 (1969): 50–91.
- Ploeg, Johannes P.M. van der. "La règle de la guerre: traductions et notes." *VT* 5 (1955): 373–420.
- Ploeg, Johannes P.M. van der. *Le rouleau de la guerre traduit et annoté avec une introduction*. STDJ 2. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Popović, Mladen. "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis? A Comparative Perspective on Judaean Desert Manuscript Collections." *JSJ* 43 (2012): 551–94.
- Puech, Émile. "Review of *Qumrân grotte 4 III (4Q428–4Q520)* by Maurice Baillet (in French)." *RB* 95 (1988): 404–11.
- Qimron, Elisha. "ההבחנה בין ו'ו ליו"ד בתעודות מדבר יהדה" *Beit Mikra* 18 (1972): 102–12 (in Hebrew).

- Qimron, Elisha. *מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים, כרך ראשון / The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*, Vol. 1. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010 (in Hebrew).
- Qimron, Elisha, and James H. Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community: Cave IV Fragments (4Q255–264 = 4QS MSS A–J)." Pages 53–104 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Rabin, Chaim. "המבנה הספרותי של מגילת מלחמת בני אור ובני חושך." Pages 31–47 in *הגנוזות: ספר זכרון מחקרים במגילות לאליעזר ליפא סוקניק*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Hekal haSefer, 1961 (in Hebrew).
- Ringgren, Helmer, Heinz-Josef Fabry, and G. Johannes Botterweck, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green and Douglas W. Scott. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977–2012.
- Schäfer, Peter. "Communion with the Angels: Qumran and the Origins of Jewish Mysticism." Pages 37–66 in *Wege mystischer Gotteserfahrung. Mystical Approaches to God*. Edited by Peter Schäfer. Schriften des Historischen Kollegs 65. München: Oldenbourg, 2006.
- Schama, Simon. *The Story of the Jews: Finding the Words 1000 BCE–1492 CE*. London: Bodley Head, 2013.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "'Memory and Manuscript': Books, Scrolls, and the Tradition of the Qumran Texts." Pages 133–50 in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Betsy Halpern-Amaru. STDJ 88. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., and James C. VanderKam, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Schofield, Alison. *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule*. STDJ 77. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Schofield, Alison. "Reading Sectarian Spaces: Critical Spatial Theory and the Case of the Yahad." Pages 176–94 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Study of the Humanities. Method, Theory, Meaning: Proceedings of the Eighth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (Munich, 4–7 August, 2013)*. Edited by Pieter B. Hartog, Alison Schofield, and Samuel I. Thomas. STDJ 125. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Schuller, Eileen. "4QHodayot^a." Pages 199–208 in *Qumran Cave 4XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by Esther Chazon et al. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Schultz, Brian. *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*. STDJ 76. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Shean, John F. *Soldiering for God: Christianity and the Roman Army*. History of Warfare 61. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- Siegel Jonathan P. "The Scribes of Qumran: Studies in the Early History of Jewish Scribal Customs, with Special Reference to the Qumran Biblical Scrolls and to the Tannaitic Traditions of Massekhet Soferim." PhD. diss., Brandeis University, 1971.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual*. CSHJ. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Smith, Morton. "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a." Pages 189–220 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Smith, Morton. "Two Ascended to Heaven – Jesus and the Author of 4Q491." Pages 290–301 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992.
- Sollamo, Raija. "War and Violence in the Ideology of the Qumran Community." Pages 341–52 in *Verbum et Calamus: Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen*. Edited by Hannu Juusola, Juha Laulainen, and Heikki Palva. StOr 99. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004.
- Stauber, Chad. "Prophetic Scribalism: A Semantic, Textual and Hypertextual Study of the Serek Texts." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2013.
- Stegemann, Harmut. *The Library of Qumran: On Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Stuedel, Annette. "Reading and Reconstructing Manuscripts." Pages 186–91 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. T&T Clark Companions. London: T&T Clark, 2018.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. "The Cultic Status of the Levites in the Temple Scroll: Between History and Hermeneutics." Pages 199–214 in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition*. Edited by Mark A. Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton. AIL 9. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Strawn, Brent A. "Excerpted 'Non-Biblical' Scrolls at Qumran? Background, Analogies, Function." Pages 65–123 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by Michael T. Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Sukenik, Eleazar L. *אוצר המגילות הגנוזות*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, 1954.
- Sukenik, Eleazar L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Translated by D. A. Fineman. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955.
- Sukenik, Eleazar L. *Megilloth Genuzoth I*. Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948.
- Tervanotko, Hanna. *Denying Her Voice: The Figure of Miriam in Ancient Jewish Literature*. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Illustrated by a Study of 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman)." Pages 26–47 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New*

- Approaches and Methods*. Edited by Maxine L. Grossman. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "Editing the Hebrew Bible: An Overview of Some Problems." Pages 41–68 in *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg and Judith H. Newman. RBS 69. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "In Search of the Scribe of 1QS." Pages 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, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "Proposals for the Critical Editing of Scrolls Compositions." Paper at SBL Annual Meeting, 2012. Available through www.academia.edu.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "Research of Qumran Scrolls in the Netherlands." Pages 487–509 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. STDJ 99. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "Working with Few Data: The Relation Between 4Q285 and 11Q14." *DSD* 7 (2000): 49–56.
- Tov, Emanuel, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*. Rev. ed. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Israeli Scholarship on the Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert." Pages 297–313 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. STDJ 99. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Some Thoughts at the Close of the DJD Publication Project." Pages 3–13 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed., rev. and enl. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Turner, Eric G. *The Typology of the Early Codex*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Ulrich, Eugene Charles. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- VanderKam, James C., and Peter Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002.
- Vanonen, Hanna. "בת (Tochter)." Pages 548–52 in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten, Band I*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Damen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011.

- Vanonen, Hanna. "Stable and Fluid War Traditions: Re-Thinking the War Text Material from Qumran." PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2017.
- Vanonen, Hanna. "The Textual Connections between 1QM 1 and the Book of Daniel." Pages 223–45 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Vanonen, Hanna. "Vastakkainasettelun aika: Valon ja Pimeyden lapset Qumranin Sotakäärössä" (The Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness in the War Scroll from Qumran). *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 3 (2013): 259–69 (in Finnish).
- Vielhauer, Roman. "Reading Hosea At Qumran." Pages 91–108 in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven. STDJ 96. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Wassen, Cecilia. "Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 499–523 in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schöpflin. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Wee, John Zhu-En. "A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns XV–XIV of the War Scroll (1QM)." *RevQ* 21 (2003): 263–83.
- Weitzman, Steven. "Warring against Terror: The War Scroll and the Mobilization of Emotion." *JSJ* 40 (2009): 213–41.
- Wenthe, Dean O. "The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM." *DSD* 5 (1998): 290–319.
- Wise, Michael O. "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran." Pages 103–51 in *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*. JSP 15. Sheffield 1994.
- Wise, Michael O. "מי כמוני באלים: A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:25–26:10." *DSD* 7 (2000): 173–219.
- Wise, Michael O. et al. "1Q33 (1QM[ilhamah] = 1QWar Scroll [Rule]." *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Woude, Adam S. van der. "Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran (11QBer)." Pages 253–58 in *Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel und Qumranwissenschaft. Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966*. Edited by Siegfried Wagner. Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968.
- Woude, Adam S. van der, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Florentino García Martínez. *Qumran Cave II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. DJD 23. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated by Batya Rabin and Chaim Rabin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977–1983.
- Yishay, Rony. "טור יט במגילת המלחמה (MQ₁) (Column 19 of the "War Scroll" [1QM]) in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls/יהודה מדבר הקברים במגילות*: 8–9 (2010): 175–92 (in Hebrew).

- Yishay, Rony. ספרות המלחמה בקומראן ("The Literature of War at Qumran: Manuscripts 4Q491–4Q496 [edition and commentary] and their comparison to War Scroll (1QM).") PhD diss., University of Haifa, 2006 (in Hebrew).
- Zahn, Molly M. "The Levites, the Royal Council, and the Relationship Between Chronicles and the Temple Scroll." Pages 253–69 in *Law, Literature, and Society in Legal Texts from Qumran: Papers from the Ninth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Leuven 2016*. Edited by Jutta Jokiranta and Molly M. Zahn. STDJ 128. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Zahn, Molly M. "Rewritten Scripture." Pages 323–36 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Index of Ancient Sources

Hebrew Bible		20	279
<i>Genesis</i>		20:2–4	276
8:4	236n41		
36	151	<i>Joshua</i>	
39:4	185n21	23:1–16	311
49:10	232		
		<i>1 Samuel</i>	
<i>Exodus</i>		2:11	185n21
14:10–14	311	3:10	187n30
14:13	187n30		
19:17	187n30	<i>2 Samuel</i>	252
23:20–33	311	7:11	232
28:35	185n21	7:23	37
28:43	185n21	22:35	66n64
29:30	185n21		
30:20	185n21	<i>2 Kings</i>	
34:5	187n30	6:8–23	311
35:19	185n21	19:20–37	311
39:1	185n21		
39:26	185n21	<i>Isaiah</i>	216n52
39:41	185n21	2:3	137
		4:3	137
<i>Leviticus</i>		5:20	112
10	114	10:32	137
10:3	114n141	10:34–11:1	231
		31:9	137
<i>Numbers</i>		35	75
1:50	185n21	35:3	66n64
3	182	35:3–6	75
3:28	183	35:6	75
6:24–25	229	37:22	137
8:18–19	186n25	40–55	143
10:2	266	40:9	137
10:9–19	266	42:11	137n183, 138
11:16	187n30	42:13	129, 137
16	151	52:1–2	137
18	182	54	135
19:16–18	176n85	54:12	134n179, 135
22:22	187n30	62:1	137
23:3	187n30	64:10	137
26:60–61	114		
31:19	176n85	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
		13:16	236n41
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		20:11	129
1:27–31	311	31:12	75n73
3:24	37	33:17	232
11:1	183		

<i>Ezekiel</i>		104:6	236n41
3:7	66n64	104:12	n91
35:12	236n41	119:1	66n64
38:8	236n41	122	252
38–39	281, 292n56	144:1	n91
39:2	236		
39:4	236, 236n41	<i>Job</i>	
39:17	236n41	16:14	129
44:15	183, 187n31	30:23	159n37
		38:23	141n189
<i>Amos</i>		<i>Song of Songs</i>	
3:9	236n41	2:17	236n41
		8:14	236n41
<i>Obadiah</i>		<i>Lamentations</i>	
1:18	151	2:19	75n73
<i>Micah</i>		<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	
5:4–7	292	9:18	141n189
<i>Habakkuk</i>		<i>Daniel</i>	
2:1	183	7	268n16
		7:21	115n142
<i>Zephaniah</i>		10	141n189
1:14	137	11	1n2
3:8	66n64	11:40–45	292n56
<i>Zechariah</i>		12	293
3	1n2	12:3	115
14:3	141n189		
<i>Malachi</i>		<i>Nehemiah</i>	
1:3	151	12:31	122
3:2–3	88n99	<i>1 Chronicles</i>	
		24	182, 185n19
<i>Psalms</i>	1n2, 137, 164n51	24:1–2	185n19
1	1n2	9:17–19	114
18	252		151n23
18:34	66n64	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
20:6	75	13:12	265
37	1n2	20:19	151n23
42	151n23		
44–49	151n23	New Testament	
48:11	137	<i>Luke</i>	
67:2	229	16:8	1n2
69:35	137	<i>John</i>	
78:9	141n189	12:36	1n2
85–85	151n23		
87–88	151n23		
97:8	137		

- 1 Thessalonians*
5:5 1n2
- Ephesians*
5:8 1n2
- Hebrews*
4:3 104n125
9:26 104n125
11:32 104n125
- Jude*
1:11 151
- Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha**
- Tobit* 216n52
- Jubilees* 1, 216n52
- 1 Enoch* 1
- Texts from the Judean Desert**
- Damascus Document (D)* 5n14, 52, 175, 249n1
- CD* 24n100, 41, 251
1:3 236
1:4 79n82
2:6 79n82
3:21–4:4 187n31
4:1 183
4:2 187n31
4:3 187n31
5:17–19 114n140
7:20 236
8:7 239
10:18 239
11:15 239
12:7 239
16:3 190
19:11–13 199
19:19 239
- 1QIsa^a* 8n24, 137, 143
- 1QIsa^b* 8n24, 37
- 1QpHab* 8n24, 45n59, 45n61, 182
6:12 183
9:5 240
- 1QapGen (1Q20)* 8n24
- Community Rule / Serekh ha-Yahad (S)* 1, 24n100, 216n52, 251n6, 254
- 1QS* 7n19, 8n24, 17, 24, 24n100, 34n19, 38, 41, 81n88, 115, 144n192, 145n194, 195, 250–51, 254n14, 273, 289–95
2:19–23 281
2:19–25 187n31
3:13 114n140
3:18–23 114n140
3:23–25 114n140
4:14 79n82
5 169n69
5:8 199n14
5:8–9 199
5:13 79n82
7:8–9 187n31
9:3–11 145n194
9:5 237
- 1QSa* 14, 24n100, 251, 254n14
1:7 79n82
- 1QScb* 254n14
3:25–28 229n28
5:20 236
- 1QM (War Scroll)* 1–17, 21–22, 23n97, 24–25, 31–52, 54–55, 60, 62–63, 82, 103–4, 117, 123, 125–26, 145, 160–61, 164–65, 168n64, 169n71, 170, 176–79, 186n23, 195–97, 200, 203, 209, 211, 214, 222–23, 234, 239, 242, 245, 250–51, 253–58, 261, 268, 270–72, 273n25, 274–75, 280, 282, 285, 289–96, 297–98, 300–12
1 5n12, 11, 104, 184n14, 195–96, 205, 207, 209, 211, 269, 291–92, 293n63, 310
1–3 205
1–4 44

1-8	297	3:8	160n38, 267
1-9	14, 292-93	3:8-9	47, 267
1:1-2:14	44	3:9	268n16
1:1-9:6	10	3:11-12	46
1:2	137	3:12-18	281
1:3	153n33	3:13	250
1:4-9	152, 207-8	3:13-4:8	41, 153
1:6	79n82, 198n8, 207	3:14	175n79
1:9	141	3:15	112
1:10	104	4:2	79n82
1:11-17	210	4:12	176n86, 268
1:13	236, 285	4:9	250
1:14-15	152	4:9-14	41, 153
2	26, 181, 184-87, 188n33, 190-93, 196, 253, 292, 293n63, 301, 305, 310	5:1	236
		5:3	250
2-9	11	5:3-4	160
2-11	284	5:3-14	44-45
2-14	269n19	5:3-18	160
2:1	190, 283-84	5:3-9:9	41, 44-45, 153, 158, 261
2:1-2	13n58, 184	5:4-14	160
2:1-3	183-84	5:6-11	158
2:1-6	184	5:15	296n2
2:2	182, 184, 185n22, 190	5:16	154-57
2:2-3	187	5:16-6:6	44
2:3	183-84, 189n35	5:16-18	160
2:4	170n75, 183, 187n28	6	162, 269
2:5	186, 189n35	6:4	239
2:7	269	6:6	176n86
2:8	170n75	6:7	296n2
2:16-3:11	41, 43, 153, 267n12, 298	6:8-6:17	44-45
		6:12	190n37
3	5n12, 171, 267, 269	6:13	190n37
3-4	268	6:16	268
3-9	47, 112	6:17	117, 134n176
3-14	269	6:18	296n2
3:1-2	172-73, 286	6:19-7:7	299
3:1-3	112	7	47, 162, 171, 271n23, 274-75, 278-79, 300
3:2	160n38, 268n16	7-8	16, 270
3:2-11	267	7-9	242, 261-62, 265-69, 271-75, 288, 291
3:3-4	159		112
3:4	154-57, 159n37	7:3	
3:5	79	7:3-7	158, 165, 271, 299, 304
3:5-6	47, 267	7:5	285n48
3:6	267	7:6	147, 151, 159
3:6-10	159	7:6-7	158
3:7	112	7:7-8	46

<i>1QM (War Scroll) (cont.)</i>		10:1-5	278
7:9	239, 263	10:1-8	281
7:9-11	160	10:1-12:5	296
7:9-12	154-57	10:2	190n37
7:10	175	10:2-5	103, 276
7:10-11	263, 278	10:3	278
7:12	263, 276, 278, 285	10:3-5	115
7:12-13	172-73	10:4	278
7:14	234	10:5	278
7:14-16	278	10:6	278
7:15	112, 262-63	10:6-8	115
7:17	261, 263	10:8	141
8	35n19, 117, 279, 291	10:8-18	242, 281
8-12	269	10:10	190n37
8:1	262-63	10:11	151
8:3	112	10:12	229
8:4	116n146, 263	10:13	237
8:6	116n145	11	115, 117
8:7	116n145	11-14	134n177
8:8-13	174-75, 266	11-15	269
8:9-10	263, 272	11:1-5	281
8:10-13	263	11:5-12	281
8:11	116n145, 262-63	11:6-7	115
8:12	116n145	11:9	176n86, 268
8:13-14	171	11:10	123, 237
8:14	116n146, 261	11:11	134n176
9	160, 176, 271, 311	11:11-12	115, 241
9-19	296	11:12-12:18	281
9:2-6	263	11:17	214
9:3	112	12	47, 129-30, 143-45, 281, 288n52, 291, 292n54, 294, 296, 298, 308
9:4	239	12:1	151, 162-63, 234
9:6	262	12:4	151
9:7-8	263, 304	12:5	234
9:7-9	176, 263	12:5-6	47
9:9	176n86	12:6	44, 296
9:10	41, 239, 250	12:6-16	45n60
9:10-17	153	12:7	141
9:10-16:1	44	12:7-16	129-30, 141, 303
9:15-16	233	12:8	130, 151
9:15-17	94n112	12:8-9	129, 132, 143, 298n5
9:17	152, 160, 262	12:8-13	130-35
9:14-14:15	10	12:8-16	298
10	115, 117, 199, 278-79	12:9	151
10-11	143, 281	12:9-10	129
10-12	141, 275	12:10-12	133
10-14	11, 245, 293n63		
10-15	278		
10-19	14, 195		

12:10-13	129	14:2-3	283
12:11	269	14:2-4	67n70, 138-41
12:12	143	14:2-15	275
12:12-13	135, 143, 298	14:3	n70
12:13	127n165, 129, 143, 298	14:4	65, 76, 141
12:13-15	129	14:4-8	74-75
12:13-16	135-38	14:4-18	68-73, 80, 283
12:14	214, 269	14:5	33, 79, 96, 269
12:15	143, 298	14:6	190n37
12:15-16	129	14:7	63n55, 76-77, 269
12:17	137	14:7-8	214-15
12:17-13:6	44	14:8	n84
12:17-14:1	139, 141	14:8-9	77
12:17-18	130	14:8-15	77-80, 141-42
13	5n12, 141, 139n185, 141n189, 143-44, 199-200, 272n23, 282-89, 291, 294, 311	14:9	96
13:1	41n52, 141, 283, 283n44	14:10	79
13:1-2	44, 284n46	14:11	76
13:1-3	152	14:13	79, 134n176
13:1-6	288, 310	14:16-E	10
13:1-16	297	14:18	84n93
13:4	134n176	15	33, 35n19, 74, 88, 90, 272n23, 278-80, 283-85, 288
13:7	141, 214	15-17	104, 138, 279
13:7-9	141-42	15-19	11, 112, 195-96, 269, 293, 310
13:7-16	275	15:1	269
13:8	79	15:2	153n33, 237, 269
13:8-9	163-64	15:2-3	237
13:9	79, 199n12	15:2-7	84n94
13:9-10	201-2	15:4	141, 283
13:9-12	114n140, 139n185, 198, 305	15:4-5	283, 284-86
13:10	151n24	15:4-7	88-89
13:11	151	15:4-16:1	283, 297
13:12	65, 141, 151	15:5	41n55, 278
13:13	141	15:6	276, 278n34, 279, 284
13:14	79, 141	15:6-7	284-85, 287
13:15	134n176	15:7	122, 285
13:17	44, 296	15:7-16:1	103, 276, 279, 310
14	5n12, 35n19, 58n42, 59, 63n54, 64-67, 74-77, 80-81, 82, 124, 139n187, 143, 145, 213-14, 269, 288, 290, 294	15:9	88, 276
14-17	124, 272, 283, 308	15:10	141
		15:10-11	276
		15:11-16	33
		15:13	88
		15:14	88
		15:15	285
		15:16-18	33

1QM (War Scroll) (cont.)

16	5n12, 74, 88, 117, 279n36, 280, 284, 288, 294	16:16	141
16-17	88, 106, 115, 117-19, 124, 145, 261-62, 265-69, 271-74, 281, 291, 294, 303	16:16-17:9	279
16-18	242	17	112, n140, n149, 280, 291, 294
16-19	289	17:1-9	106
16:1	269	17:4	113, 279
16:2	45, 297	17:4-5	112
16:2-19:E	45	17:4-8	113
16:3	4n152, 84, 153, 250, 261, 263, 279, 297	17:4-9	310
16:3-4	172-73, 266	17:5	113
16:3-8	120-21	17:5-6	84, 151n24, 279
16:3-14	106, 112	17:6	279
16:3-17:14	84-88, n94	17:6-7	33, 94n112, 139n188, 234
16:3-17:15	107-111	17:7	33
16:3-E	41	17:10	45, 105n128, 106, 119, 175, 237
16:4	116, 263	17:10-13	106, 120-21
16:4-5	84	17:10-14	112n136, 116-17
16:4-7	175	17:10-15	266
16:5	116, 265	17:11	112n133, 122, 265
16:5-9	266	17:12	262-63
16:6	262, 265	17:12-13	266
16:6-7	263	17:14	265
16:6-9	174-75	18	33, 284, 288
16:7	110, 119n150, 266	18-19	59n47, 269
16:7-8	263, 272	18:3	237
16:8	117, 263	18:3-5	172-73
16:8-15	85	18:5-6	283, 284, 286
16:8-17:9	85-88	18:6	4n152, 65
16:9	265	18:7	96
16:10	84, 297	18:8	232n33, 234, 297
16:11	263	18:8-13	175
16:11-12	85	18:8-9	47
16:11-13	84	18:10	96
16:11-15	85	18:11-12	33
16:12	112	18:12-14	33
16:12-13	266	19	33, 128n166, 129, 141, 143-45, 281, 284, 288, 291, 292n54, 294, 296, 298, 308
16:13	279, 283n43, 285	19:1	129-30
16:13-14	84, 285	19:1-2	33
16:13-15	263, 283, 284, 286	19:1-5	130-35
16:14	85	19:1-13	129-30, 303
16:15	84, 113, 279	19:2-3	129
16:15-17:3	297	19:3-5	129
16:15-17:9	84-85, 88, 103, 106, 112-15, 263	19:5	127n165, 298
		19:5-6	129
		19:5-8	135-38

19:6	269	<i>4Q216</i>	
19:7	298	1:11	190
19:7-8	129		
19:9-11	33	<i>4Q217</i>	
19:9-13	67n70	2:1	190
19:9-14	130, 138-41		
19:10	269	<i>4Q219</i>	
19:11-13	283, 284n46, 286	2:28	183n11
19:13	232n33		
19:13-14	130	<i>4Q221</i>	
(20)	33	15	183n11
<i>Hodayot</i>	3, 95, 102-3, 216n52,	<i>4QPesher on the</i>	
	236-37	<i>Apocalypse of Weeks</i>	
<i>1QH^a</i>	8, 38, 93, 95,	(<i>4Q247</i>)	237n43
	144n192, 252		
4:4	237	<i>4Qpap cryptA Serekh</i>	
4:5	183n11	<i>ha-'Edah^a</i>	256
11:31	237		
11:33	137	<i>4QCommGen A (4Q252)</i>	
14:1	79n82	6 v 3-4	232
14:15	83n91		
14:32	79n82	<i>4QpapS^a (4Q255)</i>	24n100, 203n3,
15:22	79n82		219n64, 220
16:4	237		
18:30	240	<i>4QS^b (4Q256)</i>	
18:23	240	4	169
26:6-17	13, 14n64		
27:2	79n82	<i>4Q258</i>	
<i>frg. 46</i>	94n112, 95	1	169n68
<i>frg. 56</i>	94n112, 95		
		<i>4QS^c (4Q259)</i>	273n29
<i>1Q36</i>			
16:2	183n11	<i>4QD^a (4Q266)</i>	169, 217-18
		2 i 17	236
<i>4Q107</i>	58n41	3 iii	236
<i>4Q158</i>	257	<i>4QD^d</i>	
		5:4	236
<i>4QpIsa^a (4Q161)</i>			
2-6:19	236	<i>4QD^e</i>	239
8-10 15-29	232		
		<i>4QD^f</i>	239
<i>4QFlor (4Q174)</i>			
1-2 i 11	232	<i>4Q276</i>	214n45
		18	183n11
<i>4QTestimonia (4Q175)</i>	145n194		
<i>4Q184</i>	51n8	<i>4Q285</i>	1, 5-6, 13, 14n64, 21,
			26, 214n45, 222-45,
			253-58, 306, 308

<i>4Q302</i>		<i>4QH^a (4Q427)</i>	14n64, 53n22,
2 ii 7	83n91		93n11, 95-101, 252
11:2	83n91	1 i	94n12, 95
		7	58n41, 96
<i>4Q364</i>		7 i	95
29:2	183	7 i 13-23	96
<i>4Q365</i>		<i>4QH^b (4Q428)</i>	
27:5	183	5:6	237
		10:12	237
<i>4QRP^d (4Q366)</i>		<i>4QH^e (4Q431)</i>	13, 14n64, 95, 252
3	186n22	1	94n12
<i>4QapocrMoses^{b?} (4Q376)</i>		<i>4Q433a</i>	203n3, 220
1 iii 1	236	2:8	83n91
<i>4QApocryphon of Joshua</i>	252	<i>4Q437</i>	93
<i>4Q381</i>	252	<i>4Q471</i>	1, 5, 6, 12, 21, 26, 181,
<i>4Q384</i>			188-96, 214n45,
9:2	190		253, 256-58, 305,
			308
<i>4Q385a</i>		1 2	285n49
17a-e ii 3	83n91	<i>4Q491</i>	1, 5, 6, 7n20, 12,
<i>4QapocrJer C^b (4Q387)</i>			15-16, 21, 23n97,
3:5-6	199		26-27, 46n64,
			47, 49-125, 138,
<i>4QapocrJer C^e</i>			143-73, 178-80, 219,
2 i 8	240		245n54, 251-52,
			254, 261-88,
<i>4QMMT</i>	216n52		290-91, 294,
<i>4QMMT^d (4Q397)</i>			296-97, 299-305,
2:13	236		308-9, 311
		1-3	130, 134n176, 183,
<i>4Q405</i>	93		187n28
		6	234
<i>4Q414</i>	220	8-10	141
		11	172-73
<i>4Q415</i>	220	18:5	237
<i>4QInstr^d (4Q418)</i>	232n31	<i>4Q492</i>	1, 5, 10n37, 12, 21,
69 ii 7	137		26-27, 47, 49,
			115, 126-45, 257,
<i>4QPaleoExod^m (4Q422)</i>	58n41		290-91, 294, 296,
			298, 300, 303-4,
<i>4Q423</i>			308
v 1	151n22	1	45n60, 288n52

4Q493	1, 5, 10n37, 12, 13n58, 16, 21, 26–27, 49, 81n88, 115, 144n192, 166–79, 219, 245n54, 251, 254, 257, 261–66, 268, 271–74, 280, 282, 290–91, 304–5, 308, 310–11	4Q506	204–5, 221n77–78, 282 221n77
7	122	124 3	
14	186n22	4Q509	204, 205n10, 220–21, 242n53, 282 221n77 221n77 221n77
		3 9 10 ii 8 131–132 ii 5	
		4QSongs of the Sage	3
4Q494	1, 5, 12, 13n58, 21, 26, 181–88, 193, 196, 290, 305, 311	4Q512	218n62, 220
4	283, 284n45	4Q522	183n11 183n12
		9 ii 1 9 ii 14	
4Q495	1, 5, 12, 21, 26, 197–202, 294, 297, 301, 305	4Q525	
2	144, 289–90	3 ii 3	181
		4Q546	58n41
4Q496	1, 5–6, 12, 21, 26, 203–12, 215, 219–21, 242n53, 249, 256, 258, 274, 281–82, 290, 305–6	5QDeut	146n5
15 5	176n86	5Q13	254n14
26 1	288n51	nQMelch (nQ13)	236
		219	
4Q497	1, 5–6, 12, 21, 26, 203, 212–15, 219–20, 251, 253, 256, 258, 274, 281–82, 305–6, 308	nQPs ^a	37
		nQ14	1, 5–6, 13, 14n64, 21, 26, 144n192, 222–45, 253–54, 257–59, 306, 308
4QPrayer of Enosh (4Q499)	212n31	Temple Scroll	3, 186n23
		nQT ^a , nQ19	37, 190n38
4Q503	218n62, 220	31:4	183n13
		57	190
4Q504	204n4, 205n10, 219n64	57:13	189n35
3 ii 5	221n77	nQT ^b	37
3 ii 8	221n77	MasPs ^a	37
4Q505	204–5, 282	MasEzek	37

Index of Modern Authors

- Abegg, Martin 14n65, 15–16, 20n93, 33–34, 50n4, 51–56, 58n42, 59, 63n53, 83n91, 85n95, 90–92, 94n112, 104n124, 105n127, 118, 126n157, 127, 128n166, 146, 147n7, 148n15, 149–50, 162, 166n58, 167–68, 177, 181, 184, 188n32, 189–90, 193–94, 195n50, 197–99, 205, 208n23, 211, 212n30, 213–14, 236
- Alexander, Philip S. 6n15, 17, 40n51, 41, 153n34, 218n62, 220n69, 222–24, 226, 230–32, 234, 235n39, 236, 237, 239, 253, 257
- Askin, Lindsey A. 36n29
- Baillet, Maurice 7n20, 10–12, 14–16, 20, 49–51, 52n15, 53, 54n24, 55–56, 58–60, 62–64, 76, 79n84, 82n89, 83, 85n95, 88, 90–93, 94–95n112, 104n126, 105n127, 106, 112, 118, 126, 127n161, 128n166, 132n174, 134n180, 146–50, 160, 162–64, 166–69, 170n76, 171n77, 181n4, 182n6, 184, 197–98, 199n13, 204–5, 208–9, 211–15, 219n66, 220n73, 251–54, 257–58, 266n11, 302, 307
- Barthélemy, Dominique 34
- Baumgarten, Joseph 170n76, 217–18
- Beale, G. K. 114–15
- Becker, Jürgen 139n185
- Brooke, George J. 12n50, 15, 31, 45, 81n88, 203n3, 212, 213n38, 216, 218n62, 219–21, 250n2, 257n23, 268–69, 282
- Carmignac, Jean 9n31, 15n67, 40n49, 250n5, 265n10
- Carr, David M. 24n99
- Charlesworth, James H. 15n69, 63n55
- Collins, John J. 94n112, 115n142, 256n19, 257n21, 260n1
- Crawford, Sidnie White 19n89, 34n18, 38n45, 186n23
- Davies, Philip R. 11–12, 44n57, 64n59, 67, 78n81, 80–81, 132n172, 134, 139n187, 184n18, 185, 186n22, 187n27, 261n3, 265n10
- Davis, Kipp 10n39, 20n92, 50n4, 51n7, 52n10, 54–57, 59–61, 62n51, 91n103, 284, 302
- Dimant, Devorah 37n37, 38
- Dorman, Johanna 158–59
- Duhaime, Jean 5–6, 8n23, 9n33, 10n40, 11n42, 12–13, 15, 17–18, 21n94, 26, 31n3, 32–36, 40, 50, 51n6, 52, 53n19, 58n42, 59, 62–64, 82n89, 83, 84n94, 85n95, 88n97, 90–92, 95n113, 104n126, 105n127, 106n131, 113–14, 118n149, 119n151, 126–27, 128n166, 139, 144n192, 147, 148n15, 149–53, 158, 160, 161n41, 162, 164n51, 166–68, 169n68, 181–82, 185n22, 188–89, 197–98, 199n12, 205, 206n22, 209, 212, 213n41, 214–15, 219n66, 223n5, 225, 232, 254n13, 278n34, 283, 307
- Dupont-Sommer, André 9–10
- Eshel, Esther 32, 52, 58n41, 93n111, 94n112, 96–97, 134n180, 137, 167n60, 181, 182n10, 185, 187–90, 193–95, 252–53
- Eshel, Hanan 32, 134n180, 137, 167n60, 181, 182n10, 185, 187–90, 193–95, 253
- Falk, Daniel K. 37n37, 44n57, 64n59, 204–5, 213n40, 216n53, 217–21, 281, 282n41
- Feldman, Ariel 16n77
- Fields, Weston 34n18, 49n1
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. 94–95n112, 129n168
- Flint, Peter 8n24, 10n37
- Flusser, David 207
- Frey, Jörg 10n37
- García Martínez, Florentino 7n18, 15n71, 51n9, 53–55, 59n47, 83n90, 85n95, 90–92, 95n112, 97, 104n126, 105n127, 118, 149–150, 168n65, 189, 193, 198, 199n12, 205, 222n3, 225, 230, 231n30, 257, 278n34
- Gmirkin, Russel 170, 262n8

- Haigh, Rebekah 45n60, 46n65, 268n16
 Hempel, Charlotte 14n62, 24–25, 38–39,
 40n51, 50n5, 51n8, 81n87, 125, 165, 175,
 253n10, 273–4, 309–10
 Hunzinger, Claus-Hunno 9–10, 50–51,
 52n10, 55, 58n42, 63–64, 67n69, 257
- Jassen, Alex 293n60
 Johnson, William A. 37–38
 Jokiranta, Jutta 4n9, 6n16, 7n18, 12n50,
 14n63, 17, 19n89, 24n100, 25, 62n52,
 127n164, 145n94, 147n12, 25n6, 254,
 256n20, 257n22
 Jongeling, Bastiaan 11
 Justnes, Årstein 3n6, 255n18
- Knohl, Israel 94n12
 Kugler, Robert 186n23
- Lange, Armin 257n21
 Lied, Liv Ingeborg 21n95
 Lundhaug, Hugo 21n95
 Lyons, William John 225n21
- Metso, Sarianna 7n19, 17n78, 115n144,
 253n10
 Milgrom, Jacob 186n23
 Milik, Józef T. 33–34, 40n49, 50n2, 51n9,
 222n1
 Mittmann-Richert, Ulrike 257n21
 Mroczek, Eva 4n9
 Müller, Reinhard 23n98
 Murphy O'Connor, Jerome 81n88
- Najman, Hindy 3n6, 6, 40, 169, 253n12,
 254–55
 Nati, James 212n36, 213
 Newman, Judith 218n62
 Nissinen, Martti 270n20
 Norton, Jonathan 224n13, 226
- Orlinsky, Harry M. 138n183
 Osten-Sacken, Peter von der 7n19, 11
- Pajunen, Mika S. 6n16, 65n61, 66n65,
 218n62
 Pakkala, Juha 23n98
 Perrot, Charles 45n58
- Ploeg, Johannes P.M van der 7n19, 9, 10n40,
 37n36, 139n188, 250n5, 283n44
 Popović, Mladen 179n91
 Puech, Émile 83n91, 183n12
- Qimron, Elisha 16, 40n49, 54, 58n42,
 59n47, 63n54, 83n91, 85n95, 104n126,
 105n127, 118, 149n18, 150n21, 168,
 182n9, 198n9, 199n12, 205n17, 214,
 307n2
- Rabin, Chaim 7n19, 10–11
 Romeny, Bas ter Haar 23n98
- Schäfer, Peter 144n192
 Schama, Simon 268
 Schiffman, Lawrence H. 40n51
 Schofield, Alison 24n99, 271n22
 Schuller, Eileen 98
 Schultz, Brian 7n21, 13–14, 20n93, 31n3,
 32–33, 34n19, 35, 42, 45n61, 47n69,
 50n4, 53, 132n171, 133n175, 167n60,
 171n78, 184, 185n19, 186n22, 187n29,
 195n52, 196, 198n11, 199, 200n16,
 205, 207, 212n31, 214, 221n78, 250,
 261n3, 269n19, 269n19, 283n44,
 292–93, 294n63, 298n6, 299n6,
 310
 Shean, John F. 270–71n21
 Siegel Jonathan P. 45n58
 Smith, Jonathan Z. 23n96
 Smith, Morton 58n41, 94n112, 252n8
 Sollamo, Raija 1n1
 Stauber, Chad 40n50, 41n51
 Stegemann, Harmut 17n80, 38, 39n46,
 58n41, 223n7
 Steudel, Annette 34n19, 310n3
 Stackert, Jeffrey 186n23
 Strawn, Brent A. 15n69, 63n55, 180n92,
 219n65
 Sukenik, Eleazar L. 8, 32–33, 34n19, 35,
 36n29, 250, 257
- Tervanotko, Hanna 186n23–24
 Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. 3, 6, 7n18, 9n32,
 15n71, 16n77, 18–20, 40, 51n8, 53,
 59n47, 83n90, 85n95, 90–92, 104n126,
 105n127, 118, 145n194, 149–150, 168n65,

- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. (cont.)
 169, 189, 193, 198, 199n12, 205n17, 222,
 223n4, 225, 226n23, 230, 231n30, 232,
 233n36, 240, 253n12, 254–55, 257,
 278n34
- Tov, Emanuel 6n17, 7n18, 8n27, 18n83, 19,
 31n3, 34n18, 35–38, 40, 45n58, 46,
 57n39, 58n41, 126n155, 132n170,
 145n194, 153, 166n157, 167n62, 169,
 203–4, 212n36, 214–18, 219n69, 220,
 249n1, 257, 300n7
- Turner, Eric G. 203n2
- Ulrich, Eugene Charles 7n18
- VanderKam, James C. 8n24, 10n36
- Vanonen, Hanna 1n1, 2n3, 4n9, 5n12, 6n16,
 7n18, 14n63, 17, 19n89, 24n100, 47n68,
 62n52, 79n83, 138n184, 147n12, 207, 254,
 256n20, 257n22, 259n26, 267n13
- Vermes, Geza 6n15, 17, 222n3, 223–24,
 230–32, 234, 235n39, 236, 237n44, 239,
 253, 257
- Vielhauer, Roman 252n7
- Wassen, Cecilia 144n192
- Wee, John Zhu-En 67n70
- Weitzman, Steven 102, 103n123
- Wenthe, Dean O. 114n141, 115n143, 265n10
- Wise, Michael O. 10n38, 58n41, 83n91,
 90–92, 94n112, 97, 217n59, 278n34
- Woude, Adam S. van der 222n3, 225,
 230–31, 257
- Yadin, Yigael 8–10, 15n67, 16n77, 31n3,
 32–34, 36–37, 40, 43, 66n64, 79n84, 132,
 134n180, 159n37, 185, 187n26, 199n12,
 250n4, 257, 278n34, 283n44
- Yishay, Rony 13, 14n60, 15–16, 17n82, 32n5,
 53n21, 58n42, 59n47, 61, 63n54, 64n56,
 74n72, 75n74, 78, 81n87, 82n89, 83,
 85n95, 105n127, 118, 128n167, 129n169,
 134n177, 138n183, 141n191, 147, 148n14,
 149–50, 161n41, 162, 166n58, 167n60,
 168–69, 177n87, 182n8, 198n8, 208n24,
 211n29, 214, 294–95
- Zahn, Molly M. 19n89, 186n23