

OUT OF THE WILDERNESS: STUDIES ON THE QUMRAN WAR
TRADITION

by

MICHAEL L. DEVRIES

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theology and Religion
School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
April 2023

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to provide a fresh reading of the Qumran war tradition based on the more complete picture now available of the movement itself, its beliefs and ideologies, including its eschatological imagination. Our proposal is that the authors of the Qumran war tradition drew upon priestly and holiness traditions, specifically priestly warfare ideology, wilderness traditions, and traditions regarding purity and pollution as a framework for the imagined eschatological struggle. These traditions coalesce with the Joshua conquest tradition as well as ideologies of the authors and their movement, such the self-understanding of being exiles in the desert, calendrical concerns, cosmological ordering, the communion with angelic beings, and the eschatological renewal of the earth. What results is a new expression of priestly warfare tradition, one that frames the eschatological struggle between the forces of light and darkness as a return from exile in the wilderness, re-entering the land for the purpose of purifying the earth from the pollution of the wicked. For those who shaped and transmitted the Qumran war tradition, the destruction of the enemy and the re-possession of the land by the elect of God represented the purification and renewal of the earth, so that “there will no longer be any guilt in the land” (4QRenewed Earth [4Q475] 4).

To my wife, Jamie.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As those who have trodden this path well know, the journey to the completion of a doctoral thesis is not one taken alone, but is undertaken with the encouragement, guidance, and support of others. Along the way, I have been fortunate enough to have had mentors, colleagues, friends, and family play an integral role in the process of arriving at this moment. Without them, this project would never have become a reality and for that I am profoundly grateful.

A special word of thanks goes to Prof. George Brooke, who was kind enough to offer valuable insight and suggestions at several presentations of my research. Professor Jutta Jokiranta kindly shared an unpublished chapter on rituals as media. Moreover, our discussions while working together on a chapter on ritual studies and the Dead Sea Scrolls were especially helpful. Conversations with Prof. Brian Schultz, Prof. Cecilia Wassén, and Prof. Thomas Kazen were instrumental in sharpening my thinking on the war tradition as a whole and regarding issues of purity and defilement.

Warmest thanks go to my doctoral colleagues at the University of Birmingham who were a constant source of encouragement and support. I am especially grateful to Joseph Scales, Matthew Hama, Charles Comerford, Anna Shirav, and Ellie Viv.

To my supervisor, Prof. Charlotte Hempel, words cannot express the profound impact you have had on my thinking, my academic journey, and my life. Your insight and investment have shaped this thesis and made it more than I could ever have imagined. Our supervisions became a source of encouragement and support, challenging me to think more deeply and critically about the issues we were discussing at the time. For you, I am eternally grateful. As goes without saying, any remaining errors or deficiencies in this thesis are my own.

Most importantly, to my wife Jamie and our children Joshua, Megan, Mikayla, and Madison, you have been a source of unending love and support throughout this long process. You stood by me every step of the way, believing in me, encouraging me, and cheering me on. This could not have happened without you. I love you all so very much.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS INCLUDING FREQUENTLY CITED SOURCES

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Discovery and Early Publication of the <i>War Scroll</i>	2
1.2 The Qumran War Tradition in Scholarly Discourse	7
1.2.1 Compositional History, Genre, and Textual Development of the <i>War Scroll</i>	8
1.2.2 Thematic and Functional Studies on the Qumran War Manuscripts.....	13
1.3 Framing the Discussion	18
1.4 Towards a New Reading	26
CHAPTER 2 – THE WAR TRADITION MANUSCRIPTS FROM QUMRAN	32
2.1 Introduction: Texts, Manuscripts, and Traditions	32
2.2 1QM/1Q33 (The <i>War Scroll</i>)	35
2.2.1 Material Analysis.....	35
2.2.2 Content Overview.....	39
2.3 Cave 4 War Manuscripts	47
2.3.1 4Q491 (4QM ^a).....	48
2.3.2 4Q492 (4QM ^b).....	51
2.3.3 4Q493 (4QM ^c).....	53
2.3.4 4Q494 (4QM ^d).....	55
2.3.5 4Q495 (4QM ^e).....	58
2.3.6 4Q496 (4QpapM ^f)	59
2.4 Related War Manuscripts	61
2.4.1 4Q497 (4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A).....	61
2.4.2 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B).....	62
2.4.3 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah).....	66
2.4.4 11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milhamah).....	71
2.5 Conclusion	73
CHAPTER 3 – THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE PRIESTHOOD IN TIMES OF WAR	76
3.1 Introduction	76
3.2 Militaristic Role of the Priesthood in the Hebrew Bible	78
3.2.1 Functions of the Priesthood in Pre-Battle Contexts	79
3.2.2 Functions of the Priesthood in Post-Battle Contexts	82
3.3 The Priesthood at Qumran	86
3.3.1 Priestly Terminology in the Dead Sea Scrolls.....	86
3.3.1.1 “Priest” (כֹּהֵן).....	87
3.3.1.2 “High Priest” (הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל) and “Chief Priest” (כֹּהֵן הַרֹאשׁ)	89
3.3.1.3 “Levites” (הַלְוִיִּים)	90
3.3.1.4 “Sons of Aaron” (בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן).....	92

3.3.1.5. “Sons of Zadok” (בני צדוק)	93
3.3.2 Priestly Roles and Functions at Qumran	96
3.3.3 The Militaristic Role of the Priesthood in the <i>Temple Scroll</i> (11QT ^a)	99
3.4 Priestly Roles in the Qumran War Tradition	101
3.4.1 Priestly Terminology in the Qumran War Tradition	102
3.4.1.1 “Priest” (כֹּהֵן)	103
3.4.1.2 “Chief Priest” (כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ)	104
3.4.1.3 “Levites” (הַלְוִיִּים)	105
3.4.1.4 “Sons of Aaron” (בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן)	106
3.4.1.5 “Sons of Zadok” (בְּנֵי צְדוֹק)	107
3.4.1.6 “His Deputy” (מִשְׁנָהוּ)	108
3.4.2 The Role of the Priesthood in Qumran War Tradition	109
3.4.2.1 Cultic Function of the Priesthood	109
3.4.2.2 Liturgical Function of the Priesthood	112
3.4.2.3 Tactical Function of the Priesthood	116
3.5 Conclusion	120

CHAPTER 4 – THE TEXTUALIZATION OF RITUAL AND COSMOLOGICAL

ORDERING	123
4.1 Introduction	123
4.2 Ritual and the Shaping of Reality	126
4.3 Ritual and Ideology	127
4.4 The Textualization of Ritual	129
4.5 Cultic Service in the War Tradition	132
4.5.1 Text and Translation of 1QM 2:1–6	135
4.5.2 Stratification of Cultic and Lay Leadership	136
4.5.3 The Temple and Cosmological Ordering	141
4.5.4 Levitical Position (מַעֲמָד) and the Creation of Order	146
4.5.5 Priestly Courses (מִשְׁמֵרוֹת), Divine Chronology, and Cosmological Order	149
4.6 Cosmological Order and Eschatological Judgment in 4QInstruction ^b (4Q416)	155
4.7 Performance and Cosmological Ordering	159
4.8 Conclusion	160

CHAPTER 5 – WILDERNESS AND WARFARE

5.1 Introduction	162
5.2 The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls	165
5.3 “Exiles in the Wilderness” (1QM 1)	170
5.4 Trumpets in the Qumran War Texts	172
5.4.1 Trumpets in Greco-Roman and Maccabean Warfare	173
5.4.2 Trumpets in the <i>War Scroll</i>	175
5.4.3 The Trumpets of Memorial	182
5.4.4 Trumpets and Memorialization in the War Tradition	186
5.5 The Rule of the Standards in the War Tradition	188
5.5.1 The Rule of the Standards in the <i>War Scroll</i> (1QM 2:16–3:11)	189
5.5.2 The War Standards and Their Inscriptions	191
5.5.3 Standards in the Wilderness Tradition	193

5.5.4 The Mimetic Function of the Qumran War Standards	196
5.5.5 The Division of the Standards and the Wilderness Motif	199
5.6 Conclusion: Wilderness and Warfare	201
CHAPTER 6 – THE USE OF JOSHUA IN THE WAR TRADITION.....	204
6.1 Introduction	204
6.2 Joshua in the Qumran Literary Tradition.....	206
6.2.1 The Book of Joshua at Qumran	206
6.2.2 The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls	208
6.3 Joshua and the Qumran War Tradition	210
6.3.1 Linguistic and Thematic Echoes of Joshua in the War Tradition.....	210
6.3.2 The Concept of <i>Herem</i> and the War Tradition.....	214
6.3.2.1 <i>Herem</i> in the Priestly and Deuteronomistic Traditions	216
6.3.2.2 <i>Herem</i> in the Joshua Tradition	221
6.3.2.3 <i>Herem</i> in Jewish-Hellenistic Compositions	224
6.3.2.4 <i>Herem</i> in the Qumran War Tradition	228
6.3.3 Joshua 10 and the <i>War Scroll</i>	234
6.4 The Joshua Conquest Tradition in 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381).....	239
6.5 Conclusion	243
CHAPTER 7 – PURITY AND POLLUTION: THE PURIFICATION AND RENEWAL OF THE EARTH.....	245
7.1 Introduction	245
7.2 Purity and the Protection of the Holy.....	247
7.3 Purity and Protection in the Context of Warfare.....	250
7.3.1 Purity Regulations and the War Camp (Deut 23:10–15).....	250
7.3.2 Post-War Purification in the Priestly Tradition (Num 31:19–24)	254
7.4 Enhanced Purity in the War Tradition from Qumran	257
7.4.1 War Camp Purity Regulations in 1QM 7:3–7 // 4Q491 1–3 6–10	258
7.4.2 Corpse Defilement in 1QM 9:7–9 // 4Q493 4–6	264
7.4.3 Post-Battle Purification in 1QM 14:2–3	268
7.4.4 The Role of Purity in the <i>War Scroll</i> : Preliminary Conclusions	271
7.5 The Language of Defilement in the War Tradition.....	272
7.5.1 “Slain, Defiled” (חלל)	272
7.5.2 “Uncleanness” (טמאה) and “Impurity” (נדח)	273
7.5.3 “Impure Uncleanness” (עבודה נדח טמאתם) and the Defilement of the Land	275
7.6 Purification and Renewal of the Land in the Eschatological Imagination.....	281
7.7 Conclusion	285
CONCLUSION	288
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	296
APPENDICES.....	324

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 – The Text of 1QM 2:1–3 and 4QM ^d (4Q494)	56
Table 2.2 – 4Q496 Fragment Correspondence to 1QM	60
Table 2.3 – Transcription and Translation of 4Q471 1	64
Table 3.1 – Distribution of Priestly Titles in the Qumran Corpus	86
Table 3.2 – Distribution of Priestly Titles in the Qumran War Manuscripts	102
Table 3.3 – Priestly Battle Instruction in 1QM 7:9–9:9 and 16:3–18:5	116
Table 5.1 – Trumpet Listings in the <i>War Scroll</i>	177

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS INCLUDING FREQUENTLY CITED SOURCES

Excluded are items listed in *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

BMW	The Bible in the Modern World
CCWJCW	Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BE to AD 200
CDSS	George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel, eds., with the assistance of Michael DeVries and Drew Longacre, <i>The T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> (London: T&T Clark, 2018).
CDSSE	Geza Vermes, <i>The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English</i> , 7th rev. ed. (London: Penguin Classics, 2012).
CIRC	Cambridge Introduction to Roman Civilization
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CSCT	Columbia Studies in the Classical Traditions
CSML	Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature
DHR	Dynamics in the History of Religion
DJD 1	D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, <i>Qumran Cave 1</i> , DJD 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).
DJD 3	M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, <i>Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumrân</i> , DJD 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).
DJD 5	John M. Allegro, with the collaboration of Arnold A. Anderson, <i>Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)</i> , DJD 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
DJD 7	Maurice Baillet, <i>Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)</i> , DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).
DJD 9	Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, <i>Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts</i> , DJD 9 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
DJD 11	Esther Eshel et al., <i>Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I</i> , DJD 11 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
DJD 14	Eugene Ulrich et al., <i>Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings</i> , DJD 14 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
DJD 21	Shemaryahu Talmon, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessmer, <i>Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts</i> , DJD 21 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).
DJD 22	George Brooke et al., <i>Qumran Cave 4.XVII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 3</i> , DJD 22 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
DJD 23	Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, <i>Qumran Cave 11.II (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)</i> , DJD 23 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
DJD 25	Émile Puech, <i>Qumrân Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)</i> , DJD 25 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
DJD 26	Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, <i>Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh Ha- Yahad and Two Related Texts</i> , DJD 26 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

- DJD 29 Esther Chazon, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, DJD 29 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).
- DJD 34 John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mūsār Lē Mēvîn): 4Q415 ff. With a Re-edition of 1Q26*, DJD 34 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).
- DJD 35 Joseph Baumgarten et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*, DJD 35 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).
- DJD 36 Stephen J. Pfann and Philip Alexander et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, DJD 36 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
- DJD 38 James Charlesworth et al., *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judean Desert*, DJD 38 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
- DSSHW 1 Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010), Volume 1.
- DSSNT Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, Rev. ed. (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005).
- DSSSE Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- EASA European Association of Social Anthropologists
- ECDSS Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls
- EDEJ John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow, eds., *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).
- HBM Hebrew Bible Monographs
- HBS Herders Biblische Studien
- JAJSup Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements
- JCPS Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series
- JSHJ Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus
- JSJSup Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods
- LLDSSDL The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library
- OCDSS The Oxford Commentary on the Dead Sea Scrolls
- OHDSS Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- PAM Palestine Archaeological Museum
- PFES Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
- PTSDSSP 1 James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, PTSDSSP 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994).
- PTSDSSP 2 James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, PTSDSSP 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995).
- PTSDSSP 4A James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Pseudepigraphic*

	<i>and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers</i> , PTSDSSP 4A (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997).
PTSDSSP 4B	James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice</i> , PTSDSSP 4B (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999).
PTSDSSP 6B	James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Texts</i> , PTSDSSP 6B (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002).
QM	Qumranica Mogilanensia
QUMENG	Qumran Non-biblical Manuscripts: A New Translation (Accordance Module based upon DSSNT)
RAS	Ranchi Anthropology Series
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SSEI	Smithsonian Series in Ethnographic Inquiry
SSU	Studia Semitica Upsaliensia
ThWQ 2	Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen, eds., <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten</i> , 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013), Volume 2.
ThWQ 3	Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen, eds., <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten</i> , 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2016), Volume 3.

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

I have read a little more in the “parchments”. I’m afraid of going too far in thinking about them. It may be that this is one of the greatest finds ever made in Palestine, a find we never so much as hoped for.¹

E. L. Sukenik, Diary entry on 1 December 1947

The importance of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls on our understanding of various expressions of Judaism in the Second Temple period cannot be overstated. The corpus of texts discovered in the caves near Khirbet Qumran have provided invaluable illumination regarding the transmission of texts that would later be incorporated into what we know of today as the Hebrew Bible as well as opened a window upon ideological concerns and on-going halakhic disputes in late Second Temple Jewish movements. Importantly, these manuscripts have provided scholars access to a particular Jewish movement in the period, at least some of whom decided to take up residence at Khirbet Qumran, a site located on the northwest shore of the Dead Sea.²

The desert manuscripts from Khirbet Qumran reveal a movement deeply concerned with proper interpretation of the Torah and adherence to halakhic regulations. Fidelity to the covenant found expression in matters of purity and impurity, calendrical concerns, and community rules. They believed they lived in communion with divine angelic beings as they sought to live

¹ E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1954 [Eng. 1955]), 17.

² On the nature of the movement and its communities, see John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010); Charlotte Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, TSAJ 154 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 25–62; Jutta Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement*, STDJ 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Alison Schofield, “Forms of the Community,” CDSS, 533–46.

faithfully to the commandments as divinely revealed by God to movement leadership, including such figures as the Teacher of Righteousness. The movement was eschatological insofar as they envisaged themselves living in the liminal space between this age and the age to come and having a distinct hand in the event precipitating its arrival. In this light, the movement was the “true remnant” of God, the faithful ones who were “preparing the way of the LORD” (Isa 40:3; 1QS 8:12b–16a; 9:19b–21).

After their discovery, interest in the manuscripts from Qumran, both popular and scholarly, was immediate.³ From a scholarly perspective, the manuscripts provided an unimaginable wealth of textual artifacts, which would refine and revolutionize thinking regarding Jewish movements of the period. They would have immeasurable impact on how scholars understood the shaping and transmission of “biblical” texts as well as other important literature of the period, such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. In short, the discovery of the manuscripts from Qumran transformed scholarly opinion and subsequent endeavors.⁴ The aim of this study is to reconsider one of the first manuscripts brought to light, the *War Scroll*, and what we have now come to understand as the larger war tradition to which it belongs.

1.1 Discovery and Early Publication of the *War Scroll*

Somewhere between the winter of 1946 and the spring of 1947 in the marl cliffs near the northwest shore of the Dead Sea about a half kilometer from Khirbet Qumran, a cache of ancient manuscripts was discovered in a cave that would later be known as Cave 1. Early accounts of the

³ See Matthew A. Collins, “Scholarly and Popular Reception,” CDSS, 59–73.

⁴ For a comprehensive account of scholarship in the field of the Scrolls, see Devorah Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research*, STDJ 99 (Leiden: Brill: 2012).

discovery are often conflicting and unreliable. E. L. Sukenik, professor at Hebrew University, said it best, “We know neither the exact date when the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered nor precisely what adventures they underwent immediately afterwards.”⁵ What we can say with certainty is that in March 1947 three Bedouin presented three manuscripts in the Bethlehem market for sale: a lengthy copy of the text of Isaiah (1QIsa^a), a commentary on the text of Habakkuk (1QpHab), and a collection of rules for the community (1QS).⁶ The manuscripts were shown to Khalil Eskander Shahin, also known as Kando, a local merchant and cobbler, who agreed to act as an intermediary for the sale of the ancient manuscripts. Kando showed the manuscripts to George Isha‘ya, a member of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Jerusalem, who in turn brought them to the attention of Metropolitan Mar Athanasius Samuel, Archbishop of the Syrian Orthodox Church who lived at St. Mark’s Monastery in Jerusalem. Requesting to see all the manuscripts in their possession, the Bedouin returned to the desert and recovered four more manuscripts: a second copy of the text of Isaiah (1QIsa^b), a collection of thanksgiving hymns (1QH^a), an Aramaic composition of narratives related to Genesis (1QapGen), and a text recounting an eschatological war between the “sons of light” and the “sons of darkness” (1QM). Questions remain as to how the seven scrolls were sold into two groups that do not coincide with

⁵ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 13.

⁶ For early accounts of the discovery and early publication of the scrolls from the principle actors, see John C. Trever, “The Discovery of the Scrolls,” *BA* 11 (1948): 46–68; A. Y. Samuel, “The Purchase of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *BA* 12 (1949): 26–31; Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 13–29; Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking Press, 1955), 3–28; J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1957), 15–34; Yigael Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1957), 15–52; J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, SBT 26, trans. J. Strugnell (London: SCM Press, 1959), 11–19; John C. Trever, *The Untold Story of Qumran* (Westwood, NJ: Fleming H Revell, 1965); rev. ed. Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977); A. Y. Samuel, *Treasure from Qumran: My Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966). See also Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 1–36; Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History: Volume One, 1947–1960* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Hans Debel, “Discoveries,” *CDSS*, 7–16.

the grouping of discovery. That said, on 19 July 1947, Metropolitan Samuel agreed to purchase four of the manuscripts: the complete copy of the text of Isaiah (1QIsa^a), the *Pesher Habakkuk* (1QpHab), the *Community Rule* (1QS), and *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen).⁷

The remaining three manuscripts would not resurface until the 25 November 1947 when an Armenian antiquities dealer from Jerusalem, named Nasri Ohan, showed Sukenik a fragment written in ancient square script and inquired as to whether it and others were worth buying from the Bedouin and if Sukenik might be interested in buying them.⁸ After a few days of consideration, on 29 November, Sukenik “met the Bethlehem dealer and on this occasion bought several bundles of coarse parchment from him along with two earthenware vessels in which the Beduin (sic) said the scrolls had been stored.”⁹ Included in the bundles were a collection of thanksgiving hymns, later entitled the *Hodayot* (1QH^a), and a manuscript describing a battle “between the sons of light and the sons of darkness,” subsequently designated as the *War Scroll* (1QMilhamah or 1QM).¹⁰ On 22 December, Sukenik would meet again with the Bethlehem

⁷ All manuscript names are taken from Emanuel Tov, *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

⁸ See Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 14. The following description relies on Sukenik for his own account. According to Yigael Yadin, Sukenik recounted the meeting, “When we met, my friend pulled from his briefcase a scrap of leather. He held it up for me to see. On it I noticed Hebrew script, but I could not make out the words. I asked him what it was and his story was so fascinating that I almost forgot the sickening presence of the barbed wire between us. He said that one of our mutual friends, an old Arab antiquities dealer in Bethlehem, had come to him the previous day with a tale of some Bedouin who had called him bringing several parchment scrolls which they claimed to have found in a cave near the shores of the Dead Sea, not far from Jericho. They had offered to sell him the scrolls, but he, the Arab dealer, did not know whether they were genuine. He had therefore brought them to my Armenian friend. He, too, had no knowledge of whether they were really ancient manuscripts or a fairly recent product. He wanted to know from me whether I considered them genuine and if so whether I would be prepared to buy them for the Museum of Jewish Antiquities of Hebrew University.” See Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls*, 17.

⁹ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 14. See also Yadin’s extended quotation from his father’s personal journal found after his death in 1953 regarding the trip to Bethlehem to purchase the scrolls. Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls*, 21–29.

¹⁰ See Trever, *The Untold Story of Qumran*, 111; Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 108.

dealer and purchased another scroll, the poorly preserved and fragmentary copy of Isaiah (1QIsa^b).¹¹

In 1948, Sukenik wrote a preliminary report of the three manuscripts in possession of Hebrew University (1QIsa^b, 1QH^a, and 1QM) for the Bialik Foundation, which included the first general physical description and photographs of the *War Scroll*.¹² This preliminary report also included a partial transcription of columns 8 and 14–15 and a commentary on the latter.¹³ Two years later, in 1950, Sukenik published a second report that contained a photograph and transcription of a further fragment of 1QM, a hymn beginning in 12:10 with the words, “Rise, O Hero.”¹⁴ Unfortunately, in the midst of preparing an exhaustive report on the three manuscripts, Sukenik died on 28 February 1953.

After his untimely death, Hebrew University appointed a committee to oversee the publication of an exhaustive report on all three manuscripts in their possession, including a set of plates and transcription of each manuscript and an introduction for each compiled from Sukenik’s preliminary reports.¹⁵ The committee entrusted the task to Nahman Avigad, who was assisted by Jacob Licht and Yigael Yadin.¹⁶ This first critical edition of the *War Scroll* was

¹¹ Although the purchase of 1QIsa^b is not explicitly mentioned in his personal journal, on 21 December 1947, Sukenik would write, “Days of awe. I contacted X. We’re to meet tomorrow at noon near the gate [to the Security Zone]. I came. I bought another scroll in very bad condition.” See Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 17; Trever, *The Untold Story of Qumran*, 111; Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 108. Weston Fields suggested that Sukenik also potentially purchased some fragments of Daniel as well. See Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 50.

¹² Eleazar L. Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth I* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948), 17–26 and pl. V–IX. See the preface to the Hebrew edition (excerpted in the English edition) of Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. Batya and Chaim Rabin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962 [Hebrew 1955]) for a detailed account of the development and publication of the Sukenik’s preliminary reports.

¹³ Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*, CQS 6 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 5.

¹⁴ Eleazar L. Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth II* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1950), 51–52 and pl. XI.

¹⁵ The committee consisted of “Professor B. Mazar, President of the University, Chairman, Dr. N. Avigad, Mr. S. Ginosar, Professor L. A. Mayer, Professor M. Schwabe, Maj-Gen. Y. Yadin.” See Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 7; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, x–xi.

¹⁶ Yadin notes that the subsequent publication, published in 1956 by Mossad Bialik and the Hebrew University, was entitled *Ozar ha-Megilloth ha-Genuzoth*. He then adds that the same committee “decided to entrust me with the task

released in Hebrew 1954 and in English in 1955.¹⁷ This edition contained an introduction to the manuscript, a set of plates (pl. 16–34), and a transcription of the text based upon those plates.¹⁸ Avigad was assisted in his work not only by Sukenik’s preliminary report, but also by an almost complete transcription of the manuscript discovered among Sukenik’s personal papers.¹⁹

In January 1949, a small contingent of men from the Arab Legion under the direction of Captain Akkash el Zebn conducted a search of the area in which Cave 1 was thought to be located and after a few days’ search identified the cave. The cave was excavated between 15 February and 5 March 1949 led by Roland de Vaux and G. Lankester Harding.²⁰ Discovered amidst the remains in the cave were inscribed fragments, which Harding notes, “were mounted between glass each day as they were found and photographed on the spot for safe record.”²¹ Among the fragments recovered were two fragments identified as belonging to 1QM, subsequently designated as 1Q33 fragments 1 and 2. These fragments were published by Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik in the first volume of the principal edition series, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD)*.²²

of editing the War Scroll with an introduction, restoration of damaged portions, and commentary.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, xi.

¹⁷ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. The preface to the English version comments, “In order to reduce further delay to a minimum, this committee thought it well to bring out a less ambitious book, without annotations, and so decided upon the present form of this volume, viz., facsimile tables, a faithful transcription, and an Introduction compiled from Professor Sukenik’s Introductions to *Megilloth Genuzoth* I and II supplemented by certain descriptive material, which would help the reader grasp the general character of the scrolls.” See Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 7. Yadin references the publication as being published in 1956 by Mossad Bialik and the Hebrew University, entitled *Ozar ha-Megilloth ha-Genuzoth*. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, xi.

¹⁸ For the introduction to the *War Scroll*, see Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35–36. See also pl. 16–34 and the accompanying transcription.

¹⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, x. Yadin notes that Sukenik’s transcription of 1QM was assisted by Nahman Avigad and Jacob Licht.

²⁰ For a description of the discovery and the subsequent excavation, See G. Lankester Harding, “Introductory, The Discovery, The Excavation, Minor Finds,” DJD 1:3–7.

²¹ Harding, DJD 1:7.

²² D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, “‘La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres’ (1QM),” DJD 1:135–36, pl. XXXI. See PAM 40.487, 531. LLDSSDL B-278267; B-277294.

1.2 The Qumran War Tradition in Scholarly Discourse

The initial publication of the text of the *War Scroll* was closely followed by the publication of various descriptions and translations of the manuscript.²³ Shortly thereafter, studies on the *War Scroll* began to expand in scope. Jean Carmignac produced a philological study of 1QM in addition to studies on the Kittim and citations in 1QM from the Hebrew Bible.²⁴ Johannes van der Ploeg published several chapters in edited volumes regarding the themes of holy war in 1QM and the literary composition of the manuscript.²⁵ Additional studies regarding other aspects of 1QM, such as the Kittim and the use of trumpets, would follow.²⁶ Scholarship regarding the *War Scroll*, however, would take a significant step forward with the publication of a series of substantive commentaries by Yigael Yadin (1955), Jean Carmignac (1958), Johannes van der Ploeg (1959), and Bastiaan Jongeling (1962).²⁷ These works included comprehensive

²³ Hans Bardtke, “Die Kriegerrolle von Qumran übersetzt,” *TLZ* 80 (1955): 401–20; Mathias Delcor, “La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils ténèbres ou le ‘Manuel du parfait combattant,’” *NRTh* 77 (1955): 372–99; André Dupont-Sommer, “‘Règlement de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière’: Traduction et notes,” *RHR* 148 (1955): 25–43, 141–180; J. van der Ploeg, “La Règle de la Guerre: Traduction et notes,” *VT* 5 (1955): 337–420; A. M. Habermann, *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda: The Scrolls from the Judean Desert* (Jerusalem: Machbaroth Lesifruith, 1959); J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, 2 vols. (Munich: E. Reinhardt, 1960). Jean Carmignac would also publish a translation of 1QM with limited annotations in a volume in 1961, which also included translations and annotation for 1QS and 1QH^a. See J. Carmignac and P. Guilbert, *Les textes de Qumran: Traduits et annotés* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961), 81–125.

²⁴ Jean Carmignac, “Précisions apportées au vocabulaire de l’hébreu biblique par la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres,” *VT* 5 (1955): 345–65; Carmignac, “Les Kittim dans la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres,” *NRTh* 77 (1955): 725–48; Carmignac, “Les citations de l’Ancien Testament dans la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres »,” *RB* 63 (1956): 234–60, 375–90; Carmignac, “Concordance hébraïque de la Règle de la Guerre,” *RevQ* 1 (1958): 7–49.

²⁵ J. van der Ploeg, “La guerre sainte dans la Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân,” in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l’honneur de André Robert* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957), 326–33; van der Ploeg, “La composition littéraire de la Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân,” in *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de re biblica*, eds. J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and E. Massaux, *BETL* 13 (Gembloux: Duculot, 1959), 2:13–19.

²⁶ For example, H. H. Rowley, “The Kittim in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *PEQ* 88 (1956): 92–102; Hartmut Stegemman, “Die Risse in der Kriegerrolle von Qumrân,” *TLZ* 81 (1956): 205–10; Hans Seidel, “Horn and Trompete im alten Israel unter Berücksichtigung der Kriegerrolle von Qumran,” *WZ* 6 (1957): 589–99; Robert North, “‘Kittim’ War or ‘Sectaries’ Liturgy,” *Bib* 39 (1958): 84–93.

²⁷ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*; Jean Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres: Texte restauré, traduit et commenté* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1958); J. van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre traduit et annoté avec une introduction*, *STDJ* 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959); and Bastiaan Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre des manuscrits de Qumrân*, *SSN* 4 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962).

introductions, translations, and extensive commentary on the content of 1QM and, in the case of Yadin and Carmignac's, a textual reconstruction, with Yadin's based upon Sukenik's posthumously published transcription.²⁸

1.2.1 Compositional History, Genre, and Textual Development of the *War Scroll*

Within the first decade of scholarship on the *War Scroll* matters of compositional history, such as dating and authorship, genre, and textual development of the manuscript were areas of scholarly attention.²⁹ Yadin considered the *War Scroll* a unified composition from the hand of a single author, arranging the contents of 1QM into four distinct sections—the “War Series” (1:1–2:14), the “Battle Serekh Series” (2:15–9:16), the “Ritual Serekh Series” (9:17–14:15), and the “Kittim Series” (14:16–19:13).³⁰ Drawing upon a comparison of known Roman military practices with internal military evidence from 1QM and their correlation, Yadin suggested the composition as falling between the Roman conquest of Palestine in 63 BCE and the end of the reign of Herod the Great (4 BCE), thus placing the composition near the second half of the first century BCE.³¹ This view was not shared by all, however. Michael Avi-Yonah, suggesting a closer connection with Maccabean warfare, concluded that the “military allegory” should rather be dated to late Maccabean, pre-Roman period.³² Moshe Segal responded to Yadin's assessment and suggested

²⁸ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 253–351.

²⁹ For an exhaustive analysis of scholarly opinion and issues surrounding the dating of 1QM, see Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 64–102.

³⁰ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 7–14. Yadin acknowledged that the singular author relied on various sources, including contemporaneous military sources specifically for the Battle Series, various biblical texts, and a “sectarian” source referred to in 1QM 15:5 as “The Book of *Serekh 'Itto*” for the Ritual Series. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 17.

³¹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 245–46. For a summary of Yadin's position, see Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 85–90.

³² Michael Avi-Yonah, “The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness and Maccabean Warfare,” *IEJ* 2 (1952): 1–5

that the influence of Roman military practices could have been known in Judea prior to 63 BCE, further proposing that the author of 1QM “took his military material from the contemporary Hasmonean army, and that if this material exhibits a Roman character, it was borrowed from the Romans by the military chiefs of the Hasmoneans.”³³ Russell Gmirkin, agreeing with Yadin’s assessment of the Roman character of the military practices, suggested that the army of the *War Scroll* is patterned after the Roman legions of the second century BCE prior to the reforms of Marius in 104 BCE.³⁴ More specifically and based upon proposed internal historical evidence, Gmirkin later concluded that “the final version of the War Scroll appears to constitute the official war manual of the Maccabean army of 163 BCE.”³⁵

In agreement with Yadin as to the unity of authorship, Carmignac assigned authorship of 1QM specifically to the Teacher of Righteousness, who in his estimation meticulously presented a battle plan for the eschatological war in a unified manuscript.³⁶ Contra Yadin, however, Carmignac argued for an early composition of 1QM, approximately 110 BCE between the composition of 1QS and 1QSa and that of 1QH^a.³⁷ Van der Ploeg, based upon the connections in column 1 with that of Dan 11–12, suggested an even earlier date for the inception of the composition, sometime near 164 BCE and the events surrounding Antiochus IV.³⁸ Van der Ploeg additionally noted the presence of tensions within the text between the forty years of war presented in column 2 and the war instructions contained columns 15–19, as well as between the

³³ M. H. Segal, “The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of Its Composition,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, 2nd ed., ScrHier 4 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965), 143.

³⁴ Russell Gmirkin, “The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 89–129, esp. 91.

³⁵ Russell Gmirkin, “Historical Allusion in the War Scroll,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 208.

³⁶ Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, XI–XII and n. 1.

³⁷ Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, XIII–XIV.

³⁸ Van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 23–24.

organization and tactics of columns 2–9 with those in columns 15–19. As a result, van der Ploeg proposed a primary author for columns 1, 10–12, and 15–19 and a subsequent author for columns 2–9, who then transformed the original composition into a technical rule of war.³⁹ For his part, Jongeling offered a decidedly more philological treatment of the text of 1QM focusing on issues of translation and interpretation and eschewing matters of dating and compositional history.⁴⁰

Van der Ploeg's suggestion of multiple authors and stages of textual development for 1QM opened a wider dialogue on matters of composition and structure. Citing the work of Claus-Hanno Hunzinger on 4QM^a (4Q491),⁴¹ Jürgen Becker affirmed the composite nature of 1QM and further proposed the existence of two major divisions within 1QM, columns 1–9 and 10–19. The former, according to Becker, was concerned with the rule of war, such as tactics, weaponry, and maneuvers, while the latter section was mainly liturgical in nature.⁴² Moreover, Becker made a division between columns 10–14 and 15–19 based upon a section break at the beginning of column 15 introducing a new war rule. He suggested the difference between the two sections is that whereas columns 10–14 describe a single battle scene, columns 15–19 describe a seven-stage engagement with the enemy. A difference between the content of column 1 and column 2 was also noted by Becker. Ultimately, Becker argued that 1QM was the result of two recension: the first containing 1QM 1; 7:9–8:19; and 15–19 and a second containing 1QM 2;

³⁹ Van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 7–22.

⁴⁰ For a helpful summary of the work of Yadin, van der Ploeg, Carmignac, and Jongeling as well as that of Jürgen Becker and Peter von der Osten-Sacken, see Philip R. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*, BibOr 32 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), 11–20.

⁴¹ Claus-Hanno Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches *Milhamah* aus Höhle 4 von Qumrân," *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51.

⁴² Jürgen Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament*, SUNT 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 43–50.

3–7:7; and 10–14.⁴³ Peter von der Osten-Sacken in his study on the dualism at Qumran followed Becker in understanding column 1 as the framework from which columns 15–19 is constructed.⁴⁴ Columns 7–9:9 contains material parallel to that on columns 15–19 but are less dualistic and find their origin in Maccabean warfare practices. Von der Osten-Sacken understood the dualistic struggle between light and darkness in columns 1 and 15–19 as an interpretation of the Jewish struggle with Antiochus IV in the early second century BCE.⁴⁵

Finally, Philip Davies, in his important monograph, undertook an extensive study of the structure and history of 1QM. Davies proposed a long redactional process by which various sources were brought together to shape 1QM as we have preserved.⁴⁶ For Davies, columns 2–9 constituted a war manual for the final battle compiled from different sources.⁴⁷ Columns 14 and 15–19 constituted a combination of battle narratives and liturgical passages shaped through a long process of redaction, with column 14 representing an earlier recension of columns 15–19. Davies suggested that columns 10–14 represents a liturgical manual, perhaps the same referenced in 15:5. According to Davies, column 1 was added to these various components as an introduction offering an overview of the *War Scroll* as a whole.⁴⁸ Davies' work has continued to hold influence in the field of scholarship on the *War Scroll* as evidenced in the work of Jean Duhaime and Brian Schultz. Duhaime proposed a late stage collection and redaction of 1QM—a

⁴³ Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 46–47. Becker is not altogether clear as to the placement of column 9.

⁴⁴ Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*, SUNT 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 29–41.

⁴⁵ Von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 55–69.

⁴⁶ Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 20–23. Davies points to 1QM 15:4–6 as evidence for sources being incorporated into 1QM.

⁴⁷ Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 65–67.

⁴⁸ Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 113, 123.

coalescing of various war materials available at Qumran in the second half of the first century.⁴⁹ Finally, Brian Schultz has recently argued for a more coherent portrayal of war in columns 1–2, thus connecting column 2 with column 1, leaving columns 3–9 as a distinct unit describing what Schultz sees as a second phase of a two-stage war, denoted as “the War of Divisions.”⁵⁰

With the completion of the publication of the Cave 4 fragments, a renewed interest in issues of compositional history, textual development, and interrelation between the war manuscripts at Qumran has emerged. The work of Maurice Baillet on the 4QM fragments was foundational for the scholarly engagements that followed.⁵¹ His work culminated in the publication of the principal edition of the 4QM fragments in DJD 7 in 1982.⁵² Building off the work of Baillet, Duhaime proposed the relationship between 4QM fragments and 1QM as reflecting copies of a *similar* recension (4Q492/4QM^b, 4Q494/4QM^d, 4Q495/4QM^e, and 4Q496/4QM^f), copies of a *different* recension (4Q471, 4Q491/4QM^a, 4Q493/4QM^c, and 4Q497), or copies of a *different work* (4Q285, 11Q14).⁵³ Recently, this categorization has been challenged by Jutta Jokiranta and Hanna Vanonen, who have questioned the privileging of 1QM as an exemplar in discussions of textual development. Utilizing material philological insights, Jokiranta and Vanonen have refined the current categorization of the constellation of war

⁴⁹ Jean Duhaime, “The *War Scroll* from Qumran and Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 133–51 and *War Texts*, 57–60.

⁵⁰ Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*, STDJ 76 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Schultz, “Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM),” in *Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings from the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*, eds. Daniel K. Falk et al., STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 153–64.

⁵¹ See Maurice Baillet, “Débris de textes sur papyrus de la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 71 (1964): 353–71; Baillet, “Les manuscrits de la Règle de la Guerre de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 79 (1972): 217–26; Baillet, “Le volume VII de ‘Discoveries in the Judean Desert’: Présentation,” in *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. Mathias Delcor, BETL 46 (Paris: Duculot, 1978), 75–89.

⁵² Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*, DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

⁵³ Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 40–43.

manuscripts at Qumran by proposing a re-examination of the current static textual boundaries.⁵⁴ Most recently, Vanonen has proposed a new understanding of the textual relationship between the 1QM, the 4QM fragments, and the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* manuscripts (4Q285 and 11Q14).⁵⁵ A full discussion on the Qumran war manuscripts, including the work of Baillet, Duhaime, and Vanonen, will be undertaken in Chapter 2.⁵⁶

1.2.2 Thematic and Functional Studies on the Qumran War Manuscripts

Scholarship on the Qumran war manuscripts has also focused on the themes and functions of the tradition. From the very beginning phases of Qumran scholarship, dualism was understood to be a foundational ideology of the Qumran movement. Scholars pointed to the Teaching on the Two Spirits in 1QS 3:13–4:26 and the *War Scroll* as evidence, even considering dualism to be a central characteristic of the entire Qumran corpus.⁵⁷ One of the first to undertake a thematic analysis of dualism within the Qumran corpus was von der Osten-Sacken.⁵⁸ Von der Osten-Sacken considered 1QM to be one of the earliest expressions of dualism at Qumran. According to von der Osten-Sacken, the Treatise on the Two Spirits was divided into two sections: one displaying a “cosmological” orientation (3:13–4:3) and one displaying “ethical dualism,” described in terms of light and darkness (4:4–26). Von der Osten-Sacken further proposed that

⁵⁴ Jutta Jokiranta and Hanna Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts of Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of S and M Documents,” in *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism*, eds. Mika S. Pajunen and Hanna Tervanotko, PFES 108 (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015), 11–60.

⁵⁵ Hanna Vanonen, *War Traditions from Qumran: Re-thinking Textual Stability and Fluidity in the War Text Manuscripts*, STDJ 139 (Leiden: Brill, 2022). This volume is revised version of her dissertation, “Stable and Fluid War Traditions: Re-Thinking the War Text Material from Qumran” (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2017).

⁵⁶ See 2.3 and 2.4.

⁵⁷ See Jacob Licht, “The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll,” *IEJ* 6 (1956): 1–13, 89–101.

⁵⁸ Von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 29–115.

the idea of “cosmological dualism” was an early stratum of dualism at Qumran and linked it with the dualism expressed in 1QM, which he called an “eschatological war-dualism.” For von der Osten-Sacken, 1QM was initially influenced by the book of Daniel as well as biblical traditions of “holy war” and the Day of the LORD and hence was a Jewish development.⁵⁹ A secondary stage of dualistic expansion at Qumran followed, typified in the 1QS 4:4–26, with the introduction of ethical concerns into the dualistic framework of light and darkness. In his estimation this development can be seen in 1QM as well, in the blessings and curses of 1QM 13, the presence of angels, and the use of the term *serekh*.⁶⁰

Building on the work of von der Osten-Sacken, Duhaime arrived at similar conclusions.⁶¹ For Duhaime, insertions into 1QM 13 and 16:11–17:9 reflect a larger dualistic reworking of Qumran texts, such as CD and 1QS. Specifically regarding 1QM, Duhaime sees the insertions of 1QM 13:9b–12a and 17:4b–8 as related, both reflecting an introduction of dualistic overtones into previous literary frameworks. In both cases, the insertions are cosmic in nature, with ethical, eschatological, and sometimes spatial dimensions.⁶² Duhaime suggested that these dualistic reworkings, including that of 1QM, do not merely signal a transformation of beliefs, but are closely tied to identity construction and the wider socio-religious dynamic of the Qumran movement.⁶³

⁵⁹ Von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 31–40, 81.

⁶⁰ Von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 222–32.

⁶¹ Duhaime, “Le rédaction de 1QM XIII et l’évolution du dualisme à Qumrân,” *RB* 84 (1977): 210–38; Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran,” *CBQ* 49 (1987): 32–56.

⁶² Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 45, 48.

⁶³ Jean Duhaime, “Dualisme et construction de l’identité sectaire à Qumrân,” *Théologiques* 13 (2005): 43–57.

Philip Davies proposed that a “dualizing” of the war portrayed in 1QM can be seen in three areas, which Davies characterized as a systematic revision of war material.⁶⁴ First, there is a dualistic revision in 1QM 1:4–6 where the liberation of the land of Israel in the first phase of the war has been transformed into a dualistic conflict with the forces of Belial. Dualizing can likewise be seen in the emendations to the liturgical portions of 1QM 15–19, not only in the content of the liturgical material, such as references to Belial (15:2–3), the enemy’s deeds as being “in darkness” (15:9), and the “children of darkness” (17:16), but also in the rubric preceding the material. Finally, revision can be seen in the schema of the seven-stage war. Here, the dramatization emphasizes the equality between the forces of light and darkness and the necessity of God’s intervention in the final judgment. Davies additionally highlighted the terminological transition from the employment of the term “enemy” in 1QM 7–9 to “Kittim” in 15–19. Davies rightly concluded that while both 1QS and 1QM clearly demonstrate dualistic revisions, caution should be heeded in comparing the material and reaching overarching conclusions. In his estimation, both reflect a limited dualistic revision in the wider Qumran corpus.⁶⁵

As with the nature of dualism in the war tradition, liturgical and ritual elements have drawn scholarly attention. Identifying the manuscript as a liturgy for holy war, Carmignac understood the tactical and liturgical elements as providing an image of war as liturgical event,

⁶⁴ Philip R. Davies, “Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,” in *Dualism at Qumran*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits, LSTS 76 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 12–15. See also, Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 83, 121–124; Davies, “Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll,” *VT* 28 (1978): 28–36. For an early discussion between John Collins and Philip Davies regarding the nature of dualism in 1QM, see John J. Collins, “Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P. R. Davies,” *VT* 29 (1979): 212–16; Davies, “Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Rejoinder,” *VT* 30 (1980): 93–97.

⁶⁵ Davies, “Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,” 17.

something Carmignac characterized as a mixture of “true utopia” and “false realism.”⁶⁶ For Carmignac, the prescriptions and prohibitions found in 1QM were to be carefully observed in order not to bring offense against God, while prayers functioned as a celebration of God’s triumph over the enemy. Robert North, noting that nearly half of the War Scroll is liturgical, questioned the early focus on 1QM as a war manual, wondering about the “allegorical-dramatic-liturgical” possibilities of the composition.⁶⁷ For his part, North offers a structure of 1QM focused on liturgical and ritualistic aspects rather than militaristic. Svend Holm-Nielsen considered 1QM a liturgical text that “reproduces a sort of cultic drama for Qumran, in which the eschatological world drama is laid out for them that have received God’s revelation.”⁶⁸ This line of consideration was also taken up by Edward Nielsen, who questioned whether the military rhetoric 1QM was more symbolic and the function of 1QM was more liturgical in nature instructing the Qumran community in matters of religious life.⁶⁹ Matthias Krieg suggested that 1QM 15–19 should be understood as cultic drama, one which celebrates the eschatological victory of God and the true Israel.⁷⁰ More recently, Crispin Fletcher-Louis suggested that the liturgical focus of 1QM 10–19 speaks to the efficacy of liturgical actions as a part of eschatological warfare.⁷¹ John Zhu-En Wee has argued that 1QM 15–19 represents a later redaction of 1QM 10–14 reflecting unfavorable circumstances in the life of the Qumran

⁶⁶ Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, XI–XII.

⁶⁷ North, “‘Kittim’ War,” 84–86.

⁶⁸ Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*, ATDan 2 (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus, 1960), 364–65.

⁶⁹ Edward Nielsen, “La guerre considérée comme une religion et la religion comme une guerre,” *ST* 15 (1961): 93–112.

⁷⁰ Matthias Krieg, “Mo‘ed Naqam—ein Kulturdrama aus Qumrân: Beobachtungen an der Kriegerrolle,” *TZ* 41 (1985): 3–30.

⁷¹ Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 453–55.

community. Wee furthermore proposed that 15–19 was intended as a “literary-liturgical work” potentially utilized as a part of a regular ritual at Qumran.⁷² The performative nature of 1QM has also been highlighted by Rebekah Haigh who argued that the text of 1QM evidences a variety of textual indicators of orality and performativity that suggest the potentiality of 1QM as a performative spoken text.⁷³ We will take up a discussion on the importance of performativity in Chapter 4.

Importantly, Daniel Falk has convincingly argued for the potential of 1QM functioning as a communal liturgy.⁷⁴ For Falk, the tendency within prayers found at Qumran to incorporate blessing formulas as well as the re-use of liturgical material in varying contexts points to “a living liturgical context.”⁷⁵ These features are similarly found within the liturgical material found in 1QM, thus suggesting a liturgical utilization. According to Falk, this is supported by codicological evidence, such as the opisthographic war manuscripts, which materially connect the war tradition with other liturgically focused material.⁷⁶ Falk further proposed that the terminological relationship between various liturgical prayers at Qumran and those contained in 1QM suggests a close association between liturgy and eschatological warfare in the movement’s ideology. In other words, for Falk, the recitation of daily prayers were likely regarding a means

⁷² John Zhu-En Wee, “A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns XV-XIX of the War Scroll (1QM),” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 263–83, esp. 83.

⁷³ Rebekah Haigh, “Oral Aspects: A Performative Approach to 1QM,” *DSD* 26 (2019): 189–219.

⁷⁴ Daniel K. 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*, eds. Kipp Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 275–94.

⁷⁵ Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 293. Similarly, Ayhan Aksu has recently argued that 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506 were intentionally written together to create a liturgical collection on a single manuscript, thus lending evidence to the conception of the scribe as a “collectionneur” of liturgical material from different texts. See Ayhan Aksu, “The Qumran Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as an Intentional Collection of Prayers,” *DSD* 29 (2022): 292–324.

⁷⁶ Cf. 4QpapM^f (4Q496) with 4QpapWords of the Luminaries^c (4Q506) and 4QpapFestival Prayers^c (4Q509 + 505) and 4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A (4Q497) with 4QpapHymns/Prayers (4Q499). For a discussion on these opisthographic war manuscripts, see 2.3.6 and 2.4.1. See also Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

of “participating in the defeat of darkness in anticipation of eschatological victory over the forces of darkness.”⁷⁷

1.3 Framing the Discussion

Important for our study of the war tradition are studies examining the ideological themes of the tradition and how they are situated within the wider ideology of the Qumran movement. Of particular importance are studies providing a synthesis of elements surrounding the nature of religious violence in the war tradition and how these themes inform our understanding of the eschatological imagination at Qumran.

Building her analysis upon the importance of dualism in 1QM, Raija Sollamo suggested that the *War Scroll* reflects a form of “eschatological vengeance.”⁷⁸ For Sollamo, the dualistic redaction of 1QM mirrored the ideology of the community, which saw itself as a faithful remnant, and functioned to strengthen the identity of the members of the community. This expression of dualism, according to Sollamo, had religious and ethical dimensions that transformed the eschatological battlefield from that of between nations to that of good and evil, light and darkness.⁷⁹ They were the sons of light supported by an angelic army while all outsiders were counted as sons of darkness. This vision of the final battle was closely associated with the wider “apocalyptic imagination” of the community, whereby the “time of visitation” (מועד פקודה, cf. 1QS 3:18; 4:18–19, 26) would occur and the people of God would be tested (1QM 17:8–9).⁸⁰ Within the new age, the faithful chosen ones would survive while the wicked

⁷⁷ Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 293.

⁷⁸ Raija Sollamo, “War and Violence in the Ideology of the Qumran Community,” *StOr* 99 (2004): 341–52.

⁷⁹ Sollamo, “War and Violence,” 345–46.

⁸⁰ Sollamo, “War and Violence,” 348–49.

would be destroyed in an ordained divine act of retribution and vengeance. As Sollamo noted, this is a departure from the exhortations of 4QMMT that understood those outside the movement as still able to come to proper understanding. For the *War Scroll*, the sons of darkness were the focal point of God's eschatological wrath while the sons of light were counted as the suffering chosen ones who would inherit the world to come. All this would come by the hand of God. Hence, Sollamo concluded that the "apocalyptic imagination" of violence expressed in the *War Scroll* was not active violence. Rather, it provided a "theological interpretation" of war and violence as well as a "means of maintaining the identity of the community and ensuring its members' loyalty."⁸¹

Along similar lines, Davies argued that ideals regarding warfare, such as war as a sacral, cultic act and the portrayal of God as a "divine warrior," attested in the Hebrew Bible as well as within Second Temple literature, can also be seen within the *War Scroll*.⁸² Furthermore, the Hebrew Bible expresses this "divine warrior" imagery in mythological, historical, and eschatological terms. For Davies, these facets can also be identified within the *War Scroll*, which envisages warfare as "both human and divine, both nationalistic and sectarian, both cosmic and ethical."⁸³ Davies also noted the combination of the practical and the imaginary in the *War Scroll* suggesting several avenues of future exploration: the absence of a warrior messiah figure and the social function of fantasy in the war tradition.

Perhaps the broadest engagement regarding the function of eschatological violence within the Qumran corpus is that of Alex Jassen. Exploring the intersection between religious violence,

⁸¹ Sollamo, "War and Violence," 351–52.

⁸² Philip R. Davies, "The Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume One, Scripture and the Scrolls*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 206–32.

⁸³ Davies, "The Biblical and Qumranic Conception of War," 231.

sacred space, and the formation of identity, Jassen argued that “sectarian” literature exhibits a distinct ideological transformation concerning the emergence of violence.⁸⁴ In other words, whereas early sectarian writings involve the clarification of disputes as competing claims, later writings demonstrate a distinct emergence of conflict and violence as a focal point. For example, according to Jassen, 4QMMT with its legal disputes regarding the administration of the temple and its cultic activity stands as a fountainhead of the movement’s interaction with outsiders demonstrating a tone of civility and a hope for restoration. The dualistic worldview contained in *Damascus Document*, while similar to that of 4QMMT, suggests the transition to being one of the elect is far more difficult.⁸⁵ The *Community Rule*, and in particular the Teaching on the Two Spirits in 1QS 3:13–4:26, represents an even more solidified privileging of the Qumran movement and the expectancy of eschatological salvation, signaling a marked contrast between those considered insiders and outsiders regarding future salvation.⁸⁶ Jassen suggested this transition paralleled the intensifying self-identification of the community—from being the “true Israel” and God’s elect to becoming the sons of light with all others counted as the sons of darkness.

Jassen highlighted a second conclusion, namely that the violence embodied within the Qumran corpus is absent of “real-time vengeance,” but is postponed until the future

⁸⁴ Alex P. Jassen, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Violence: Sectarian Formation and Eschatological Imagination,” *BibInt* 17 (2009): 12–44; repr., *Violence, Scripture, and Textual Practice in Early Judaism and Christianity*, eds. Ra’anan S. Boustan, Alex P. Jassen, and Calvin J. Roetzel (Leiden: Brill: 2010), 13–44.

⁸⁵ Jassen, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 40.

⁸⁶ Jassen, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 40–42. Jassen is here borrowing the language of “introversionist” and “revolutionist” from Eyal Regev. See Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, RS 45 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 42–66. For the notion of “group privileging” and “scarce resource theory” Jassen draws upon the work of Hector Avalos, *Fighting Words: The Origins of Religious Violence* (Amherst: Prometheus, 2005); rev and repr., *The Reality of Religious Violence: From Biblical to Modern Times*, BMW 72 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2019).

eschatological battle, which Jassen equates with the “day of vengeance” (1QS 10:19).⁸⁷ He suggests this phenomenon is linked with the “revolutionist” sectarianism of the movement whereby they looked to the divinely ordained future judgment as opposed to taking up active violence in the present. Jassen further proposed that the vilification of the other serves a present-day rhetorical purpose of empowering the disempowered.⁸⁸

More recently, Jassen has examined eschatological violence in the *War Scroll* more fully.⁸⁹ Building upon the work of Ingo Schröder and Bettina Schmidt, Jassen argued that 1QM, with its combination of realistic and idealized depictions of war, should be characterized as a “violent imaginary,”⁹⁰ which Schröder and Schmidt defined as the process of imagining how violence will be carried out as well as a justification for such actions:

Violence needs to be imagined to be carried out. Groups do not strike out at random at the next accidental bystander but follow cultural models of appropriate action. War is framed in a code of legitimation that declares the assertion of interests to be related to moral imperatives.⁹¹

For Jassen, the *War Scroll* is just such an *imagined* future eschatological battle, one which includes a justification of moral imperative. Subsequently, Jassen suggested that the *War Scroll* should be understood as a “propagandistic tool” for the Qumran movement as they transitioned

⁸⁷ Jassen, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 43.

⁸⁸ Jassen, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 44. See also Alex Jassen, “Prophecy, Power, and Politics in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism,” in *Divination, Politics, and Ancient Near Eastern Empires*, eds. Alan Lenzi and Jonathan Stökl, ANEM (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 171–98; Jassen, “War and Violence,” in CDSS, 568–76.

⁸⁹ Alex P. 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: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, eds. Kipp Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 175–203.

⁹⁰ Ingo W. Schröder and Bettina E. Schmidt, “Introduction: Violent Imaginaries and Violent Practices,” in *Anthropology of Violence and Conflict*, eds. Bettina E. Schmidt and Ingo W. Schröder, EASA (London: Routledge, 2001), 1–24, esp. 9–13.

⁹¹ Schröder and Schmidt, “Violent Imaginaries,” 9.

from the rhetoric of imagined violence to the reality of violence at the dawn of the eschaton.⁹² In this light, the violent imagining of the *War Scroll* reflects a future fantasy of divine eschatological retribution as well as the empowerment of those disempowered with the hope of an eschatological reversal of power.⁹³ Jassen suggested elsewhere that notions of imagined violence and reversal can likewise be seen in the *pesharim* where the destruction of the enemy is framed as a reversal of present realities (e.g., 4QpPsa [4Q171] 1–10 ii 18–20; iii 7–8; 1QpHab 9:3–12; 12:1–6).⁹⁴

Jassen's conclusions have not gone unchallenged. Challenging Jassen's assertions that "violent language and imagery frame much of the history and worldview of the Qumran community"⁹⁵ and that "the emergence of violence was one of their central preoccupations,"⁹⁶ Årstein Justnes argued that violence in the Qumran texts was rather linked with and carried out by God, conceived as a divine imperative.⁹⁷ Justnes highlighted the prominent role of divine violence in the Qumran corpus noting the distinct absence of the commissioning of violence by God as well as an imperative to carry out violence or vengeance on God's behalf. According to Justnes, the divine violence displayed in the Scrolls were "righteous, salvific acts that put an end to evil and unrighteousness" and are not considered an intensification or amplification of human violence.⁹⁸

⁹² Jassen, "Violent Imaginaries," 176; Jassen, "War and Violence," 575.

⁹³ Jassen, "Violent Imaginaries," 203.

⁹⁴ Jassen, "War and Violence," 572–73.

⁹⁵ Jassen, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 13 and 15.

⁹⁶ Jassen, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 15.

⁹⁷ Årstein Justnes, "Divine Violence and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Encountering Violence in the Bible*, eds. Markus Zehnder and Hallvard Hagelia, BMW 55 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), 178–93.

⁹⁸ Justnes, "Divine Violence," 185–86. Citing Gen 6:11–13 as analogous, Justness suggested that divine and human violence contrast one another like notions of righteousness and ungodliness.

With reference to the *War Scroll*, Justnes suggested that it is first and foremost God who acts violently, not humans.⁹⁹ As evidence, Justnes pointed to the hymnic portion of 1QM 11:1–5, 7–12, where God is portrayed as a violent, divine warrior and the battle is ascribed as belonging to God. This is likewise seen in what Justnes described as a “rare example of sanctified violence,” the complete annihilation of the enemy (חרם) in 1QM 9:4–9 and 18:1–6, both of which he considers ritualistic and characterized in the same manner as divine violence. Justnes concluded that the *War Scroll* reflects by and large a movement away from “sanctified violence” and toward divine violence.¹⁰⁰ This, like other phenomena of violence in the Scrolls, is a fictional violence that, in the words of Kimberly Stratton, “constitute[s] a literary genre that was appropriate for a variety of ideological purposes, including social critique.”¹⁰¹

Several other studies that have touched upon wider themes in the Qumran war tradition are worth noting. Christophe Batsch, in a monograph based on his doctoral dissertation, broadly examined various rituals associated to warfare, reviewing the evidence from the Hebrew Bible and other writings from the Second Temple period, such as 1–2 Maccabees, Philo, Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, and the Qumran corpus.¹⁰² Regarding elements found in the Qumran war tradition

⁹⁹ Justnes, “Divine Violence,” 186–88.

¹⁰⁰ Justnes, “Divine Violence,” 188. This is in contradistinction with Jassen who uses the “sanctified violence” to refer to “violence that is believed to be sanctioned and/or required by God.” See Jassen, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 15 n. 7.

¹⁰¹ Kimberly B. Stratton, “The Eschatological Arena: Reinscribing Roman Violence in Fantasies of the End Times,” *BibInt* 17 (2009): 48; repr., *Violence, Scripture, and Textual Practice in Early Judaism and Christianity*, eds. Ra’anan S. Boustan, Alex P. Jassen, and Calvin J. Roetzel (Leiden: Brill: 2010). For example, see David A. deSilva, “The Revelation of John: A Case Study in Apocalyptic Propaganda and Maintenance of Sectarian Identity,” *Sociological Analysis* 53 (1992): 375–95.

¹⁰² Christophe Batsch, *La guerre et les rites de la guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple*, JSJSup 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2005). Batsch later revised and summarized his findings on the priesthood in warfare in Batsch, “Priests in Warfare in Second Temple Judaism: 1QM or the *Anti-Phinehas*,” in *Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings from the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*, eds. Daniel K. Falk et al., STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 165–78.

in particular, Batsch explored the role and function of the priesthood (Chapter 5) and the use of trumpets and standards in warfare (Chapter 6). Batsch observed that near the end of the Second Temple period, the concept of “zeal” (קנאה) for God had emerged as a potent political concept. Whereas the concept of zealousness is more a psychic or moral force in the Scrolls, political Zealotism flourished in other writings and found connection in the figure of Phinehas (cf. Num 25; 1 Kgs 18) bringing together a vision of a warrior priest.¹⁰³ Batsch argued that the *War Scroll* in its portrayal of priesthood involvement in war departed from this model and was simultaneously anti-Hasmonean and anti-Zealot in its new presentation of priestly involvement in warfare.¹⁰⁴

According to Batsch, this new model of priestly warfare portrayed in the *War Scroll* was one in which the priesthood had a distinct leadership role yet were securely separated from the activity of war. On the one hand, the priesthood exercised tactical leadership through a series of trumpet signals. On the other, the heightened concern for priestly ritual purity, as evident in 1QM 7:9–12 and 9:7–9, signified the necessity of priestly separation from combat. For Batsch, the demarcation of the line between the priests and the combatants in battlefield exhortation as well as the use of trumpet signals to remain safely separated from the bloodshed evince an “anti-Phinehas” orientation.¹⁰⁵ Whereas Zealots embraced the warrior priest figure of Phinehas, the Qumran movement opted for a model of priestly warfare in which the priesthood, while

¹⁰³ Batsch, “Priests in Warfare,” 167.

¹⁰⁴ Batsch, “Priests in Warfare,” 172.

¹⁰⁵ Batsch, *La guerre*, 174–78; Batsch, “Priests in Warfare,” 173–75.

providing tactical military leadership, maintained the role of mediator between the human and divine in strict observance of ritual purity.¹⁰⁶

Finally, Ian Werrett and Stephen Parker have recently examined the role of purity and rules of exclusion in the Qumran war tradition.¹⁰⁷ Werrett and Parker proposed that the strict purity requirements for the eschatological combatants found in 1QM 7:3–7 signal a deep concern for the maintenance of ritual purity as well as a requirement for combatants to be “perfect in spirit and flesh” (1QM 7:5b). Moreover, Werrett and Parker aptly demonstrated the predominance of ritual purity concerns over and above those of logistical and “real world” warfare concerns, thus leading to the suggestion that the *War Scroll* should be understood as “a utopian document.”¹⁰⁸ On this view, the manuscript functioned as a source of spiritual and moral support to a movement expecting a future where the forces of evil would be destroyed and the righteous vindicated. This, for Werrett and Parker, accounts not only for the dualistic and predestinarian concerns in the manuscript but also the “quixotic desire” for the sanctity and purity of the eschatological combatants.¹⁰⁹ Purity in the *War Scroll*, far from a minor concern, is of paramount importance as a prerequisite for those engaged in the eschatological struggle as well as an absolute qualification for victory.

¹⁰⁶ Batsch adds another layer to the overall portrait of priesthood in times of war in the Second Temple period, that of war vs. compromise. Thus, Batsch forms four theoretical choices: the Phinehas model (zeal and warfare), the *War Scroll* (warfare and purity), the Sadducees (purity and compromise), and Josephus (compromise and zeal). See Batsch, *Le guerre*, 208–209; Batsch, “Priests in Warfare,” 176–77. Additionally, Batsch has argued elsewhere that the notion of Essene pacifism was a historical myth, see Batsch, “Le ‘pacifisme des Esséniens,’ un mythe historiographique,” *RevQ* 21 (2004): 457–68.

¹⁰⁷ Ian Werrett and Stephen Parker, “Purity in War: What is it Good For?” 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*, eds. Kipp Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 295–316.

¹⁰⁸ Werrett and Parker, “Purity in War,” 315.

¹⁰⁹ Werrett and Parker, “Purity in War,” 315–16.

1.4 Towards a New Reading

The studies reviewed above share an attempt to provide a reading of the *War Scroll*, or the larger war tradition, based upon various literary or ideological features identified in the material. Most scholars have tried to make sense of the violent characteristics contained in the tradition. In other words, the crucial line of questioning related to how we are to understand the violent nature of the accounts of war in these manuscripts considering other literature found at Qumran and what we know based on the archeological remains at Khirbet Qumran. Some studies have focused on other ideological matters within the war texts, such as their dualistic features and the light this might shed on the wider dualistic ideology attested in the literature of Qumran. Others have undertaken an examination of specific elements within the war manuscripts, such as the role of the priesthood, the use of trumpets and banners, as well as issues of purity and defilement—all in service of understanding their place within the war tradition as well as what light they might shed on the self-understanding and eschatological ideology of the movement. By and large these studies have provided a window through which we have gained a greater understanding of the war tradition, not to mention the Qumran movement and the wider Jewish landscape. In many ways, these studies are steppingstones for the present study.

The purpose of this study is to provide a fresh reading of the Qumran war tradition based on the more complete picture now available of the movement itself, its beliefs and ideologies, including its eschatological imagination given the full publication of texts. We take as our starting point that the Qumran war tradition represents an imagined conflict between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. While the war tradition is clearly built upon “holy war” traditions contained in the Jewish Scriptures it also shows a demonstrable knowledge of Greco-

Roman military tactical manuals and Maccabean warfare practices. Steeped in “holy war” traditions, the Qumran war material advances these notions by expanding them into a cosmological realm where angelic beings, led by the archangel Michael, fight alongside the sons of light against the forces of Belial and his lot.

Our proposal in this study is that the Qumran war tradition uniquely brings together priestly traditions regarding warfare (Num 31; Josh 6; 2 Chr 13; 20), the time of preparation in the wilderness (Num 2; 10), and notions of purity and defilement (Lev 15; 19; 21; Num 31), in addition to holiness and post-exilic traditions regarding pollution and purification. This coalescence of priestly and holiness traditions is framed within a distinct self-presentation of the movement within an ideological framework, including the self-understanding of being “exiles in the desert” and attentive to calendrical concerns with their cosmological implications. What results is a new expression of priestly warfare tradition, one that ultimately envisages the eschatological warfare as a purification of the earth from the pollution of the wicked.

To this end, we will begin in Chapter 2 with a survey of the constellation of manuscripts associated with the rubric of the Qumran war tradition: the *War Scroll* (1QM or 1Q33); the 4QM manuscripts, 4QM^{a-f} (4Q491–496); 4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A (4Q497); 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471); and the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* manuscripts (4Q285 and 11Q14). We will examine the materiality, history of publication, and content of these manuscripts in addition to their proposed textual relationships. Special attention will be placed on scholarly conceptions, such as “texts,” “manuscripts,” and “traditions.” Based upon insights gained through material, or new philology, we will additionally argue that theoretical constructs such as editions and recensions

tend to privilege one textual witness over another, making it preferable to examine each individual witness as its own material expression within a wider, evolving war tradition.

In Chapter 3, we will investigate the role and function of the priesthood in the Qumran war tradition. Against the backdrop of the pre-battle and post-battle warfare function of the priesthood in the Hebrew Bible and situated within the presentation of the priesthood in the Scrolls more broadly, we will survey the priestly terminology and functioning within the Qumran war tradition. Our focus will be twofold. First, observations will be drawn regarding what the evidence reveals concerning genealogical concerns and priestly status in the Qumran movement. Second, and more specifically to the war tradition, attention will be focused on the specific ritual, liturgical, and tactical functioning of the priesthood. While the first two seem to mirror what we see within the priestly tradition of the Hebrew Bible, the tactical functioning represents an unprecedented development. The results of our investigation demonstrate that the Qumran war tradition, while framed within the priestly tradition, evidence evolution and development.

The focal point of Chapter 4 is the textualization of ritual instructions and its significance in understanding the re-occupation of Jerusalem and re-establishment of proper Temple cultic activity in 1QM 2:1–6. Ritual theory, especially that of the textualization of rituals, will ground our exploration of the priestly ritual instructions in 1QM 2:1–6. These instructions point to a necessity within the war tradition for the re-establishment of cosmological ordering through the re-institution of properly conducted Temple cultic activity. Significant here is the central focus on proper hierarchical stratification of priestly leadership and the re-institution of priestly courses according to the properly calendrical schema of the movement. These instructions frame the first phase of the eschatological war in cosmological terms with the goal of bringing order to the

cosmos out of disorder. The connection between cosmological order and eschatological judgment, as we will see, is expressed in other writings found at Qumran.

We then turn attention to the wilderness motif in the Hebrew Bible and the ideology of the Qumran movement and its employment in the war tradition in Chapter 5. We will build upon the work of Shemaryahu Talmon who suggested that the employment of the wilderness motif in the Qumran tradition signaled a time of transition and preparation for the achievement of a new goal, namely, the future re-occupation of Jerusalem and the land of Israel.¹¹⁰ We will examine the use of “exile” terminology in 1QM 1 as a framework for the eschatological war. Moreover, we will suggest that the use of trumpets and standards in the war tradition directly connect the wilderness preparation narratives of Num 2 and 10 with the eschatological campaign. Specifically, regarding the trumpets, we will argue that the earliest stratum of the war tradition demonstrates that the use of trumpets served a more memorial function rather than a tactical one, with the tactical orchestration representing a later development in the tradition. Ultimately, we conclude that the allusive connection between the wilderness motif and the war tradition frames the conflict as a sort of re-entry into the land from exile in the wilderness.

Building upon Ariel Feldman’s demonstration that the Joshua tradition was the focus of a literary and exegetical enterprise in the last two centuries BCE,¹¹¹ the aim of Chapter 6 is to explore the exegetical connection between the Joshua conquest narratives and the Qumran war tradition. We examine the linguistic and thematic relationship between the two traditions,

¹¹⁰ Shemaryahu Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif’ in the Bible and in Qumran Literature,” in *Biblical Motifs, Origins and Transformations*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 31–63; repr., *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible: Form and Content* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), 216–54.

¹¹¹ Ariel Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, BZAW 438 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014).

including the re-emergence of the concept of *herem* from the Joshua tradition in the war tradition, arguing that the Joshua tradition played a significant role in the framing of the imagined eschatological battle. This picture is further supported by the work of Eileen Schuller on 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) 69, a fragment which connects the Joshua tradition with the destruction of those who have defiled the land by their deeds and the possession of the land by the elect.¹¹² We conclude that the employment of the Joshua tradition in the war tradition augments the wilderness preparation motif discussed in Chapter 5, thus portraying the eschatological war as a re-entry and re-possession of the land defiled on account of the abominable acts of the people of the land.

In our final chapter, we will turn our attention to the themes of purity and defilement, pollution and purification in the Qumran war tradition. Whereas the enhanced purity regulations of the war tradition have been previously explored, matters of defilement, pollution, and purification have not received similar attention. Here, we will analyze the purity and perfection requirements for the war camp in 1QM 7:3–7 and the concern for corpse impurity in 1QM 9:7–9 and 14:2–3 considering their biblical tradition antecedents, Deut 23:10–15 and Numbers 31:19–24, respectively. We then shift to the language of defilement with special attention given to the phrase “works of impure uncleanness” (עבודת נדת טמאתם) in 1QM 13:5, which appears in other biblical and Qumran texts referring to abominable acts that pollute the land requiring the removal of the wicked from the land as purification. Importantly, this phrase appears in 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) 69 1–2, thus bringing together the Joshua tradition, the abominable

¹¹² Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran*, HSS 28 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); Schuller, “4QNon-Canonical Psalms B,” DJD 11:87–172.

acts of the wicked that defilement of the land, and the need for purification through the possessing of the land by the elect. We suggest that a similar constellation of concepts can be seen in the Qumran war tradition as well as in the wider eschatological imagination within the Qumran movement in texts such as 4QRenewed Earth (4Q475) and 4QpPsalms^a (4Q171). We will conclude our study with a look forward to avenues of potential future studies regarding the nature of religious violence as well as the wider eschatological imagination of the Qumran movement.

Our investigation illuminates a new understanding of the Qumran war tradition, where priestly and holiness traditions of warfare, wilderness preparation, and purity and pollution are drawn upon, expanded, and coalesced with the distinct ideology of the authors to create a new landscape of imagined eschatological warfare. The resulting image pictures the elect of God as returning from a time of exile and preparation in the wilderness to a land defiled and polluted by the abominable acts of the wicked, who are under the dominion of darkness. This offers the context for engaging the enemy in battle, marked by purity and perfection, to annihilate the forces of darkness, take possession of the land, and thus bring about the purification and eschatological renewal of the earth.

CHAPTER 2 – THE WAR TRADITION MANUSCRIPTS FROM QUMRAN

2.1 Introduction: Texts, Manuscripts, and Traditions

Over the past decade or more, a prominent discussion has arisen regarding the nature and interrelationship of the material medium with which Qumran scholarship is based: the fragments and scrolls collected under the rubric the Dead Sea Scrolls. This is not surprising given the full publication of the Cave 4 fragments and subsequent analysis of newly discovered manuscripts in relation to previously known ones, such as the 4QS manuscripts vis-à-vis the *Community Rule* (1QS). Questions regarding the relationship between manuscripts has led to a re-examination of basic concepts, such as the nature of a “text” or a “manuscript.” Incorporating insights from material philology, or “new” philology,¹ Qumran scholarship has rightly undertaken discussions concerning issues of materiality as well as how we are to understand the nature of fragments and their associative relationship as “manuscripts.”² As Eibert Tigchelaar has observed, whereas

¹ See Bernard Cerquiglini, *Éloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris: Seuil, 1989); English translation: Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*, trans. Betsy Wing (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale*, Collection Poétique (Paris: Seuil, 1972); English translation: Zumthor, *Toward a Medieval Poetics*, trans. Philip Bennett (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992); Stephen G. Nichols, “Introduction: Philology in a Manuscript Culture,” *Speculum* 65 (1990): 1–10; M. J. Driscoll, “The Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New,” in *Creating the Medieval Saga: Version, Variability, and Editorial Interpretation of Old Norse Saga Literature*, eds. Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge, The Viking Collection 18 (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2010), 87–104; Stephen G. Nichols, “What is a Manuscript Culture? Technologies and the Manuscript Matrix,” in *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*, eds. Michael Robert Johnson and Michael Van Dussen, CSML (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 34–59; Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992).

² See Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “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. Maxine Grossman (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 26–47; Tigchelaar, “Proposals for the Critical Editing of Scrolls Compositions,” (paper presented at SBL Annual Meeting 2012, Chicago, IL, 18 November 2012); Andrew B. Perrin, “Redrafting the Architecture of Daniel Traditions in the Hebrew Scriptures and Dead Sea Scrolls,” *JTS* 72 (2021): 44–71. Regarding the Qumran war tradition specifically, see Kipp Davis, “‘There and Back Again’: Reconstruction and Reconciliation of the War Text 4QMilhamah^a (4Q491^{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*, eds. Kipp Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 125–46; Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 18–27.

fragments are the most basic of concrete phenomena, once we move into the realm of “manuscripts,” “works,” and “textual groups” we have moved into theoretical constructions.³

For the purpose of our study, we will define a “text” as “a series of words in a particular order,” or as Liv Ingeborg Lied has more precisely noted, “the words on the page.”⁴ Regarding the Dead Sea Scrolls this “text” is inscribed on skin or papyrus, which are preserved in numerous fragments of varying size.⁵ The term “scroll” loosely refers to a manuscript written on skin or papyrus. While most of the extant evidence is fragmentary in nature, nine scrolls are relatively well preserved in rolled fashion (1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, 1QpHab, 1QapGen, 1QS, 1QM, 1QH^a, 11QPs^a, 11QT^a).⁶ Hence, the term “scroll” refers to both fragmentary manuscripts as well as those preserved in rolled fashion. As for the term “manuscript,” a precise definition depends on individual usage. Tigchelaar has pointed out that the term as used in Dead Sea Scrolls studies has three different meanings.⁷ First, the term is used for a proposed larger inscribed object, an original “whole,” consisting of discrete pieces of inscribed skin or papyrus of which one or more extant fragments are preserved. Second, the term refers to “the sum and tentative assemblage of all the fragments and only those fragments that are hypothesized to originate from one and the same whole.”⁸ Third, the term can refer to “the tentative scholarly re-construction of the original

³ Tigchelaar, “Proposals for the Critical Editing of Scrolls Compositions,” 4.

⁴ See Liv Ingeborg Lied, “Text–Work–Manuscript: What Is an ‘Old Testament Pseudepigraphon’?” *JSP* 25 (2015): 150–65, esp. 152–53; Driscoll, “The Words on the Page,” 94.

⁵ George Brooke, “Physicality, Paratextuality, and Peshar Habakkuk,” in *On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures*, eds. Sydney H. Aufère, Philip S. Alexander, and Zlatko Pleše, OLA 232 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 175–93; Brooke, “Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin: Culture, Complexity and Multiple Identities in the Qumran Library,” in *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World*, eds. Mladen Popović, Myles Schoonover, and Marijn Vanderberghe, *JSJSup* 178 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 119–35; Ingo Kottsieper, “Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture,” *CDSS*, 167–77.

⁶ See Annette Steudel, “Assembling and Reconstructing Manuscripts,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019), 1:516–34; Steudel, “Scroll Reconstruction,” *EDSS* 2:842–44; Steudel, “Reading and Reconstructing Manuscripts,” *CDSS*, 186–91.

⁷ Tigchelaar, “Constructing,” 26–28.

⁸ Tigchelaar, “Constructing,” 27.

whole on the basis of the extant evidence.”⁹ For this study, we will follow Tigchelaar’s understanding of a “manuscript” as the “real or reconstructed physical object” upon which “text” is inscribed, a sense more akin to Tigchelaar’s second sense of the term.¹⁰

Recent discussions on material philology have offered significant insight challenging scholarly assumptions of both text and manuscript. M. J. Driscoll highlighted three key principles of material philology applicable for our study.¹¹ First, literary “works” do not exist independently of their material embodiment, what we might deem a “manuscript.” Thus, each material form needs to be understood as its own artefact within the wider tradition. Second, these physical objects, or what we would call manuscripts, arise from a series of processes involving numerous people in particular times, places, and purposes with their own social, economic, and intellectual contexts. Third, these physical objects are transmitted and disseminated through time in settings which are also socially, economically, and intellectually derived. Together, material philology focuses on the concrete material object itself, its production and utilization, examining them as a discrete entity rather than an early textual witness of a later, normative form of the “composition.” In this light, each manuscript is not a primitive form of the composition, but rather a unique snapshot of a continually evolving pluriform tradition that requires individual consideration when examining the overarching tradition.¹² It is in this sense, that we speak of a “tradition” as *a collection of manuscripts representing the evolving, pluriform transmission of specific ideas and ideology in a specific, shared context.*

⁹ Tigchelaar, “Constructing,” 27.

¹⁰ Tigchelaar, “Constructing,” 27. Lied as a similar understanding for “manuscript,” that is “as ‘the text-bearing object,’ which is to say a culturally produced material artefact that contains the text-on-page.” See Lied, “Text–Work–Manuscript,” 153.

¹¹ Driscoll, “The Words on the Page,” 90–95, esp. 90–91.

¹² See Hugo Lundhaug and Liv Ingeborg Lied, “Studying Snapshots: On Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology,” in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology*, eds. Liv Ingeborg Lied and Hugo Lundhaug, TUGAL 175 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 1–19.

The basis of our study is a collection of manuscripts that reflect a close affinity with a tradition of an imagined future eschatological battle. This collection would include 1QM (1Q33), the *War Scroll*; 4QM^{a-f} (4Q491–496); 4QWar Scroll-like Text A (4Q497); 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471); 4Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285); and 11Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (11Q14). While these manuscripts evidence varying textual relationship to one another, including strata within the evolving textual tradition, each manuscript will be examined on its own as a material object. The concern will be for the evolving Qumran war tradition as opposed to the prevailing tendency to assess 1QM as the final and fullest intended expression of the tradition.

2.2 1QM/1Q33 (The *War Scroll*)

2.2.1 Material Analysis

The longest and relatively best preserved of the Cave 1 manuscripts, the scroll consists of what Eleazar Sukenik described as “fine, buff coloured leather.”¹³ Measuring 2.9 meters by 16 cm, 1QM (1Q33) consists of four sheets preserving eighteen columns of inscribed text.¹⁴ The sheets themselves range in length between 47 and 89 cm, with the first sheet containing columns 1–4, the second containing columns 5–10, the third containing columns 11–15, and the fourth columns 16–18.¹⁵ A fifth, detached sheet, represented by a large fragment (9 x 13 cm) and several smaller fragments, preserves the remnants of the nineteenth column with a few letters evidencing a subsequent twentieth column.¹⁶ Esther and Hanan Eshel suggested that the detached

¹³ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35. On the manuscript and contexts, see van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 1–25. For a recent material and content analysis of 1QM (1Q33), see Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 31–48.

¹⁴ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35. Emanuel Tov states the length of the scroll as 2.70 m. See Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts from the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 74, 77. Tov classifies 1QM as a medium sized scroll. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 70.

¹⁵ See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 80. The first sheet contains four columns of text, the second sheet six columns of text (with the eighth column being narrower), the third sheet five columns of text, and the fourth sheet containing three columns of text.

¹⁶ Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13.

sheet belonged to a different manuscript and recension of 1QM.¹⁷ Brian Schultz, however, in addition to observing the remnants of a suture line at the end of the fourth sheet suggesting a fifth sheet, noted that the “remains of a small sheet, badly decomposed, was found rolled together with, or partially wrapped around the scroll” inside a protective covering.¹⁸ This evidence suggests that the detached fifth sheet does indeed belong to 1QM although there has been further discussion as to its exact placement within the manuscript.¹⁹ As was discussed in the last chapter, subsequent to the purchase of 1QM, two additional fragments were found in Cave 1 in 1949, the first of which was a portion of column 18 (1Q33 1) and the second a portion of column 19 (1Q33 2).²⁰

The upper portion of the manuscript is well preserved, as opposed to the lower portion which evidences varying degrees of damage. The upper portion does display a damage pattern in columns 1–6 which appears consistent with the rolling up of the scroll. Columns 9–10 and 13–18 have damage to the center portion of the manuscript, gradually increasing in the later columns. The combined damage pattern is consistent with the suggestion that the scroll was loosely rolled from the beginning columns to the end.²¹ There also appear to be various surface defects to the parchment in several locations requiring the scribe to leave a space (1:10, 3:10; 10:9; 11:7; 12:14; 13:12; 14:5; 14:12–13; 17:6).²² The upper margin is approximately 3 cm with the

¹⁷ Esther Eshel and Hanan 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*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 354.

¹⁸ Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 12.

¹⁹ Jean Carmignac suggested that the detached sheet belonged to column 20. See Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 259.

²⁰ Barthélemy and Milik, DJD 1:3–40, 135–36, pl. XXI. See PAM 40.487 and 40.531.

²¹ Hartmut Stegemann, “Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR 2 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 193–97.

²² See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 249–51 and Fig. 18 (group A) and Fig. 19 (group G) for a collection of irregularities due to surface defects.

intercolumnar margin measuring 2 cm.²³ The extant manuscript contains between 16 and 18 lines of text per column, measuring between 10.5 and 16 cm in length.²⁴ Sukenik suggested that only a few lines, perhaps three or four, are missing from the lower portion of the manuscript.²⁵ With the damage to the lower portion of the manuscript the exact height of the scroll cannot be established with any certainty. The beginning of the scroll contains an initial margin of 7.1+ cm, wider than normal, directly to the right of the first column. This uninscribed area indicates that the first column of the extant manuscript is the preserved first column of the scroll. According to Sukenik, a detached blank leather sheet measuring 35.5 cm in length has survived as well and, in his estimation, served as a handle sheet to the scroll.²⁶ Emanuel Tov, however, deemed this suggestion unlikely as the first sheet shows no evidence of stitch holes.²⁷ Due to the damage at the end of the scroll, the actual length of the manuscript beyond the last extant column is uncertain.

According to Sukenik, the scroll was copied “by an expert scribe writing a beautiful and accurate hand.”²⁸ The formation of letters is clearly distinguishable, except for the letters *yod* and *vav*, which are graphically indistinguishable. Letters are carefully written below horizontal lines which are ruled across the sheet. Commenting on the meticulous nature of the scribe, Yigael Yadin noted that while the scribe endeavors to stay within the column width, when needing to

²³ Tov noted a fluctuation of the top margin between 2.7–3.5 cm. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 102.

²⁴ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35. For his part, Yadin argued that columns 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, and 17 all contained 17 lines; columns 2 and 5 contained 16 lines; columns 8–11 and 14 contained 18 lines; columns 15 and 16 contained 15 lines; column 18 contained 14 lines; and column 19 contained 13 lines. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 248.

²⁵ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35. Tov suggests that 1QM had 20 or 23–25 lines when reconstructed. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 127.

²⁶ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35.

²⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 112–115.

²⁸ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35. Frank Moore Cross described the hand of 1QM as “an excellent example of a delicate, usually miniscule, formal script.” See Frank Moore Cross, “Paleography,” *EDSS* 2:632.

extend a line the scribe is careful not to extend more than half the letters of the final word.²⁹ The space between the lines fluctuates between 0.6 and 0.9 cm in height and the letters measure approximately 2 mm in height, producing between sixty and ninety letters or spaces per line depending on column width.³⁰

Corrections to the text are methodically treated through a variety of means. The scribe corrected through full erasure (5:4; 7:1; 13:12; 15:1, 12); partial erasure or letter interruption (2:10; 3:3; 11:6); supralinear addition of a letter(s) (2:7; 3:2;³¹ 5:3;³² 6:5, 9; 7:1; 10:13; 14:10; 15:1; 16:14; 18:9) or a full word (2:6; 4:16; 12:11; 15:12; 17:10); and by a process of cancellation dots above and below letters (4:6), above and below multiple letters with a supralinear addition (11:8), and an irregular dotting form consisting of cancellation dots above, below, and to the left of the word (3:4).³³ This suggests the possibility of several different hands at work. The first four lines on the right margin of column 3 display an exceptional case where the text is damaged perhaps due to wear, smudging, or even a surface defect. Lines 2–4 appear to have been re-inked. Line 1, however, has been completely corrected, potentially by a secondary scribe, who has bracketed the first three words (the left-hand bracket is divided due to the narrow space between the words in the original location), written a horizontal line above the grouping of words, and corrected the text with a supralinear addition.³⁴ Column 10, line 9 also displays a

²⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 249.

³⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 105; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13.

³¹ Eric Reymond cited this location in support of his suggestion that fatigue of writing the same word frequently can lead to a scribal mistake. See Eric D. Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*, RBS 27 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 30.

³² The supralinear addition in 5:3 and 6:5 correct an identical scribal mistake. Intending to write מערכת, the scribe wrote מכת. The ער was added supralinearly.

³³ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 249–52 and Figs. 18 and 19 for an extensive discussion on the irregularities and corrections within the manuscript of 1QM, as well as the orthographical tendencies of the scribe. See also, Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 191–97.

³⁴ Yadin suggested a line below the grouping of words as well, but in my estimation what he sees could equally be cancellation dots. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 251 and Fig. 19 (group G). Of this location, Tov remarked, “The supralinear inscription added at the end of the first line after the completion of the writing possibly served as a

notable correction, where in the middle of the line the scribe has left a long horizontal line between the words **ומיא** and **בעמכה**. While the rationale for such a correction is uncertain, it is quite possible that the scribe was signaling a mistaken lacuna or division.³⁵

As discussed in Chapter 1, opinions have varied regarding the dating of the manuscript.³⁶ Sukenik tentatively suggested that the manuscript was copied before the destruction of the Second Temple (ca. 70 CE) while also hypothesizing a pre-Hasmonean period for the “date of composition.”³⁷ Frank Moore Cross, based on paleographical features, classified the manuscript as typical early Herodian formal script and placed the date of copying in the second half of the first century BCE (ca. 30–1 BCE).³⁸ While the traditions reflected in 1QM are surely a part of a larger, evolving tradition, stretching back to at least early first century BCE and perhaps before, the copying of 1QM seems securely positioned in the latter half of the first century BCE.³⁹

2.2.2 Content Overview

Sukenik provisionally entitled the scroll “The War of the Sons of the Light against the Sons of Darkness” in light of the content of the scroll explicitly captured in the first full line of the text

superscription to a new section.” See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 177. What has not been addressed, in my estimation, is the separation of **והיצורות** into three separate words (**וה צו צרות**) in the supralinear correction.

³⁵ Yadin included this location under his classification of locations where the scribe had to leave a blank in the text due to a fault in the skin, although he admits that no fault is visible to him. He did suggest that the horizontal line is curved “to indicate that the words belong together.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 249 and 305. Tov theorized that the horizontal line reflects a cancelled section division in which “he (or a later scribe) canceled it with a thin strike level with the bottom letters.” See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 187. Van der Ploeg suggested that the line is meant to indicate that the space was not intentional. See van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 137.

³⁶ See 1.2.1.

³⁷ Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 36.

³⁸ Frank Moore Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. G. Ernest Wright (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1979), 138. Solomon Birnbaum argued for a dating in the third quarter of the first century BCE (ca. 50–25 BCE). See Solomon A. Birnbaum, *The Hebrew Scripts, I, Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 150–54. Philip Davies referenced Cross as stating that 1QM “exhibits ‘Herodian’ script, which would date the manuscript to approximately in the early part of the first century A.D.” yet did not cite a specific location in “The Development of the Jewish Scripts.” See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 18.

³⁹ For a discussion on issues surrounding the dating of 1QM, see Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 64–102.

which he rendered, “The first campaign of the sons of light shall begin against the lot of the sons of darkness...”⁴⁰ The manuscript comprises a detailed description of an eschatological war between the “Sons of Light” and the “Sons of Darkness,” where after six engagements, with each side victorious three times, the Sons of Light conquer the Sons of Darkness in a seventh and decisive engagement. Combining themes of dualism and ritual purity, the *War Scroll* presents a wide array of features associated with the eschatological war, including the types of trumpets and banners employed by the Sons of Light, the militaristic organization and weaponry utilized in combat, the tactical maneuvers executed, and the accompanying martial liturgical elements. Taken as a whole, the *War Scroll* depicts a human conflict fought in conjunction with the divine realm, one in which the God of Israel is a divine warrior fighting on behalf of his faithful remnant. Universally agreed upon to be a composite text, the structure of the *War Scroll* has been a matter of some debate. For our purposes, the content of the *War Scroll* has been presented in line with the work of Philip Davies and Jean Duhaime as consisting of four units of material: column 1, columns 2–9, columns 10–14, and columns 15–19.⁴¹ While this structure is by no means universally accepted, we will utilize this structure to discuss matters of theme and content.⁴²

⁴⁰ Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth I*, 18. Unfortunately, the first few words of the text are lost due to manuscript damage along the right margin of the text. Various translators have tendentiously reconstructed the opening phrase of line 1, which ends with the extant words “[...] the war,” with varying options. Yadin reconstructed this location as, “And th[is is the book of the disposition of] the war” based upon 1QS 5:1; CD 10:4; 14:12; and 1QM 15:5. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 256. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar reconstructed the line as, “For the Ins[tructor: The Rule of] the War.” See García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 113. Geza Vermes as, “For the M[aster: The Rule of] War on the unleashing the of the attack...” See *CDSSE*, 165. Duhaime is more cautious, choosing “For m[...] of] the war.” See Duhaime, *PTSDSSP 2:97*.

⁴¹ See Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 20–23; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 14–20; and Jean Duhaime, “War Scroll,” in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, eds. Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2013), 3118.

⁴² For other structures of 1QM, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 7–14 (e.g., War Series [1:1–2:14], Battle Serekh Series [2:15–9:16], Ritual Serekh Series [9:17–14:15], and Kittim Series [14:16–19:13]; van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 5–6; Philip S. Alexander, “Rules,” *EDSS 2:802–3*; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 42–60; Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 40–47.

Column 1 presents the initial engagement between the Sons of Light, comprised of Levites, Judahites, Benjaminites, and “the exiles of the wilderness” (1:2–3), and the lot of the Sons of Darkness which is comprised of “the army of Belial, the troop of Edom and Moab, the sons of Ammon and [...] Philistia and the troops of the Kittim of Ashur, and in help with those who transgress the covenant” (1:1–2).⁴³ Lines 8–15 describe the fall of the Kittim and the Sons of Darkness at the hands of the faithful remnant in a seventh decisive engagement. The battle, preordained by God, results in the annihilation of the enemy—bringing about the exaltation of God’s majesty and “for peace and blessing, glory and joy, and length of days for the sons of light” (1:9). The damaged lower section of column 1 speaks of the potential appearance of God with the holy ones for the annihilation of the Sons of Darkness.

Columns 2–9 present the organization and detailed instructions by which the Sons of Light will fight against the Sons of Darkness. The opening section of 2:1–14 begins with the organization and cultic service of the priesthood and the congregation during the sabbatical year, a year of rest from war (2:1–6a). This is followed by a detailed description of the conscription for a remaining thirty-three years of war (2:6b–10a) and a listing of nations that will be fought against and the time allotted to each engagement (2:10b–14). The remaining material in columns 2–9 includes instructions for the implements of war, the organization of the military, and the tactical maneuvers carried out in the midst of battle. Columns 2:16–3:11 consist of the descriptions of the trumpets of the congregation, including their functional/tactical aspects and names inscribed upon each. This is followed in columns 3:13–4:17 by descriptions of the banners of the congregation according to their various units and the inscriptions upon each, as well as the banners used within various phases of battle and the inscriptions inscribed upon

⁴³ All translations of 1QM are my own unless otherwise noted.

each.⁴⁴ The inscription upon the shield of the Prince of the Congregation follows in 5:1–2, which leads into the rule of the formation of the divisions of the army in columns 5:3–7:7—instructions concerning the heavy infantry in the front formation and their weaponry (5:3–14), the deployment of the light infantry or skirmishers and their weaponry (5:16–6:6), and regarding the cavalry and their weaponry (6:8–17). This rule section concludes with regulations regarding conscription age limits (7:1–4a) and prescriptions for maintaining ritual purity within the war camp (7:4b–7). The final section of columns 2–9 addresses the procedures for the execution of battle, including the arrangement and deployment of the light infantry and the battle engagement all under the tactical direction of the priesthood (7:9–9:9). The section ends with detailed description of the formation used in pursuit of the enemy (9:10–16). This tactical orchestration is conveyed through the use of distinctive trumpet sounds, which choreograph each of the phases of engagement—specifically, the “trumpets of assembly” (7:13, 15; 8:3; 9:3), “trumpets of memorial” (7:13), “trumpets of alarm” (7:13), “trumpets of pursuit” (7:13; 9:6), “trumpets of return or withdrawal” (7:13; 8:2, 13, 16), and “trumpets of the slain” (9:1–2). As I will develop later more fully, by conjoining sacerdotal orchestration with an elevated concern for the ritual purity of the war camp, what is presented here is a vision of “holy war” in which God is seen as participating on behalf of the faithful remnant.

Columns 10–14 comprise a lengthy collection of liturgical material which, taken as a whole, conveys the explicit ideological conception of the eschatological war in the mind of the faithful remnant. Column 10 opens with an address to God, recalling the instructions given to the people through Moses in Deut 20, whereby the priest and officers stand and address the people,

⁴⁴ The division of the army into units of tribes, myriads, thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens and their corresponding banners displays a particular reliance upon Num 1–10 for inspiration. See Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 33.

encouraging and strengthening them for battle. God's great deeds and mighty strength are glorified, as is Israel, the people of the covenant. Column 11 continues the theme of praise declaring, "For to you is the battle..." (11:1) and then recounting the great victories God has wrought for his people. Referencing Num 24:17–19, God's revelation to the remnant of impending victory over the enemy and the forces of Belial is proclaimed in terms reminiscent of the account of the Israelites' victory over Pharaoh and his forces (11:6–12). The column concludes with a declaration that God will deliver the enemy into the hands of the poor for recompense and for the just judgment of God (11:13–15). The prayer continues in column 12 where the holy ones in heaven, the host of angels, along with the chosen ones of his holy people who live in the community on earth will be mustered "by their thousands and their myriads" and sent forth into battle (12:1–5). After an empty line, the prayer crescendos in 12:7–16 with the acknowledgement that God, the King of Glory, is in their midst.⁴⁵ Joined by mighty men of valor and a host of angels on the day of battle, the chosen petition God to arise and conquer the enemy, taking the spoil, "placing your hand upon the neck of the enemy and your foot upon the backs of the slain" (12:11), and filling the land with glory and his inheritance with blessing.

Whereas the preceding prayer is focused on nationalistic themes, column 13 presents a new liturgical setting within a dualistic framework. The priests, Levites, and elders of the community pronounce from their position a blessing upon the God of Israel and a curse upon Belial and all the spirits of his lot. Blessed is God for his holy plan and the deeds of his truth and blessed are all those who serve him and know him in righteousness (13:2b–3). Conversely, Belial is cursed for his plan of hatred and his guilty authority and, likewise, the spirits of his lot are

⁴⁵ Yadin suggested that this being the essential part of the prayer, a special section was given to it. Yadin did not highlight the vacant line as a part of this proposal, but seems to highlight the first phrase here, "And Thou..." seeing the parallel opening in 13:7 as functioning this way. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 316.

cursed for their wicked plan and works of impure uncleanness (13:4–6). The column shifts in scope at 13:7, expanding to an extensive blessing of God for the covenant made with their fathers, confirmed for their seed, and kept by the “survivors of the covenant” (13:8). God has redeemed for himself an eternal people (13:9b) and has appointed Belial to corrupt and, along with his forces, to “walk on the boundaries of darkness” (13:12). The section concludes with a portrayal of the lot of truth rejoicing in the strength of God and a declaration that on the day of battle God will “bring low the darkness and lend might to the light” (13:15).

Column 14 opens with a singular statement about the return from the field of battle to the encampment, including a reference to an apparent but no longer extant “hymn of return” (14:1). The morning after the victory, after washing their garments of the blood of the slain, the army is to reassemble to the place where they stood before the falling of the enemies’ slain (14:2–4a). There, in unison, they are to declare a blessing of the God of Israel. God is praised for preserving his covenant, for the salvation of his chosen ones, and for the annihilation of the enemy (14:4b–6a). Those who are gathered for annihilation and all the haughty are brought low, but the remnant of his people, those who have remained faithful to the covenant, are raised up by God—and all this to his glorious praise (14:6b–15). The column ends with a fragmentary petition for God to rise up and bring final destruction to the Sons of Darkness (14:16–18).

Columns 15–19 provide instructions for a seven-lot engagement between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, where each side is alternatively victorious until a seventh and decisive engagement where the Sons of Light destroy the Kittim and the forces of Belial. Column 15 begins with an introduction, the beginning of which is non-extant at the end of column 14, before moving into a description of the first engagement (15:4–16:9). The first engagement begins with the chief priest, his fellow priests, Levites, and all the men of the *serekh*

standing and reading the “prayer for the appointed time of battle,” after which the chief priest shall array the battle line (15:4–6a). The priest appointed for “the appointed time of vengeance” walks along the battle lines, strengthening the hands of the army before the battle (15:6b–16:1). He encourages them to be strong and courageous for the battle of God “for this day is the appointed time of battle” and God has raised up his mighty hand against all wickedness (15:12b–14a). Afterwards, the priests blow the trumpets of remembrance opening the battle gates and with various trumpet signals, the skirmishers go forth and engage the Kittim in battle, whom they slay in victory (16:3–9).⁴⁶

The second engagement begins in 16:11 when the Sons of Darkness inflict severe casualties on the line of skirmishers “according to the mysteries of God to test all those appointed to battle.” Once the first line is withdrawn from the battle, the chief priest strengthens the battle line with an exhortation (16:14–17:9). The speech begins with a blessing to the God of Israel before the column breaks off in lines 15–16, whereupon resuming in column 17 we find a historical recounting of the judgment of Nadab and Abihu, followed by an exhortation to take courage and not fear the enemy as now was the appointed time by God for the destruction of the enemy (17:4–9). In the third engagement, detailed in 17:10–16a, the Sons of Light defeat the Kittim and the troops of Belial. This is followed by a short notice of the fourth engagement in line 16b–17a before the column breaks off.

Column 18 begins the seventh and final engagement where the great hand of God is raised up against Belial and the forces of his dominion, whereby Asshur and the sons of Japheth are destroyed and the Kittim are slain without remnant nor survivor (18:1–3). The chief priest, the priests and the Levites, the chiefs of the battle lines, and the men of the army offer a blessing

⁴⁶ Yadin referred to these lines as lines 2–8. As a matter of convention, Yadin did not count empty lines within 1QM leading to some slight discrepancy with line references. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 334.

to the God of Israel before the *herem* of the enemy. God is praised for decreeing the appointed time of final destruction of the enemy (18:9–end). In column 19, in what is assumed to be a continuation of the blessing in column 18 and paralleled in 12:7–16, God is acknowledged as the King of Glory, the one in their midst, and petitioned to arise and take the spoil due him, destroying the enemy with his sword (19:4). Column 19 ends on the morning after the battle as the Sons of Light reconvene on the field of battle where the slain of the enemy have fallen by the sword of God (19:9–11a). There, the chief priest and others offer a prayer of praise to the God of Israel, the text of which is fragmentary and breaks off after line 13.⁴⁷

The use of the term סרך (*serekh* or “rule”) is significant regarding the content and self-understanding of the Qumran war tradition. The term סרך is applied in several ways in the Qumran corpus: as a title of a manuscript, such as 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB, or as a subheading for individual units of text incorporated into a larger manuscript matrix, or as a technical term on its own.⁴⁸ Despite being more closely associated with the *Community Rule* tradition, the term occurs most frequently in the Qumran war tradition where it is used as a subheading (1QM 3:13 [cf. 4QM^f (4Q496) 10 2]; 4:9; 5:3; 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 6), regarding regulations contained within the manuscript itself (1QM 7:16–17; 8:14; 16:3; 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 9; and 4QM^c [4Q493] 9), denoting a particular group of combatants participating in the eschatological battle (1QM 6:10, 11, 14; 7:1; 13:1; 15:4; 18:6; 4Q491 1–3 17), and the ranking or ordering of individual members

⁴⁷ Evidenced by a few letters in column 20, the prayer may have continued there. Yadin theorized that the rest of the manuscript presumably contained a description to the return to Jerusalem, including a “hymn for the way of return” (cf. 1 Macc 4:24; 5:53; and 2 Macc 10:38 and the inscription on the “trumpet for the way of return” in 3:10). Moreover, Yadin theorized further ceremonies and prayers, possibly even in the Temple itself. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 13, 228, and 351. Duhaime suggested column 20 contained the victorious return of the troops to Jerusalem for a celebration of thanksgiving (cf. 3:11). He also proposed other scenes, including the trial and execution of the King of the Kittim by the Prince of the Congregation (cf. 4Q285 7). See Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 3149.

⁴⁸ See Charlotte Hempel, “Rules,” CDSS, 405–12; Charlotte Hempel and Michael DeVries, “Rules and Rule Scrolls in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion, forthcoming.

(1QM 4:6, 11; 5:3–4).⁴⁹ The significance of the term for the war tradition relates to its usage as a proper, ordained community organization and practice. In this light, the war tradition is portrayed as including instructions for the proper orchestration of the imagined, future eschatological battle.

2.3 Cave 4 War Manuscripts

In addition to the Cave 1 manuscript, 1QM, and 1Q33 fragments 1 and 2,⁵⁰ manuscript fragments of related war texts were discovered in Cave 4 and Cave 11.⁵¹ Six of these fragments, 4Q491–495 (4QM^{a-c}) and 4Q497 (4QWar Scroll-like Text A), were initially assigned to Józef Milik for reconstruction, then later transferred to Claus-Hanno Hunzinger for editing and publication.⁵² In 1957, Hunzinger published an excerpt of 4Q491 (fragments 8–10) comparing it with the hymn of praise to the God of Israel found in 1QM 14.⁵³ While working with a group of papyrus fragments, Maurice Baillet identified a fragmentary manuscript of a related war text, 4Q496 (4QM^f), publishing his initial findings in 1964.⁵⁴ In 1971, the fragments assigned to Hunzinger were re-assigned to Baillet for final publication. In 1972, Baillet published a short description of each of the seven fragments (4QM^{a-f} [4Q491–496]).⁵⁵ Baillet later published the *editio princeps* of the 4QM fragments in 1982 in DJD 7.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ Hempel and DeVries, “Rule and Rule Scrolls,” forthcoming.

⁵⁰ PAM 40.487, 531.

⁵¹ See Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 6–9 for a detailed account of the publication of the Cave 4 and Cave 11 fragments.

⁵² Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 6.

⁵³ Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer ältern Fassung,” 131–51.

⁵⁴ Maurice Baillet, “Débris de textes,” 353–71.

⁵⁵ Maurice Baillet, “Les manuscrits,” 217–26.

⁵⁶ Maurice Baillet, DJD 7:12–72. Prior to publication, Baillet’s findings were presented at the Colloquium Biblicum in Leuven in 1976. See Maurice Baillet, “Le volume VII,” 75–89.

2.3.1 4Q491 (4QM^a)⁵⁷

Frgs. 1–3

- 1 Korah and his congregation *lb*[...] *s* judgment [... .]
- 2 In the sight of the whole assembly *l*[...] *s* [...] *m l*[... judg]ment as a sign [...]
- 3 And the commander of his angels with their [...] so that they have a mighty hand [... in the] battl[e ...] [...] *qzh* for the mounts and the horse[men...] [...] *ym*[...]
- 4 The hand of God will smite [...] [...] for the everlasting destruction [...] they shall atone on th[eir] behalf [...] all the prin[ces of...] their [...] *k* and in *sn*[...]
- 5 His holiness in everlasting j[o]y [... .] After [...] the congregation and a[ll] the prince[s] shall [no]y go towards the lines of the enemy [... .]
- 6 This is the rule (to observe) in their encampments and in [... and in] their [di]visions *m*[...] *mym* the surrounding, on the outside [... .] No woman or young boy or a man stric[ken...]
- 7 [the li]ne. The craftsmen [and the] sm[el]ters and those appointed to the me[n of] *mm*[...] their [...] *y'y* to their stations in [...] the line until their return. There shall be two thousand cubits between the [camps...]
- 8 Nakedness shall not be seen in the[ir] surroundings. 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, for the daily duty. [...]
- 9 (on) that day, from all their tribes, they [shall m]arch out of the camps towards the house of meet[ing... shall m]arch out towards them the [priest]s, the Lev[i]tes, and all the camp commanders. There they shall pass in front of [...]
- 10 To the thousands, the hundreds, the fifties and the te[n]s. Any man who will noy be [... on] that [ni]ght [shall] no[t c]ome with them to the [b]attle, for the holy angels (are) togeth[er] within their lines [... .]
- 11 [When] the appointed line [de]parts for the battle of that day, to proceed towards al[l...] the [bat]tle, three lines shall stand, one line 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[l 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 [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 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 [...]
- 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 position, the first ones shall withdraw, and [...] shall ri[se... .]
- 16 The seco[nd one...] by dr[aw]ing up the battle (order). The second l[i]ne shall fulfill its portion, withdraw and s[tand on its position... .]

⁵⁷ Translation from Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:143–45.

- 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 [...tu]rbans [...] 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 [...]

Originally comprised of what Hunzinger identified as seventy un-joined fragments in total, several joins were made resulting in a total number of sixty-two fragments before the project was transferred to Baillet for publication. In the publication of 4Q491 in DJD 7, the manuscript consisted of thirty-seven fragments.⁵⁸ Judging by the early PAM photographs, the fragments, which were light brown, have darkened over time.⁵⁹ The lines and margins are traced thinly and the black ink is well-preserved. Small marks are visible to the right of the first words of 4Q491 1–3 lines 1, 4, 6, 14, 18, 19; 31 1; and 32 1–3.⁶⁰ The manuscript exhibits varying methods of scribal correction, including the use of cancellation dots above more than one letter (1–3 4, 8; 11 i 13), above and below letters (1–3 3; 11 i 17), and within supralinear addition (11 i 14). The scribe, moreover, utilized a horizontal stroke to cancel out a partial or complete word (1–3 8; 10 ii 17), potentially due to dittography.⁶¹ Noting the small script and narrow line spacing, the *he* measuring approximately 2 mm in height and line spacing varying between 4–4.5 mm, Baillet suggested this was indicative of a manuscript for private use.⁶² The Herodian hand is beautiful and carefully regulated. In light of the similarity of the final forms with that of 1QpHab, the *tav*

⁵⁸ Baillet, DJD 7:12–44, pl. V–VI. For a detailed discussion on the materiality of 4QM^a (4Q491), see Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 49–125, 146–66.

⁵⁹ PAM 42.004, 045, 144, 473, 474, 933; 41.400, 846, 847, 889, 965, 980; 40.581, 592, 976. LLDSSDL B-371148, 354, 355; B-363816–861; B-367004; B-366994–367003; B-367005–013; B-370892–895.

⁶⁰ Tov referred to these marks a “hyphens.” See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 184. Duhaime referred to them as “tick marks” further suggesting that they reflect the scoring system during the preparation of the scroll for the placement of the text. See Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:143.

⁶¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 198–200. Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:142. Tov further suggested that the presence of vertical dittography in 4Q491 1–3 4–5 demonstrates that the manuscript was copied from a source with equal line length. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 28.

⁶² Baillet, DJD 7:12.

with that of 1QapGen, the *lamed* of 1QIsa^b, the *ayin* of 1QS, and the final *kaph* with that of 1QIsa^a, Baillet dates the hand to the second half of the first century BCE.⁶³

According to Baillet, the text of the manuscript follows that of 1QM in some locations, “summarizes” 1QM in others as well as referring to locations that are not connected to 1QM.⁶⁴ Due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscript any reconstruction of an “original” is tentative at best; Baillet, however, utilized 1QM as an exemplar for his reconstruction, arranging fragments 1–16 according to the corresponding material in 1QM. He then collected material comprised of instructions (designated frags. 17–22), that containing hymns, prayers, and speeches (designated frags. 23–25), and finally material of undetermined content (designated frags. 26–37).⁶⁵ Martin Abegg, in his 1993 Ph.D. dissertation, challenged Baillet’s reconstruction of 4Q491 positing three different manuscripts based upon physical, paleographic, and orthographic evidence.⁶⁶ Abegg denoted the three manuscripts as 4Q491a or 4QM^{a/a} (consisting of frags. 8–10, 11 ii, 13–15, 18, 22, 24–28, 31–33, and 35), 4Q491b or 4QM^{a/b} (consisting of frags. 1–3, 4, 5–6, 7, 16, 17, 19–21, and 23), and 4Q491c or 4QM^{a/c} (consisting of frags. 11 i and 12).⁶⁷

The exact relationship between 4Q491 and 1QM is difficult to locate and has been the subject of much debate. Baillet and Duhaime both proposed that 4Q491 represents a differing recension of 1QM.⁶⁸ Building upon previous studies, Duhaime further proposed a connection

⁶³ Baillet, DJD 7:12.

⁶⁴ Baillet, DJD 7:12.

⁶⁵ Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 25.

⁶⁶ Martin G. Abegg, Jr. “The War Scroll from Cave 1 and 4: A Critical Edition,” (PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1993).

⁶⁷ See Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 24–30 for a full discussion of Abegg’s reconstruction. Recently, Kipp Davis has reassessed Abegg’s reconstruction of 4Q491 arguing for a rejoining of 11 i with 12–11 ii as a single literary unit based upon digital reconstructions and material philological insights. See Kipp Davis, “‘There and Back Again’,” 125–46.

⁶⁸ Baillet, DJD 7:12. Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:82. As will be discussed later, this suggestion has been convincingly challenged on the basis of the privileging of 1QM in the reconstruction of 4Q491 1–16. See Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 11–60.

between 4Q491 1–3, 8–10, and 11 ii 8–18 and their corresponding locations in 1QM as demonstrating a similar source, albeit independently and innovatively developed.⁶⁹ Recently, Hanna Vanonen has suggested the relationship between 1QM 14:2–18:8 and 4QM^{a/a} (4Q491a) can be explained as 1QM re-writing the text known from 4Q491a.⁷⁰ As for 4Q491b 1–3, translated above, Vanonen suggested a more complicated relationship, one in which 1QM rewrites portions of 4Q491b while also selectively expanding upon it.⁷¹ In this light, the content preserved in 4Q491a and b fit with Charlotte Hempel’s description of Cave 4 as having an “eclectic and scholarly character.”⁷²

2.3.2 4Q492 (4QM^b)⁷³

- 1 for the mighty ones. Fo[r...]
- 2 covering the ea[rth...]
- 3 glorious [... !] Seize [...]
- 4 your foes and [let] your sword [devour fl]esh. F[il]l [...]
- 5 [and gol]d in your palaces. [...] Zion rejoices greatly [...]
- 6 your gates continually, that one may bring to [you] the wealth of the nations. Their kings shall serve you and [shall bow down...]
- 7 they shall lick your feet. Daughters of my people, burst forth [into] a voice of jubilation! Deck yourselves [...]
- 8 to your camps, and Israel shall reign forever. Then they shall gather (to) the camp, on night [...]
- 9 [In the] morning they shall come to the place of the line, where the mighty of the Kitt[i]m had fallen, and the multitu[de...]
- 10 [...] a large number of slain were [de]ad with not bu[ri]al, they who had fallen there by God’s swor[d...]
- 11 [...] and the Levites [... and al]l the chiefs of the lines [...]
- 12 [...] together where they stand, by (?) the slain [...] the God of Israel w[...]
- 13 [...] to God (the) Most High w[...]/[...]/[...]/[...]

⁶⁹ Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:82.

⁷⁰ Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 125.

⁷¹ Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 165.

⁷² Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts*, 337.

⁷³ Translation from Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:169.

Comprised of three thick-skinned, smooth, brown fragments, this manuscript is characterized by deeply scored horizontal lines which has resulted in the flaking of the surface in many locations.⁷⁴ Written in Herodian script, the hand is almost identical to that of 1QM. Baillet suggested that if they were not the work of the same scribe, they were at least contemporaries.⁷⁵ Paleographically this would date the manuscript in the latter portion of the first century BCE. 4Q492 1, the largest of the three, is slightly larger than 11 cm in width and 11 cm in height and preserves thirteen lines of text. The lettering is approximately 3mm high, suggesting there was space for about 75 letters or spaces per line.⁷⁶ The fragment contains a text parallel to that of 1QM 19:1–14 with minor variants, with lines 1–8a also paralleling 1QM 12:8–16, albeit more loosely as the text of fragment 1 is more closely related to that of 19:1–14.⁷⁷ 4Q492 1 1–8 contain a prayer petitioning God to seize upon and destroy the enemy to the rejoicing of Zion and Israel. 4Q492 1 9–13 presents the celebration of God’s victory on the field of battle the morning after (cf. 1QM 19:9b–14). Measuring approximately 4 cm in width and 3.5 cm height, 4Q492 2, preserving two lines of text, contains the first two lines of a column as evidenced by the intact top margin measuring 2.5 cm.⁷⁸ Baillet reconstructed the first line of the text to read, “[...] his [st]rength over all [the na]tions [...], while the second is too fragmentary to reconstruct.⁷⁹ The third fragment, measuring 1.5 cm in width and just over 6 cm in height, preserves two letters from the final word in two separate lines of text. The fragment appears to be the left margin of a sheet and possibly the top-left portion of sheet due to the size of the marginal area on the top of the fragment.

⁷⁴ See Baillet, DJD 7:45–49, pl. VII. PAM 44.018; 42.475; 41.351, 848. LLDSSDL B-295112–114; B-295678–680; B-298228; B-370796, 797.

⁷⁵ Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 20; Baillet, DJD 7:45.

⁷⁶ Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 127.

⁷⁷ Eshel and Eshel, “Recensions of the War Scroll,” 352–56; See also, Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 128–45.

⁷⁸ Baillet, DJD 7:49. Also, Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 103.

⁷⁹ Baillet, DJD 7:49.

Vanonen hypothesized that the large spaces between the lines and the location of the *vacats* in 4Q492 1 suggest that the manuscript might have been a working copy in preparation for changes and additions, perhaps as an interim copy between the text of 1QM 19 and that of 1QM 12.⁸⁰ While admittedly speculative, the hypothesis is intriguing and might open a new line of inquiry into scribal work and activity in antiquity.

2.3.3 4Q493 (4QM^c)⁸¹

1 המלחמה והכונים בני אהרון יעמודו לפני [ה] מערכות
2 והריעו בחצוצרות הזכרון ואחריו כן יפתחו א [ת] השערי [ם] לאנשי
3 הבנים והכוחנים יריעו בחצוצרות המלחמה [ה] [...] יד במערכות
4 גויים והכוחנים יצאו מבין החללים יעמדו [דו] [...] ה למלות
5 ליד החרף והמאבן ולוא יחללו שמן כהונתם [...] ללי [...]]
6 [ו] לכול מערכות הבנים לוא יגשו ותקעו בקול חד ל [ת] א [...]]
7 המלחמה להתקרב בין המערכות בחצוצרות [...]] [...]]
8 לשלוח יד במלחמה ובמלא עונותם יתקאו להם בחצוצרות [צ] רות המש [ו] ב
9 לבוא השערים ויצאה המערכה השנית וככול הסרך הזה [...]]
10 להם [...]] עים בעונותה בצאתם יתקעו [ו] להם בחצוצרות
11 ובמלאם [חצוצרות התרועה] [וב] שובם יתקעו
12 [...]] כמש [פט] [...]] יתקעו לכ [ול] המ ערכות
13 [...]] ת [...]] על חצוצרות [ה] שבתות [...]]
14 [...]] התמיד ולעולות כתוב תבו⁸²

⁸⁰ Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 144–45.

⁸¹ Reconstruction and translation are my own. Reconstruction is based upon LLDSSDL B-474639. See also, PAM 44.018; 42.475; 41.400, 848; 40.612. LLDSSDL B-474638, 639; B-496239. Textual notes, reference Baillet, DJD 7:49–53, pl. VIII; Elisha Qimron, *מגילות מדבר יהודה*, (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010), 1:118; Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:172–73; Émile Puech, “Review of *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*, par Maurice Baillet (DJD VII),” *RB* 95 (1988): 405; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 211. Regarding signa, the following conventions have been followed: ✱ = an essentially certain reading of a damaged letter, ✶ = an uncertain reading of a damaged letter, and ○ = an illegible letter.

⁸² **Line 1:** Baillet read the supralinear letter as the upper portion of a *lamed*. Puech suggested that it could be a *vav*. Duhaime leaves this uncertain. Tov read the letter as probably a *vav*, further noting this as possibly reflecting a numbering device at the beginning of the sheet.

Line 2: There is a scribal mark resembling a dot between כן ואחריו visible in the image. The mark follows the convention noted by Tov as demarcating a separation of words lest they be read as forming a singular word. Baillet and Duhaime both suggested this mark as equivalent to a hyphen.

Line 3: Baillet read לשלוח in the lacuna.

Line 4: Baillet reconstructed the lacuna to read ועמדו [דו] מזהו. This is quite uncertain as Baillet himself noted. Additionally, he raises the possibility of ועבדו here. Not enough remains of the final word in the line for reconstruction. Qimron reconstructed this final word as למלחמה.

Line 5: Baillet reconstructed the lacuna as [בדם הח] ללי [ם] based upon 1QM 9:8–9.

- 1 w the war. And the priests, Sons of Aaron, shall take up position in front of [the] lines
 2 and sound the trumpets of memorial. And afterwards they shall open [the gat]es for the
 3 infantrymen. And the priests shall sound the trumpets of battle [to stretch out the] hand
 against the lines of
 4 the nations. And the priests shall go out from among the slain and take posi[tion...]
 5 on the side of the catapult and the ballista. And they shall not profane the oil of their
 priesthood [with the blood of the s]lai[n.]
 6 [And] to any of the lines of the infantrymen they shall not approach. And they shall blow
 with a sharp sound for [...]
 7 the war to come near between the lines on the trumpets [...]
 8 to stretch out the hand in battle. And when their periods of time are completed, they shall
 blow for them the trump[e]ts of withdrawal
 9 to enter the gates. And the second line shall go out, and, according to the entire rule [...]
 10 [...] for them during its period of time. When they go out, [they] shall blow for them on
 the t[rumpets...]
 11 when [they] comple[te ...] on the trumpets of alarm [and when] they [re]turn [they] shall
 blo[w...]
 12 [...] according to the ordinan[ce...] they shall blow for a[ll the li]nes. (*vacat*)
 13 [...] on the trumpet[s of the] sabbaths [...]
 14 [...]the daily offering and for the burnt offering it is written [...]

Line 6: Qimron reconstructed יגשו as the Hiphil יגשו. This is plausible given the space between the *gimmel* and the *shin*. Baillet reconstructed the final two words of the line as [שי] לִצְאָתָּ אֲנִי in light of IQM 7:9 and 15:7.

Line 7: Baillet reconstructed the lacuna as החללים followed by the word [וה]ה[ח]ל[ו], given the visible *vav*.

Line 9: Not enough remains of the text at the end the line for an accurate reconstruction. The proposed reconstruction of [ה]ה[ח]ל[ו] (Baillet and Duhaime) and הסרד הזה יתקרא (Qimron) are highly speculative.

Line 10: The image shows the potential of *ayin-yod-final mem* as the last three letters of the second word. Equally plausible is *nun-yod-final mem*. The word appears too long to accommodate Baillet's suggestion of מו[י]ע[י]ם.

Qimron reconstructed this word as הכהנים. While בת[ח]צוצרות at the end of the line is probable, the reconstruction of the final word as המקרא as per Baillet and Qimron is unwarranted.

Line 11: Baillet and Qimron reconstructed the end of the line as [יתק]עו להם בחצוצרות.

Line 12: The first word of the line is beyond any accurate determination. Baillet reconstructed the first word in the line to read [ה]מ[א]ס[ף] in light of IQM 3:2.

Line 13: Baillet added כתוב to the end of the line, however this is not visible in the image and purely speculative. Qimron reconstructed the same location as והחודשים ("and the new moons...").

Line 14: Qimron reconstructed the first part of the line to read והמועדות ולמנחות התמיד ("and the appointed times and for the grain offering of..."). Qimron's reconstructions in line 13 and 14 show a dependence on Num 10:10. Concerning Baillet's reconstruction of כתוב in this line, Baillet noted the possibility of a *vav* or a *yod* for the second to last letter in the word. This is quite consistent with the hand of this scribe who does not draw a distinction between the two letters in this fragment. Baillet also correctly noted that the perfect form of the verb would be unlike that employed in IQM, which typically utilizes the imperfect form. While probable, Baillet's reconstruction here is not definite. Qimron reconstructed the final word in the line to read תרועת. This is highly unlikely as a *bet* can clearly be seen.

Consisting of two grey tinted fragments joined together, this fragment measures approximately 9 cm in height and 12 cm in width and preserves fourteen lines of un-ruled text in a singular column written in what Baillet categorized as being slightly earlier than Herodian script and perhaps dating from the first half of the first century BCE.⁸³ Lines 1–12a overview the priests and Levites’ orchestration of the battle. In lines 1–4a, the sons of Aaron stationed in front of the battle line signal the opening of the gates with the trumpets of memorial (cf. 1QM 16:3–4). Lines 4b–6a, paralleled in 1QM 9:7–8, include regulations for the priesthood to not draw near the line of the skirmishers so as not to profane the oil of their priesthood. Through a series of trumpets, the priests orchestrate the advancement of the first line of troops, their engagement with the enemy, and their return in lines 6b–9a (cf. 1QM 16:7–9; 17:12–24). A second line is sent forth and engage the enemy in lines 9b–12a via the continual signaling of the Levites. Lines 12b–14 contain a fragmentary conclusion to the fragment, including a unique mention of the “trumpet[s] of] Sabbaths” presumably used for Sabbaths and sacrifices (lines 13–14).⁸⁴

2.3.4 4Q494 (4QM^d)⁸⁵

- 1 [...] tri[be]s [...]
- 2 and the priests, the Levites and the chiefs of the [...]
- 3 the priests, and for the Levites as well. And the divisions of [...]
- 4 the chief priest and his deputy, [...] chiefs [...]
- 5 [and twe]nty [... shall] ser[ve] in their divisions [... .]
- 6 [Af]ter them, the chief[s] of [...]

⁸³ Baillet, DJD 7:50. Acknowledging no clear literary connection between 4QM^c and 1QM, Baillet suggested that this could be the oldest manuscript witness to the war tradition and likely comes from a different recension and, moreover, could be from the same recension as 4QM^a. Duhaime agreed with Baillet regarding this as being a different recension. See Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:81. Duhaime further held that, while possibly being the same recension as 4QM^a (4Q491), this proposal cannot be validated as the overlap between 4QM^a (4Q491) and 4QM^c (4Q493) is not significant. See Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 30. For another reconstruction and analysis, see Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 166–78.

⁸⁴ On the use of these trumpets uniquely to this text alone, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Sabbath Trumpets in 4Q493 M^c,” *RevQ* 12 (1987): 555–59. See also 5.4.2 and 5.4.3.

⁸⁵ Translation from Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:175.

A singular, dark brown fragment comprises this manuscript.⁸⁶ Measuring just over 6 cm in width and approximately 4 cm in height, this fragment is written in Herodian script and situated in the first half of the first century CE by Baillet, who further suggested that the hand was contemporary with that of 1QpHab and the first hand in 1QH^a.⁸⁷ The manuscript preserves six un-ruled lines of text, the first of which consists of only several ink remnants at the top of the fragment. Lines 4–6 appear to parallel 1QM 2:1–3 with minor variants. This location recounts the regulations for assigning the service of the priesthood in the year of remission from war. Lines 1–3 are unparalleled in 1QM, but due to their connection with lines 4–6 could be connected the non-extant lines at the bottom of 1QM 1.⁸⁸

Table 2.1 – The Text of 1QM 2:1–3 and 4QM^d (4Q494)⁸⁹

1QM 2:1–3	4QM ^d (4Q494)
<p>אבות העדה שנים וחמשים ואת ראשי הכהנים יסרוכו אחר <u>בוהן הראש ומשנהו ראשים</u> שנים עשר להיות משרתים <u>בתמיד לפני אל וראשי המשמרות ששה ועשרים במשמרותם</u> <u>ישרתו ואחריהם ראשי הלויים לשרת תמיד שנים עשר אחר</u> <u>לשבט</u></p>	<p>ם[]⁹⁰ והכוהנים והלויים וראשי ה' הכוהנים וכן ללויים ומשמרות <u>בוהן הרואש ומשנהו ראשים</u> <u>[ו]עשרים במשמרותם [י]ש[רתו]</u> <u>[ואת] ר'יהם ראש[י]</u></p>
<p>1 fathers of the congregation, fifty-two. They shall arrange the chiefs of the priests behind <u>the chief priest and his deputy</u>, twelve <u>chiefs</u> who are to serve</p>	<p>1 [...] tri[be]s^{oo} [...] 2 and the priests, the Levites and the chiefs of the [...] 3 the priests, and for the Levites as well. And the divisions of [...]</p>

⁸⁶ Baillet, DJD 7:53–54, pl. VII. See PAM 44.018; 42.475; 41.848. LLDSSDL B-474642, 643; B-496239.

⁸⁷ Baillet, DJD 7:53; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 21. See also Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 181–88.

⁸⁸ Baillet proposed that the text contained in lines 5–6 departed from is preserved in 1QM 2. See Baillet, DJD 7:54. Due to the fragmentary nature of these lines, any proposal here is speculative.

⁸⁹ Text and translation of 4Q494 are taken from Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:174–75. Linguistic correlations between 1QM 2:1–2 and 4Q494 are represented in underline.

⁹⁰ Following Baillet, Duhaime reconstructed the first line to read שְׁבָטֵי[ט]ם. On the PAM images the bottom portion of the left stroke of the ש angled slightly to the left can be seen as well as a faint stroke of the bottom of the right stroke. The next letter consists of a faint bottom stroke which feasibly could be a ב, but not with certainty. The final letter of the word does evidence a letter whose bottom stroke is angled downwards and below the letter line of the other letters in the word. This appears consistent with other ם seen in the fragment.

<p>2 steadily before God; <u>twenty-six chiefs of divisions shall serve in their divisions. After them, twelve chiefs</u> of the Levites are to serve steadily, one 3 for (each) tribe.</p>	<p>4 <u>the chief priest and his deputy, [...] chiefs [...]</u> 5 <u>[and twe]nty [... shall] ser[ve] in their divisions [...]</u> 6 <u>[Af]ter them, the chief[s of...]</u></p>
---	--

In DJD 7, Baillet accurately identified the connection between 4Q494 and 1QM 2:1–2, noting the undoubtably strong linguistic connection between lines 4–6 with 1QM 2:1–2.⁹¹ Especially striking is the phrase כוהן הראש ומשנהו ראשים (“the chief priest and his deputy [twelve] chiefs”) present in both 4Q494 4 and 1QM 2:1 and the usage of term משמרות (“divisions” or “courses”) a term which appears infrequently within the scrolls as a whole but found widely within the war tradition.⁹² Given these close linguistic correlations, Baillet further suggested lines 1–3 as containing a text parallel to that of the non-extant end of column 1. Since the end of 1QM 1 is not preserved, however, any definitive textual relationship between 4Q494 1–3 and 1QM 1 is speculative.⁹³ Considering the inability to securely associate lines 1–3 with 1QM 2, any attempt to draw a conclusive genealogical relationship between the two texts must be made with guarded hesitancy. Accordingly, it is best to approach 4Q494 as a unique witness within the war tradition

⁹¹ Baillet, DJD 7:54.

⁹² Regarding lines 4–6, Baillet raised the issue of a spatial problem between the 4Q494 reading and 1QM 2:1–2. In short, the beginning of line 5 contains a text parallel to 1QM 2:2a, whereas the beginning of line 6 contains a text similar to 2:2b. This results in a problem regarding the length of line 5. Baillet suggested two potential solutions. First, following ישרתו in line 5 Baillet proposed there is a vacat in 4Q494 which is not present in 1QM 2. Second, Baillet posited two variants at work, whereby line 5 continues with the text of 1QM 2b–3a, but the phrase וראשי במעמדו in 2:3b is missing. A second variant occurs in line 6 with the term אחריהם comes before וראשי השבטים ואבות העדה as opposed to after in 1QM 2:3b. Baillet’s reconstruction in DJD 7 favors the second option. See Baillet, DJD 7:54. See also Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 221–22, 227–28; Martin Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 78.

⁹³ Duhaime identified 4Q494 as one of the “copies of the recension of the *War Scroll* preserved in 1QM.” See PTSDSSP 2:82; See also Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 391. To the contrary, Rony Yshai has argued that none of the Cave 4 fragments are copies of 1QM and that given the fragmentary nature it is even impossible to definitively ascertain their relationship with 1QM whether as a different recension or as different compositions altogether. See, Rony Yshai, ספרות המלחמה בפומראן (PhD diss., University of Haifa, 2006), 323.

while remaining open to relational options with 1QM.⁹⁴ What can be said is that 4Q494 contains a similar tradition to that found in 1QM 2 and demonstrates that the presence of Temple service in connection with the eschatological war was a notable feature within the Qumran war tradition.

2.3.5 4Q495 (4QM^e)⁹⁵

Frg. 1

- 1 [...] Isr[ael...]
- 2 [...] covenant, le[arned...]

Frg. 2

- 1 [...] God, you have created us for yo[u... .]
- 2 You have entrusted to our rescue [... .]
- 3 You have made [...]
- 4 Angels of des[truction...]

Two brown and irregularly shaped fragments represent this manuscript.⁹⁶ 4Q495 1, triangular in shape and measuring approximately 1.8 cm in height and 1.5 cm in width, preserves two lines of text—the first line consisting of the remnant of one word and the second line a full word and a remnant of a second. Baillet linked this fragment with 1QM 10:9–10, an association adopted by most scholars.⁹⁷ The second fragment, measuring approximately 4.3 cm in height and nearly 5 cm in width, preserves four lines of text. Non-scored, guiding lines are faintly visible with the letters hanging from the lines. The fragment contains a right margin and guiding dots.⁹⁸ Baillet categorized the hand as Herodian script and situated it in the middle of the first century BCE,

⁹⁴ It is significant to note that while Baillet leaned extensively upon 1QM 2:1–2 for his reconstruction of 4Q494 4–6 in DJD 7 he is cautious to propose any potential relationship between the two manuscripts.

⁹⁵ Translation from Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:177.

⁹⁶ Baillet, DJD 7:54–56, pl. VIII. See PAM 44.018, 014; LLDSSDL B-474646, 647, 650, 651; B-496239.

⁹⁷ Baillet, DJD 7:55; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 21–22.

⁹⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 68.

roughly contemporary with 1QM.⁹⁹ Most scholars have posited 4Q495 2 as a parallel reading of 1QM 13:9–12, which is most plausible.¹⁰⁰ The text of 4Q495 2 contains a blessing addressed to God, praising him for his creation of a chosen people and his assistance in their rescue.

2.3.6 4Q496 (4QpapM^f)

This papyrus manuscript, written on the verso side of an opisthograph that also contains 4QpapWords of the Luminaries^c (4Q506) and 4QpapFestival Prayers^c (4Q509 + 505), is comprised of 119 fragments.¹⁰¹ Baillet categorized the hand as pre-Herodian script, placing the manuscript just before the middle of the first century BCE.¹⁰² The line spacing is around 8 mm and the average letter height is 3 mm.¹⁰³ Frayed and worn in many places, the majority of the fragments of this war text are quite small, containing only a few words or letters and stand beyond any conclusive reconstruction.¹⁰⁴ Only 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 enough to offer some reading of the text. Baillet identified fragments 1–14, 16, 35 and 75 as those containing text parallel with 1QM and mainly located within columns 1 through 4:7.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁹ Baillet, DJD 7:55.

¹⁰⁰ Baillet, DJD 7:55; Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 80; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 22; Qimron, מגילת מדבר יהודה, 1:124.

¹⁰¹ Baillet, DJD 7:56–68, pl. X, XII, XIV, XVI, XVIII. See PAM 43.652, 654, 656–658, 858, 860, 862, 865; 42.059, 061–063, 489, 498; 40.628, 981. LLDSSDL B-508297–310; B-486369–384; 486825–886; 486985–487076, 487079–080; B-371782–825.

¹⁰² Baillet, DJD 7:58.

¹⁰³ Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 22.

¹⁰⁴ For an analysis of the fragments including reconstruction, see Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 204–12.

¹⁰⁵ Baillet identified fragment 15 as possibly aligned with 1QM 9:5–9. See Baillet, DJD 7:58–65. Regarding fragment 97, noting the near impossibility of reconstruction, Baillet suggested a potential parallel between line 3 and 19:6–7 (cf. 1QM 12:15). See Baillet, DJD 7:68.

Table 2.2 – 4Q496 Fragment Correspondence to 1QM

4QM^f (4Q496) Fragments	Parallel in 1QM Proposed by Baillet
Fragment 2+1	1QM 1:11–17
Fragment 3	1QM 1:4–9
Fragment 4	1QM 2:9–10 (?)
Fragment 5+6	1QM 2:9–12
Fragment 7	1QM 2:5–6
Fragment 8	1QM 2end–3:2
Fragment 9	1QM 2:17 (?)
Fragment 10	1QM 3:11–15
Fragment 11	1QM 3:9–11
Fragment 12	1QM 3:6–7
Fragment 13+75+14	1QM 2:13–14
Fragment 15	1QM 9:5–9 (?) ¹⁰⁶
Fragment 16	1QM 3end–4:2
Fragment 35	1QM 4:6–7

While 4QM^f (4Q496) demonstrates a textual relationship with 1QM, the exact nature of that relationship is uncertain. Where preserved, the text of 4Q496 is not entirely similar to that of 1QM but does demonstrate a certain number of parallels and at times offers significant textual additions not preserved in 1QM, such as the double mention of the “Prince” in 4Q496 10. In this case, Duhaime has suggested that this appears to indicate a more prominent role for the Prince of the Congregation than is afforded in 1QM, more in line with the role preserved in 4Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285) and 11Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (11Q14), both of which will be discussed in greater detail below.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ On this identification, Baillet noted that it is “timidly proposed” and reflects a reading shorter than that found in 1QM 9:6–7. See Baillet, DJD 7:64.

¹⁰⁷ Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 23.

2.4 Related War Manuscripts

2.4.1 4Q497 (4QpapWar Scroll-like Text A)

Written on the verso of an opisthograph containing 4QpapHymns/Prayers (4Q499), this papyrus manuscript consists of fifty-four fragments which are poorly preserved.¹⁰⁸ The edges are often frayed, and the surface worn on some fragments but not on others. The ink is fairly well preserved but is dusty and worn in some locations. Baillet tentatively dated the hand on the verso (4Q497) to the middle of the first century BCE, slightly later than the hand on the recto (4Q499), which Baillet dated to ca. 75 BCE.¹⁰⁹ In Baillet's estimation, while the text of 4Q497 intersects with 1QM at various points, the connection is not strong enough to warrant the assignment of this manuscript to "a seventh copy" of 1QM.¹¹⁰

George Brooke, noting that fragments of 4Q497 contain the edges of columns, suggested the presence of several columns of text even though the recto side of the opisthograph shows no signs of column structure.¹¹¹ Moreover, the writing on the verso is in the same position as on the recto suggesting the scroll was turned over and the writing on the verso began at the end of the scroll in reverse direction toward the beginning of the scroll. This led Brooke to propose that the length of the scroll may have been shorter rather than longer.¹¹² James Nati further proposed that this writing phenomenon suggests that the recto and verso sides were read as a single

¹⁰⁸ See Baillet, DJD 7:69–72, pl. XXVI. See PAM 43.652, 654, 656, 658, 858, 860, 862, 865; 42.058, 059, 063, 489; 40.981. LLDSSDL B-487191–298. See also, Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 212–21.

¹⁰⁹ Baillet, DJD 7:69; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 31.

¹¹⁰ Baillet provisionally designated this manuscript as p4QM^a. See Baillet, "Les manuscrits," 224–25. He also entertains the possibility of this text, along with others from Cave 4, as comprising some collection of war blessings, entitled 4QBerakhot-Milhamah. See Baillet, DJD 7:69.

¹¹¹ George J. Brooke, "Between Scroll and Codex? Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs," in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*, eds. James K. Aitken, Katherine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin, BZAW 420 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 128.

¹¹² Brooke, "Between Scroll and Codex?" 131.

composition.¹¹³ While the exact textual relationship with 1QM is beyond identification, due to the highly fragmentary nature of the manuscript, the fact that 4Q497 and 4Q496 were both written on the verso side of a papyrus opisthograph, as noted by Vanonen, makes the inclusion of 4Q497 in the Qumran war tradition as reasonable option.¹¹⁴

2.4.2 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B)¹¹⁵

Frg. 1

1] from all tha[t
2]each man from his brothers from the son of[Aaron]
3 [and the chiefs of the priests,] they [shall dispose] and will continually with him, and they shall serve]
4 [before him. And (there shall be) twelve leaders, one [for] each trib[e,]
5 [And the chiefs of the courses twen]ty-[six] and twe[lve] Levites,
6 [one to each tribe. They shall] serve continually [before Hi]m all
7 [the days. They shall choose for them warriors in]order to have them sw[ord]-trained
8 [to enter the army And the wa]r of [their] divisio[ns
9 wa]r[

Frg. 2

1] ... [
2 to] keep the testimonies of our covenant[
3] all their armies, in being slow ang[er
4] and to discourage their heart from every de[ed
5 Sl]aves of darkness. For the judgements of[
6] the guiltiness of his lot[
7 to refuse the goo]d and to choose the evil and to[
8]God hated. And he set [
9 in] all the good tha[t
10]the fury of vengeance[

¹¹³ James Nati, “The Rolling Corpus: Materiality and Pluriformity at Qumran, with Special Consideration of the *Serekh ha-Yahad*,” *DSD* 27 (2020): 161–201 (188–89).

¹¹⁴ Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 215. See also, Aksu, “The Qumran Opisthograph,” 292–324.

¹¹⁵ Translation from Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “4QWar Scroll-like Text B,” *DJD* 36:443–44. For an early reconstruction of 4Q471, see Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four, Fascicle Two* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1992), 294–96.

Included within the cache of fragments assigned to John Strugnell were fragments deemed by Strugnell to comprise a single manuscript of a war text, 4Q471 (4QWar Scroll-like Text B). The fragments were later transferred to Esther Eshel. In collaboration with Hanan Eshel, the preliminary findings on frag. 1 were published in 1991 before the final publication of the fragments in two separate volumes of DJD, fragments 1–3 and 6 in DJD 36 and fragments 7–10 and 4–5 in DJD 29.¹¹⁶ After subsequent exploration and publication, only fragments 1–3 were finally included in the composition known as 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471).¹¹⁷ 4Q471 1 and 2, roughly the same in size, measure 7.6 cm in height and 5.2 cm in width and 7 cm in height and 5.2 cm in width respectively. 4Q471 3 measures approximately 3 cm in height and 1.2 cm in width and preserves four lines of highly fragmentary text. Eshel and Eshel dated the hand to the Herodian period.¹¹⁸

According to Eshel and Eshel, 4Q471 1 1–6 preserve a variant reading of 1QM 2:1–3a dealing with the temple service in the year of remission, which omits mention of the chief priest and his deputy and the laymen, as well as the description of the מעמדות. Lines 7–9 preserve a variant reading beginning in 1QM 2:7 dealing with the conscription of the army.¹¹⁹ Based upon

¹¹⁶ Esther Eshel and Hanan 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, 1991*, eds. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11. (Leiden, Brill, 1992), 2:611–20; Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:439–45, pl. XXX and 446–49, pl. XXXI. Fragments 1–3 were published in the volume by E. Eshel and H. Eshel under the designation 4QWar Scroll-like Text B, whereas fragment 6 was published by E. Eshel and M. Kister under the designation 4QPolemical Text. Fragments 7–10 and 4–5 were published by Esther Eshel under the heading “Self-Glorification Hymn,” with frags. 7–10 designated as 4QSelf-Glorification Hymn (=4QH^c frag. 1?) and frags. 4–5 under the designation 4QPrayer Concerning God and Israel. See Esther Eshel, “Self-Glorification Hymn,” DJD 29:421–32, pl. XXVIII and 433–35, pl. XXVIII.

¹¹⁷ Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:439. See PAM 43.551; 42.472, 834, 914, 916; 41.389, 583, 715, 849, 857, 977. LLDSSDL B-298169; B-358442–358447, 358450–358451, 358454–358465. LLDSSDL includes PAM 41.412 in 4Q471, whereas Tov and Stephen Reed identified PAM 41.412 as belonging to 4Q471a Polemical Text. See Tov, *Revised Lists of the Texts of the Judaean Desert*, (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 55 and Stephen A. Reed and Marilyn J. Lundberg, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue: Documents, Photographs and Museum Inventory Numbers*, SBLRBS 32 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 320.

¹¹⁸ Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:439.

¹¹⁹ Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:442–43. See also Martin G. 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*, eds. John C. Reeves

these variant readings, Eshel and Eshel argued that 4Q471 1 could be either a source of a more expansive 1QM 2 or an early recension.¹²⁰ 4Q471 2, containing eleven lines of fragmentary and incomplete text, has no exact identifiable parallel within 1QM, but, as Eshel and Eshel have suggested, might have affinity with speeches within 1QM.

Table 2.3 – Transcription and Translation of 4Q471 1¹²¹

4Q471 1 Transcription	4Q471 1 Translation
ה' מכל[ו] אש[ר]	[...] <i>h</i> from a[1]l tha[t]
כול איש מאחיו מבני	[...] each man from his brothers the sons of [...]
והיו עמו תמיד וש[רתו]	[...] they [...] and will be continually with him, and they will s[erve...]
כול שבט ושב[ט] א'ש	[...] one [for] each trib[e...]
רים ומן[ה] לויים שנים	[...] <i>rim</i> and from the Levites two
ויש[ו] [ו] תמיד כ[ו]	[...] <i>wyš</i> [...] <i>w</i> continually a[1]l
למען יהיו מלמדים]	[... in] order to have them trained [...]
ת מהלקו]תם	[...] <i>t</i> of [their] divisio[ns...]
מה]	[...] <i>mh</i> [...]

Esther and Hanan Eshel identified 4Q471 1 as being “a part of a version of the *War Scroll* which is shorter and probably earlier than 1QM II or 4QM^d” and more specifically “apparently one of the sources of 1QM II, or part of an early recension of it.”¹²² This latter identification is based upon three criteria which Eshel and Eshel find in common between 1QM 2 and 4Q471 1: the presence of Temple service, the selection of soldiers, and the “war of divisions.”¹²³

and John Kampen, JSOTSup 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 136–47. Abegg argued 4Q471 1 is related to 11QT 57:11–15 rather than 1QM 2:1–4, highlighting that nearly all the technical terminology connected with 1QM 2 is found in reconstructed rather than extant text.

¹²⁰ Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:440–441. Davies agrees. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 27.

¹²¹ The transcription and translation of 4Q471 1 is based upon Esther and Hanan Eshel’s in DJD 36 with two alterations: first, the DJD 36 reading ח[ר]ב מלמדי ח[ר]ב has been amended to read מלמדיים pace Abegg’s reconstruction; and second, the reconstructions based upon 1QM 2 have been limited in scope. See Abegg, “4Q471,” 142.

¹²² Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:439–440.

¹²³ Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:440.

As has been noted, Eshel and Eshel’s identification of 4Q471 1 as a source or early recension of 1QM suffers from an over-reliance upon 1QM 2 in their reconstruction.¹²⁴ First, while linguistic connection between 4Q471 1 and 1QM 2 is clearly present, it is not fully conclusive of genetic textual relationship. The word שבת (“to serve”) in line 3 is questionable, while the terms “continually” (תמיד) in lines 2 and 6, “tribes” (שבט) in line 4, and “Levites” in line 5 are present. Second, the suggestion that line 7 represents a shift in subject matter towards the selection of soldiers presupposes the reconstruction of the full line as “[the days, they shall choose for them warriors in]order to have them sw[ord]-trained...”¹²⁵ The introduction of the selection of soldiers in the reconstruction appears without warrant, while the reconstruction of “sw[ord]-trained” is questionable and is better rendered following Abegg’s reading as מלמדים (“and they shall be teaching”).¹²⁶ Read without these reconstructions, line 7 addresses the issue of training, but the recipients and subject of that training remain elusive.¹²⁷ Given what little remains of the text, the reconstruction here appears overly speculative and lacks a demonstrable connection to the selection of the soldiers. Finally, concerning the “war of the divisions,” while the term מחלקו]תם is evident, the preceding word is not altogether clear. While the phrase does appear in 1QM 2:10 and has been reconstructed in 4Q496 5–6 ii 10, it is not completely clear if

¹²⁴ See Abegg, “4Q471,” 141–47; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 222–28; Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 188–96.

¹²⁵ Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:443.

¹²⁶ Abegg, “4Q471,” 146. Consulting the PAM images of line 7, the amount of space between the visible *yod* and the next letter does not appear consistent with the regular spacing between words evident elsewhere on the fragment, suggesting that the following letter is likely a continuation of the word. Additionally, the identification of the letter as *khet* is also questionable. When *khet* is visible on the manuscript (lines 2 and 8) the top line does not protrude past the right downstroke, which appears to be the case with the proposed letter in line 7. To my mind, these factors call Eshel and Eshel’s reading of line 7 into question. See PAM 43.551; 42.491; 41.583, 849. See also LLDSSDL image B-358443.

¹²⁷ Interestingly, Eshel and Eshel also suggested חוק מלמדי as a possible reconstruction in light of 1QM 10:10 (“a people of holy covenant and law instructed”), but decided “that this reconstruction would not fit the context, particularly since ‘the w]ar of [their] divisio[ns]’ is found in line 8.” See Eshel and Eshel, DJD 36:442. The reconstruction of “the w]ar of [their] divisio[ns]” in line 8 is not altogether clear, however; therefore, “law instructed” should not be dismissed as this could quite possibly fit a Temple service context.

the “war of the divisions” is in view in 4Q471 1.¹²⁸ While 4Q471 1 does suggest that cultic service is in view, this does not necessitate the genealogical relationship with 1QM 2 proposed by Eshel and Eshel. The suggestion that 4Q471 1 is an earlier recension of or source for 1QM 2 is not self-evident.¹²⁹

Identification notwithstanding, just as with 4Q494, 4Q471 1 demonstrates another occurrence of a tradition of cultic service. If the fragment does indeed have some relation to the tradition contained in 1QM 2 and 4Q494, an option that should remain open, it provides one more illustration of a concern for proper cultic service in the context of the eschatological battle.

2.4.3 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah)¹³⁰

Frg. 3

2]the Levit[e]s and trum[pets
 3 of a r]am to blow them[
 4] of the Kittim he will treat them with contempt/despoil them[

Frg. 4

1 [] wickedness will be smitten[]
 2 [the Prin]ce of the Congregation and all Isra[el.]
 3 [as i]s written[in the book of Ezekiel the Prophet: “I will strike your bow from your left hand]
 4 [and will make you 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] Kittim []
 6 [the Prince 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]

¹²⁸ On the reconstruction of מלחמה המחלקות in 4Q496 5–6 ii 10, see Baillet, DJD 7:60.

¹²⁹ See also Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 231.

¹³⁰ Translation from Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, “4QSefer ha-Milhamah,” DJD 36:228–46. For an early reconstruction of 4Q285, see Wacholder and Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition*, 223–27.

Frg. 7

1 [As it is written in the book of]Isaiah the prophet: “Cut down shall be
2 [the thickets of the forest with an axe, and Lebanon by a majestic one shall f]all. And
there shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse,
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 [by stroke(?)s and wounds(?). And a priest [of renown(?)] will command
6 [the s]lai[n] of the Kittim[] []

Frg. 8

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 Is]rael: {Blessed are you in the name of the Most High
God []
3 [and ble]ss[ed is his holy name for] e[v]er and ever.[And blessed are [] and blessed
are]
4 [all the angels of his holiness. May] the Mo[st High] God [bless] 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 to [bring down upon your land showers
of blessing.]
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. And [may] the land [prod]uce for [you delightful fruits. And
may you eat]
8 [and may y]ou [grow fat]. And may there be no-one miscarrying [in yo]ur l[and,] nor[
sickness]. May [blight and mildew]
9 not be seen in [its] produ[ce. May there be n]o affliction,[or (cause of) stumbling in your
congregation, for wild beasts have ceased]
10 from the land. And may there be no pestil[ence in yo]ur [land]. For God is wi[th you and
the angels of his holiness are standing in your congregation, and the name]
11 of his holiness has been proclaimed ov[er you [] []
12 for a [com]munity. And in your midst []

Frg. 10

1 [] []
2 []from the midst of [the] congregation[]
3 [he who fors]akes property[and] gain []
4 [] and you shall eat / and it shall devour them []
5 [] for them grave[s]
6 [] [] the[ir] slain (?) []
7 [those who re]pent from sin shall return []

8 []with mercy and[]
9 [] and Is[r]ael []
10 [] and []

Provisionally entitled 4Q*Berakhot-Milḥamah*, this manuscript was re-designated as 4Q*Sefer ha-Milḥamah* by J. T. Milik in 1972.¹³¹ Comprised of ten reconstructed fragments, 4Q285 (4Q*Sefer ha-Milḥamah*) contains a text which appears related to 1QM but evidences no overlap between that manuscript nor any of the 4QM manuscripts. Due to the abrupt ending of 1QM, Milik suggested that 4Q285 preserved a portion of the ending of 1QM.¹³² The manuscript was later re-assigned to Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes who designated the manuscript 4Q*Sefer ha-Milḥamah* in DJD 36.¹³³ Reconstructed from twenty-three fragments, 4Q285 contains ten reconstructed fragments written on smooth parchment and varying in brown hue, with the largest fragment, fragment 4, measuring 8 cm in width by 8.5 cm in height, and the smallest, fragment 5, 0.5 cm in width and 0.8 cm in height.¹³⁴ Alexander and Vermes noted that the line spacing is variable among the fragments, ranging from 1 cm in fragment 9 and the top of fragment 10 to 0.6 cm in fragment 7.¹³⁵ Average letter size measures around .25 cm in height, producing around fifty to fifty-five letter spaces per line. The hand is similar to that of 1QM, an early Herodian formal hand, locating the manuscript to the latter half of the first century BCE. Alexander and Vermes reconstructed the fragments based upon similar handwriting, physical characteristics,

¹³¹ J. T. Milik, “*Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-reša* ‘ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144.

¹³² Milik, “*Milkî-ṣedeq*,” 142–43.

¹³³ Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:228–46, pl. XII–XIII. The editors further proposed 4Q*Eschatological War* as an alternative designation. The docket on PAM 42.260 is designated as “4Q*Apocal. War (=M?)*,” whereas the docket on PAM 43.325 designate 4Q285 specifically as “4Q*Berakhot-Milḥamah*.”

¹³⁴ See PAM 43.325; 42.260, 370; 41.282, 317, 466, 468, 708; 40.594. LLDSSDL B-496228; B-473695–696, 699, 700, 703, 704, 708, 709, 711, 712, 715, 716, 719, 720, 723, 724, 727, 728, 731, 732, 735, 736, 739, 740, 743, 744; B-299261. For measurements of fragments, see Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:228.

¹³⁵ Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:229. Alexander and Vermes additionally noted that the line spacing in fragment 7 may be due to shrinkage of the fragment over time. On the materiality of 4Q285 and 11Q14, see Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 223–28.

content, and with comparison with 11Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (11Q14). Moreover, they proposed that the extant fragments preserve text from six successive columns which contained approximately thirteen lines of text each.¹³⁶

The content of 4Q285 has been associated with phases of the eschatological war occurring after 1QM 19 and was thus preliminarily posited as preserving the ending of 1QM.¹³⁷ Tigchelaar, however, has convincingly argued that *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285 and 11Q14) represent a war tradition quite different from that preserved in 1QM.¹³⁸ Jonathan Norton has suggested that *Sefer ha-Milhamah* is a “messianic reworking” of 1QM as opposed to its conclusion.¹³⁹ Along similar lines, Alexander posited that *Sefer ha-Milhamah* was more of an “apocalyptic description of what would happen” in the final stage of the eschatological war and following.¹⁴⁰ At issue is the paucity of textual overlap between 4Q285 and 1QM, not to mention a lack of location in which 4Q285 can be inserted into the tradition contained in 1QM. Where 4Q285 and 1QM share similar terminology, there is no sustained location within 1QM to posit. This seems to support Tigchelaar’s conclusion that *Sefer ha-Milhamah* represents a differing war tradition from that of 1QM and the 4QM fragments.

Regarding content, 4Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285) 1, consisting of four lines of text, appears to preserve a prayer “for the sake of your name” (line 2), potentially petitioning the

¹³⁶ Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:229–331. Alexander and Vermes did note the speculative nature of their column reconstruction, admitting the problematic feature that fragments 6 and 7 differ in line-spacing and letter size than fragments 4 and 8 between which the editors place them and suggesting the shrinkage of fragments 6 and 7 as a potential explanation. Signs of damage through shrinkage are visible on fragment 7.

¹³⁷ Alexander and Vermes, DJD 36:231.

¹³⁸ Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data: The Relation between 4Q285 and 11Q14,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 49–56.

¹³⁹ Jonathan Norton, “Observations on the Official Material Reconstruction of *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (11Q14 and 4Q285),” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 3–28, esp. 10–27.

¹⁴⁰ Philip S. Alexander, “A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 (4Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah*),” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 333–48, esp. 348; See also Alexander, “The Material Reconstruction and Genre of 4Q285 (*Sefer ha-Milhamah*) Reconsidered,” in *Studia Semitica: The Journal of Semitic Studies Jubilee Volume*, eds. Philip S. Alexander et al., JSSSup 16 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 95–113.

angelic assistance of Michael (line 3). 4Q285 3 contains three lines of text which mention the Levites blowing trumpets during a battle with the Kittim. Consisting of ten lines of text, 4Q285 4 describes a battle sequence with the Kittim, who are defeated by the Prince of the Congregation in whose presence the king of the Kittim is delivered (line 10).¹⁴¹ 4Q285 7 preserves the important reference to “the Branch of David” (line 3) in connection with a quotation of Isa 10:34–11:1 in 7 1–3, who is identified by Alexander and Vermes as the Prince of the Congregation.¹⁴² In 7 4–6, the Prince of the Congregation tries and puts to death the King of the Kittim, potentially with the help of the High Priest, who further commands the removal of the slain of the Kittim (7 6). Reconstructed in light of 11Q14 1 ii, a proposed parallel text, 4Q285 8 contains a blessing of peace pronounced over Israel, potentially by the high priest, after the final victory over the Kittim—a blessing whose opening lines show a reliance upon the priestly blessing of Num 6:24–25.¹⁴³ Alexander and Vermes plausibly constructed 4Q285 9 and 10 to preserve thirteen lines of text potentially concerning the purification of the land after the final victory, foremost of which is the burial of the slain (10 5–6).

¹⁴¹ For a discussion of the mention of a “return to dry land” in 4Q285 4 9 and the seeming portrayal of a maritime conflict, see Brian Schultz, “The Naval Battle in the Qumran War Texts,” 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*, eds. Kipp Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 204–14.

¹⁴² Alexander and Vermes DJD 36:239. Supporting this identification, most commentators reconstruct 4Q285 7 4 as reading והמיתו נשיא העדה צמ[ח] דויד. Most translate as “and the Prince of the Congregation, the Branch of David, will kill him...” with few choosing “and the Prince of the Congregation will kill him, the Branch of David...” Without the presence of the accusative particle in the line, the former reading seems more likely. See Martin G. Abegg, Jr. “Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment,” *JBL* 113 (1994): 81–91.

¹⁴³ The editors of both DJD 36 and DJD 23 agree upon the linguistic connection between 4Q285 8 and 11Q14 1 ii, suggesting that 11Q14 1 is an almost identity copy of 4Q285 8 with only a few minor variants. See Florentino García-Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, “11QSefer ha-Milhamah,” DJD 23:244. This identification has been challenged in William J. Lyons, “Clarifications Concerning 4Q285 and 11Q14 Arising from *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* 23,” *DSD* 6 (1999): 37–43; and subsequently supported by Tigchelaar. See Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data,” 49–56.

2.4.4 11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milhamah)¹⁴⁴

Frg. 1 Col. i

5 []
6 []
7 [the bud of Da]vid
8 []
9 [the prophet Isaiah: the thickest of wood will be cut]
10 [with iron, and Lebanon in its grandeur will fall. And a sh]oot [will emerge]
11 [from the stump of Jesse, and a branch will spring from its root the bu]d of
12 [David. And they shall judge]
13 [and the Prince of the Congregation the bud of David, shall kill him,]
14 [and with wounds. And the high priest shall command]
15 [] [] the dead of

Frg. 1 Col. ii

1 [] []
2 [] [] and he shall bless them in the name of [the God of]
3 [I]srael, and he shall begin to speak[and say] Israel, blessed be y[ou]
4 in the name of God Most High [] and blessed be [his] holy name
5 for ever and ever; blessed be[] his [] and blessed be all
6 his holy angels. *va[cat va]cat*
7 God Most High will bless you and shine his face upon you, and he will open for you
8 his rich storehouse in the heavens, to send down upon your land
9 showers of blessing, dew and rain, the early rain and the latter rain in its season, and to
give you frui[t],
10 produce, grain, wine and oil in abundance; and the land will produce for you [d]elightful
fruit
11 so that you will eat and grow fat. *vac* And none will miscarry in your land,
12 and none be sick, no blight and mildew will be seen in its grain;
13 [and there will be no stroke or stum]bling at all in your congregation, and wild animals
will be absent from
14 [the land; and there will be no plag]ue in your land, for God is with you and [his holy]
angels
15 [ar]e [standing] in your congregation and his holy name is invoked over you.

Among the texts recovered in the last cave found by the Bedouin, 11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milhamah) was part of a collection of fragments purchased in 1961–1962 by Koninklijke

¹⁴⁴ Translation from García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23:246–48.

Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen and subsequently entrusted to Johannes van der Ploeg and Adam S. van der Woude for examination and publication. The fragments were provisionally identified as 11QBerakhot (11QBer) by van der Woude due to the extended blessing contained within two fragments joined to preserve 11Q14 1 ii.¹⁴⁵ With the preliminary release of the contents of 4Q285 and the literary connection between the two recognized, the manuscript was re-designated as 11QSefer ha-Milhamah. The critical edition of the manuscript was published in DJD 23 by Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude.¹⁴⁶

11QSefer ha-Milhamah consists of four fragments with the largest fragment, 11Q14 1, consisting of six joined and non-joined fragments—designated as 1a–f.¹⁴⁷ The manuscript is well-prepared, finely grained, and slightly thicker than average with a light tan color and irregular dark brown spotting. The hand is careful and well-trained. The editors remark that the scribe began slightly to the right of the right margin ruling and did not appear to be concerned with a standard length to the line.¹⁴⁸ Paleographically, the editors locate the manuscript in the latter portion of the first half of the first century CE. 11Q14 1, measuring approximately 14 cm in height and 15 cm in width, contains two columns of text including an intercolumnar margin (1.8–1.9 cm), a variable left margin after column 2, and a bottom margin.¹⁴⁹ The first column, composed in fragments 1a–d (see Plate XXVIII), preserves a left-hand margin and only several

¹⁴⁵ Adam S. van der Woude, “Ein neuer Segenspruch 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), 253–58, pl. 1.

¹⁴⁶ García-Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23:243–51, pl. XXVII.

¹⁴⁷ PAM 44.006, 007, 114; 43.977; 42.176, 178, 179. Fragment 1f is un-photographed, but according to the editors of DJD 23, it preserves the top of the *yod* and the final *mem* of וברוכים in 1 ii 5 and was joined to 1a on Mus. Inv. 607. See García-Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23:247. See also LLDSSDL B-496287; B-371399; B-496306; B-298302; B-483127, 128; B-365287, 288; B-370948–951; B-299977.

¹⁴⁸ García-Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23:243.

¹⁴⁹ Frg. 1d could potentially contain the bottom edge of the manuscript itself. See PAM 44.114 and Plate XXVIII.

extant words of text, whose overlap with 4Q285 7 is suggested by the editors as probable.¹⁵⁰ Column 2, composed of fragments 1a, 1b, 1e, and 1f, preserves fifteen lines of text, of which only a letter trace at the top of fragment 1e is visible on the infrared image. The text of 11Q14 1 ii contains a blessing upon the congregation of Israel in the name of the God Most High, whereby God will make his face shine upon them and bring abundance upon the people and the land (1 ii 7–11).¹⁵¹

As is the case with 4Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285), the textual overlap between 11Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* and 1QM is minimal and suggests that the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* tradition represents a differing war tradition from that preserved in 1QM and the 4QM fragments. In this light, it is most prudent to approach the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* tradition (4Q285 and 11Q14) as a separate tradition under the larger rubric of Qumran war tradition rather than in relation to other war manuscripts. As Tigchelaar concluded, just as differences between 1QM and the 4QM fragments make abundantly clear, there are differing compositions or editions regarding the eschatological war and *Sefer ha-Milhamah* might be copies of a differing edition or tradition.¹⁵²

2.5 Conclusion

We began this chapter with a cautionary note distinguishing what we mean by the concepts of “text,” “manuscript,” and “tradition.” We emphasized that once we move away from the concrete

¹⁵⁰ García-Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23:246. The editors of DJD 23 referenced 4Q285 5 as the fragment that overlaps with column 1 here, whereas Alexander and Vermes referenced this same fragment as 4Q285 7. The editors of DJD 23 also referenced 4Q285 1, which correlates to 4Q285 8 in DJD 36. For the change in fragment designation, including a concordance correlating the new number system with those employed in former treatments, see Alexander, “A Reconstruction and Reading,” 333–48. For the sake of clarity, I have followed the new numbering system and made the appropriate changes to DJD 23 references.

¹⁵¹ García-Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude proposed that frg. 2 of 11Q14 might be related to the poem preserved in 1QM 12:8–16; 19: 1–8; and 4QM^b 1 1–8. See García-Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23:244. In my estimation, with only two full extant words there is not enough evidence to make any conclusive determination as to the content and literary connection of this fragment.

¹⁵² Tigchelaar, “Working with Few Data,” 56.

physical fragments themselves, we step into the realm of theoretical constructs, such as “manuscripts,” “works,” and “textual groups.” To this latter grouping we might also add the notion of “recensions” and the theoretical construction of literary and textual development across textual witnesses. The publication of the Cave 4 manuscripts has only enhanced this tendency.

Regarding the Qumran war tradition, several attempts to categorize the textual relationship between the war manuscripts has been made. Most comprehensively, Duhaime categorized the war manuscripts according to their relationship with 1QM: 1) those that represent “copies of a similar recension” (4QM^b [4Q492], 4QM^d [4Q494], 4QM^c [4Q495], and 4QM^f [4Q496]), 2) those which represent “copies of different recensions” (4QWar Scroll-like Scroll B [4Q471], 4QM^{a/a and a/b} [4Q491a and b], 4QM^e [4Q493], 4QWar Scroll-like A [4Q497], 3) those deemed “copies of a separate work” [*Sefer ha-Milhamah* [4Q285 and 11Q14], 4QM^{a/c} [4Q491c], and 4) other copies of the Self-Glorification Hymn [1QH^a 26:6–17; 4QH^a (4Q427) 7 i; 4Q471b 1a–d = 4QH^e (4Q431) 1].¹⁵³ Schultz, for the large part, follows Duhaime, but noted that *Sefer ha-Milhamah* represents “a different composition altogether, albeit very much related to the eschatological war described in M.”¹⁵⁴ Inherent in these approaches is the theoretical notion of “recensions” and “compositions” as well as a proposed textual relationship between the preserved manuscripts. While these categories may be heuristically helpful, they run the risk of creating pre-conceived notions regarding their production and transmission as well as their importance in the overall tradition.

More recently, eschewing notions of “recensions” altogether, Vanonen categorized the war manuscripts as 1) war texts that overlap with other war texts (4Q491a [4QM^{a/a} + 4Q491^{a/c}] and 4Q492 [4QM^b]), 2) unestablished war visions (4Q491b [4QM^{a/b}]) and 4Q493 [4QM^e]), 3)

¹⁵³ Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 40–43; Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:80–83.

¹⁵⁴ Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 37–39, quote from 39.

texts that overlap with 1QM 2? (4Q494 [4QM^d] and 4Q471 [4QWar Scroll-like Text B]), 4) remnants of a war text? (4Q495 [4QM^e], 5) opisthographic war text manuscripts (4Q496 [4QpapM^f] and 4Q497 [4QWar Scroll-like Text A]; and 6) *Sefer ha-Milhamah* texts (4Q285 and 11Q14).¹⁵⁵ The approach taken in this study aligns more with that of Vanonen, allowing the textual evidence to speak equally and exist independently within the larger rubric of Qumran war tradition. While there certainly may be relationship between the war manuscripts within the evolving tradition, our aim is to allow the war manuscripts to equally inform our understanding of the tradition without privileging 1QM as the teleological and paradigmatic expression of the Qumran war tradition.

To this end, in the next chapter we examine one of the most recognizable elements of the war tradition, that of the role and function of the priesthood within the tradition. We will situate the function of the priesthood within the priestly warfare functions in the Hebrew Bible as well as within the context of their role and function as portrayed in the wider Qumran corpus. What we hope to illuminate is not only the dependence of the war tradition upon the priestly traditions contained in the Hebrew Bible, but also their expansion within the war tradition in a way that points to the importance of priestly and holiness traditions for understanding the underlying ideological perspective of the eschatological battle.

¹⁵⁵ Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 25–27.

CHAPTER 3 – THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE PRIESTHOOD IN TIMES OF WAR

3.1 Introduction

When the Cave 1 manuscripts came to light in 1948, one of the areas of early fascination was the *War Scroll*, including the presence and function of the priesthood and priestly figures in the eschatological struggle.¹ While early scholars focused their attention on the identification of priestly figures, such as the “priest appointed for battle” and the High Priest,² a close examination of the role and function of the priesthood would wait until the publication of the first sustained commentaries on the *War Scroll*.³ Following the full publication of the Qumran corpus, including the remaining Cave 4 fragments, interests shifted by and large to that of the textual development of the Qumran war tradition.⁴ A renewed interest in the priesthood surrounding the Qumran movement also emerged, however. The genealogical identity of the priesthood underwent reconsideration, particularly regarding the origins of the Qumran movement, as did the role and function of the priesthood considering the full evidence.⁵ The

¹ See Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls*, 128–43.

² Millar Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New Interpretations with Translations of Important Recent Discoveries* (New York: Viking, 1958), 307–08, 347–52; Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 121–23. Milik suggested that the High Priest and the Prince of the Congregation were messianic leaders. See p. 122.

³ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 198–228; van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 14–17, 29.

⁴ See Eshel and Eshel, “Recension of the War Scroll,” 351–63; Duhaime, *The War Texts*; Schultz, *Conquering the World*; Brian Schultz, “Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM)” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*, eds. Daniel K. Falk et al., STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 153–64; Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 11–60; Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves*.

⁵ See Carol A. Newsom, “‘He Established for Himself Priests’: Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Shabbat Shirot,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR 2 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 101–20; Daniel R. Schwartz, “On Two Aspects of a Priestly View of Descent at Qumran,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR 8 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 157–79; Albert I. Baumgarten, “The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 137–56; Robert A. Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam,

portrait which has resulted from this renewed engagement is considerably more varied and multivalent than once thought. One priestly role, however, which has garnered marginal attention is that of the militaristic function of the priesthood found in the *War Scroll* and related 4QM fragments.⁶

The goal of the present chapter is to provide an examination of the role and function of the priesthood in the Qumran war tradition, situating it within the context of other so-called sectarian writings at Qumran as well as antecedents within the biblical tradition. The war tradition, while displaying a continuity with biblical tradition, shows a remarkable amount of expansion and innovation with respect to the functioning of the priesthood in times of war, ascribing to the priesthood a role unique in Second Temple Jewish writings, namely that of “sacerdotal combatants.”⁷

We will begin our investigation by examining the functions of the priesthood in times of war within biblical tradition, where we find the priesthood fulfilling various functions exclusively within pre-battle and post-battle contexts. We will then turn our attention to the priestly terminology and functions as reflected in the Qumran corpus, including the function of the priesthood regarding warfare preserved in the *Temple Scroll*. Finally, we will survey the priestly designations and functions employed within the Qumran war tradition specifically, paying special attention to their function within cultic, liturgical, and tactical contexts, before

(Leiden: Brill, 1999; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019), 2:93–116; Robert A. Kugler, “Priests,” *EDSS* 2:688–93; Joseph L. Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Heinz-Josef Fabry, “Priests at Qumran: A Reassessment,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, ed. Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 90 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 243–62.

⁶ Notable exceptions are Christophe Batsch, *La guerre et les rites de la guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple*, JSJSup 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2005); Batsch, “Priests in Warfare in Second Temple Judaism: 1QM or the *Anti-Phinehas*,” in *Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings from the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*, eds. Daniel K. Falk et al., STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010) 165–78.

⁷ Here I am borrowing the term from Robert Kugler. Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 109.

drawing some preliminary conclusions regarding the priestly orientation and character of the war tradition.

3.2 Militaristic Role of the Priesthood in the Hebrew Bible

That there has been no shortage of discussion regarding the origins, social location, and function of the priesthood and its various priestly groups in ancient Israel goes without saying.⁸ Yet while the portrait of the priesthood in ancient Israel is fraught with uncertainty, more firm grounding is attained as we move into the Second Temple period, particularly regarding the role and function of the priesthood.⁹ Whereas the majority of scholarly inquiries have tended to focus on the priesthood as cultic functionaries or historical concerns regarding the cultic leadership in Jerusalem, one area which has garnered marginal engagement is that of the role of the priesthood in times of war. Despite this fact, however, the biblical tradition ascribes the priesthood a distinct function within the context of warfare, both pre- and post-battle.

⁸ For example, see Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985); Saul M. Olyan and Gary A. Anderson, eds., *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, LHBOTS 125 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991); Lester L. Grabbe, *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-Historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995); Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995); Patrick D. Miller, *The Religion of Ancient Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000).

⁹ On the role and function of the priesthood in the Second Temple period, see Richard D. Nelson, *Raising Up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993); Steven D. Fraade, “‘They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob’: Priests, Scribes, and Sages in Second Temple Times,” unpublished paper, <https://www.academia.edu/301787>; Deborah W. Rooke, *Zadok’s Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000); Van Gorcum, 2004); Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Mark Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, eds., *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, AIL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011); Risa Levitt Kohn and Rebecca Moore, “Rethinking Sectarian Judaism: The Centrality of the Priesthood in the Second Temple Period,” in *Sacred History, Sacred Literature: Essays on Ancient Israel, the Bible, and Religion in Honor of R. E. Friedman on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Shawna Dolansky (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 195–213.

3.2.1 Functions of the Priesthood in Pre-Battle Contexts

Within pre-battle contexts the function of the priesthood in the Hebrew Bible is multifaceted. The priesthood played a central role in the securing of divine sanction and oracular direction for warfare through the ephod, the ark, or the Urim and Thummim.¹⁰ In Num 27:21, God instructs Moses to have Joshua stand before Eleazar the chief priest, who was to make oracular inquiry (שָׁאַל לוֹ בַּמִּשְׁפָּט) for Joshua through the means of the Urim regarding the deployment and gathering in of the army, so that “at his word they shall go out, and at his word they shall come in” (NRSV).¹¹ The instructions here establish the role of the chief priest in the rendering of oracular judgment through the Urim and Thummim, in Num 27:21 specifically regarding the proper time for the initiation and cessation of warfare.¹² Judges 20:27–28 recounts the Israelites seeking divine sanction from God through Phinehas son of Eleazar and the ark for their impending battle with the Benjaminites.¹³ Saul likewise sought pre-battle oracular direction from Ahijah before moving into battle with the Philistines (1 Sam 14:18–19).¹⁴ David also sought

¹⁰ The Urim and Thummim are mentioned only seven times in the Hebrew Bible (Exod 28:30; Lev 8:8; Num 27:21; Deut 33:8; 1 Sam 28:6; Ezra 2:63; Neh 7:65). For a discussion of the usage and potential interpretations of the Urim and Thummim itself, see Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 484–86.

¹¹ The idiom of “going out and coming in” is a direct reference to military leadership (cf. Num 27:17; Josh 14:11; 1 Sam 18:13, 16; 29:6). See Milgrom, *Numbers*, 235–36. Similarly, a group of priests, known as *fetiales*, is portrayed in Roman sources as overseeing the making of treaties and the declaration of war (Plut. *Num.* 12.3–7; Livy 1.23, 24; 1.32.6–14; 9.45.5–9; 10.12.1–3). See Richard Billows, “International Relations,” in *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, Volume 1: Greece, Hellenistic World and the Rise of Rome*, eds. Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees, and Michael Whitby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 314–16; Harry Sidebottom, “International Relations,” *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, Volume 2: Rome from the Late Republic to the Late Empire*, eds. Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees, and Michael Whitby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 14–15.

¹² Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 21–36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 4A (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 351. Levine suggests that the word Thummim has potentially dropped out through scribal error.

¹³ Susan Niditch notes the importance of the person of Phinehas as the priestly mediator of the inquiry. He is “the zealous Yahwist” of Num 25 who is praised for the zealous act of slaying the Israelite man and the Midianite women accused of the non-Yahwistic practices. See Niditch, *Judges: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 204.

¹⁴ There is question as to the mechanism by which Saul sought direction. The LXX reads “ephod” in 14:18, whereas the MT reads “ark of God.” Most commentators prefer the LXX reading over that of the MT. See P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 8 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980),

divine direction through Abiathar and the ephod as to the potentiality of Saul coming to Keilah and the inhabitants of that city handing him over (1 Sam 23:9–12) as well as to whether he should pursue the Amalekites after the raid at Ziklag (1 Sam 30:7–8). Uniquely, it should be noted that in both accounts David himself is spoken of as inquiring of God, although most likely through the ephod and the priesthood as mediators.¹⁵ Finally, the priesthood is additionally portrayed as delivering war oracles without any explicit reference as to the means (cf. Judg 18:5–6).

Moreover, the priesthood is portrayed as having a central function in the conscription and encouragement of the troops before moving into battle. Within a section of regulations concerning judicial and militaristic concerns, Deut 20:1–9 contains specific instructions for the conscription and preparation of the army for battle.¹⁶ Before the battle engagement, the priest is instructed to come before the troops to strengthen them with what some commentators have referred to as a “war sermon”¹⁷ or a “sacred war oracle.”¹⁸ Along the same functional lines of the Mosaic speeches in Deut 7:17–21 and 9:1–3, the priest is to admonish the troops not to fear and to trust in God’s presence among them fighting for their deliverance against the enemy (Deut

237; Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, trans. J. S. Bowden, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), 113–14. Contra, see Philip R. Davies, “Ark or Ephod in 1 Sam XIV. 18?” *JTS* 26 (1975): 82–87.

¹⁵ Likewise, twice in 1 Sam 23:1–5 and once in 2 Sam 5:23–24 David is said to have inquired of God if he should pursue the Philistines. In these locations, no sacerdotal intermediary or means of oracular inquiry are explicitly mentioned.

¹⁶ What is envisioned here is not a standing army, but a civilian army or militia, which is mobilized according to need and overseen by officers who are chosen for the occasion. See Jeffrey Tigay, *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 186. Nelson suggested that what is portrayed in Deut 20 are “wars of the citizenry,” popular wars with widespread support and result in the material gain for the citizenry. See Richard D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 248.

¹⁷ Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*, trans. Dorothea Barton, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 131.

¹⁸ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 249. Nelson suggests the language of a “sacred war oracle” also on display in Judg 18:6; 20:28; Isa 7:4; and the Stele of Zakir, lines 13–15 (*ANET*, 655). See also 1 Macc 4:8–11, where Judas Maccabee similarly exhorts the troops before battle to not be afraid of the enemy.

20:4).¹⁹ As we will see, the Qumran war tradition references the admonition of Deut 20:2–4 in 1QM 10:2–5.

In several war narratives, the ark of God is referred to as accompanying the troops as a palladium, embodying God’s presence going with Israel into battle, acting as an assurance of victory (Josh 6:4–13; 1 Sam 4:4–6; and 2 Sam 11:11).²⁰ Here the priesthood fulfills a custodial function, as the ark was presumably housed in a tent and concealed from view (cf. Num 4:5–6; 2 Sam 11:11). In Joshua 6, the priests are to carry the ark of God as they encircle the city for seven days before the destruction of Jericho. Here, the procession of the ark is tied to the ideology of the divine warrior with the ark embodying God’s warlike presence among the troops.²¹ The ark is likewise presented as accompanying Israel into the battle of Aphek in 1 Sam 4 and into the siege of Rabbah of the Ammonites in 2 Sam 11.

Along similar lines, Num 31:6 makes mention of Phinehas being sent into battle carrying the “holy vessels” (כְּלֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ) and trumpets for sounding the alarm. It is not altogether clear what is being referenced to as “holy vessels.”²² Both Baruch Levine and Jacob Milgrom cautiously suggest they might include the Urim and Thummim mentioned in Num 27:21, perhaps for

¹⁹ Gerhard von Rad argued the notion of trusting in God’s action and deliverance on their behalf as a critical component of holy war, from which later expressions of faith in God are derived. See Gerhard von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel*, trans. and ed. Marva J. Dawn, with an introduction by Ben C. Ollenburger and bibliography by Judith E. Samuelson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 71; originally published as *Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel*, ATANT 20 (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1951).

²⁰ See Patrick D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, HSM 5 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 145–51; Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Volume 1: Social Institutions* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), 259; repr., *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Livonia, MI: Dove Booksellers, 1997). The ark may have also accompanied Israel into the battles in the wilderness and conquest periods, as inferred by Num 14:44. See Milgrom, *Numbers*, 373.

²¹ See Richard D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 90; Miller, *The Divine Warrior*, 150–51.

²² Susan Niditch questions whether the “holy vessels” are symbols of the warrior’s purity and that they have come to war with clean hands and hearts. See Susan Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 88.

oracular direction.²³ What is clear, however, is that Phinehas is fulfilling a priestly function, as demonstrated by the description of Phineas as “the priest of the war” (הַכֹּהֵן לְצָבָא) in 31:6, not as a tactician, as we will see in the Qumran war tradition, but plausibly in a consultatory role as diviner. Furthermore, Phinehas carries trumpets for sounding the alarm (תרועה) for war. The priestly blowing of trumpets in times of war is similarly evidenced in Num 10:9; Josh 6; 2 Chr 13:12–14. As we will examine in Chapter 5, the sounding of trumpets in times of war functioned as a memorial before God prior to the engagement with the enemy (Num 10:9).²⁴ Here in Num 31:6, the trumpets are “for sounding the alarm” (הַצִּצְרוֹת הַתְּרוּעָה), literally “the trumpets of alarm”). The term תְּרוּעָה (“shout” or “alarm”) has strong connections to the holy war tradition and further establishes a connection between cultic ritual activity and divine intervention.²⁵

3.2.3 Functions of the Priesthood in Post-Battle Contexts

Instances of the post-battle functioning of the priesthood are clustered within a singular narrative concerning the Israelites’ war of vengeance against the Midianites in Num 31. As has been noted by commentators, Num 31 represents a distinctly priestly ideology of warfare.²⁶ The text likewise evidences a terminological relationship with the military traditions of Chronicles, including the usage of the phrases “fighting men” (אֲנָשֵׁי צָבָא in Num 31:53; 1 Chr 12:9) and “one who goes out to war as a part of the fighting force” (יֵצֵא צָבָא in Num 1; 31:27–28; 1 Chr 5:18;

²³ Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 452; Milgrom, *Numbers*, 257. Milgrom envisions Phinehas functioning akin to a *barû*, diviners who accompanied the Mesopotamian armies to determine the will of the deity regarding warfare.

²⁴ Levine sees the *niph'al* form נִזְכַּרְתֶּם as “you will be brought to the attention of” and relates it to the language of supplication “in which God is implored to turn toward those who call upon him, to remember them, to remain awake.” See Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 4 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 306.

²⁵ See von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel*, 48–49, 129–131; Nelson, *Joshua*, 93. Both von Rad and Nelson read תְּרוּעָה as “war cry” in a sense of divine war traditions seen here in Josh 6:5, as well as 1 Sam 4:5; 17:20, 52; and to a lesser degree in Judg 7:20.

²⁶ See Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 78–89.

7:11; 12:33–34; 2 Chr 25:5; 26:11).²⁷ Numbers 31 begins with God instructing Moses to bring retribution on the Midianites, after which Moses will be gathered to his people. Moses then commands the people to prepare themselves to carry out the vengeance of God (31:3–4). After returning triumphant and the subsequent rebuke by Moses concerning the sparing of the Midianite women (31:13–18), three episodes take place in which the priesthood perform central functions: the purification of the warriors and the captives (31:19–24), the distribution of spoils (31:25–47), and the paying of the ransom (31:48–54).²⁸ It is noteworthy that while the actual description of the victorious battle is only five verses in length (31:7–11), the description of the post-war rituals occupy the majority of the chapter (31:19–54). This further demonstrates the priestly ideology of the war.

Numbers 31:19–24 contains prescriptions for post-war purification, which we explore more fully in Chapter 7.²⁹ Leaving the camp for seven days, presumably in compliance with purification from corpse impurity in Num 19:1–22 and Lev 11:32, all persons and organic materials are to be purified with the ashes of the red heifer on the third and seventh day (31:19–20). What is innovative is the additional prescription for the purification of all inorganic materials (31:21–23).³⁰ For those materials able to withstand fire, they are to be purified by passing through fire and water (מַי וְאֵשׁ); those which cannot are to be purified by passing through water only. Finally, all persons are to wash their clothes on the seventh day before being allowed

²⁷ Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 465. On the Chronicles war tradition, see Troy D. Cudworth, *War in Chronicles: Temple Faithfulness and Israel's Place in the Land*, LHBOTS 627 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016); Mark J. Boda, “Gazing through the Cloud of Incense: Davidic Dynasty and Temple Community in the Chronicler’s Perspective,” in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*, eds. Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 243–44; Gary N. Knoppers, “Jerusalem at War in Chronicles,” in *Zion, City of Our God*, eds. Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 57–76.

²⁸ Milgrom, *Numbers*, 260–63; Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 457–63.

²⁹ See 7.3.2 and 7.4.3.

³⁰ Niditch interprets this as the uncleanness of the enemy (the “Other”) attaching itself to these objects and secondarily the uncleanness of death. See Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 88.

to return to the camp (31:24). These purification prescriptions are dependent upon the purification procedures in Num 19 regarding contact with a corpse, presently applied to contact with dead corpses within the arena of war.³¹ War is presented here as an unclean-rendering and defilement-inducing activity. This explicit linking of warfare with corpse contamination is unique in the biblical tradition.³² Within these post-war purification rituals, the priesthood functions as boundary negotiators, moving those made unclean through the defilement of corpse contamination to a status of cleanness, and symbolically from the arena of death to life post-war.³³

Directly following post-war purifications, Num 31 moves to a secondary post-war function of the priesthood: the distribution of spoils (31:25–47) and the receipt of the ransom payment (31:48–54).³⁴ Divine decree directs Moses and Eleazar to make an inventory of the spoils—human and animal—dividing them into two parts, between “the warriors who went out into battle” (הַיִּצְאִים לְעִבָּא) and “all the congregation” (כָּל־הָעֵדָה). From the portion of the warriors, one out of every five hundred is to be set aside as tribute and given to Eleazar as an offering to God.³⁵ Moreover, one out of every fifty from the portion of the people is to go to the Levites.³⁶ Notably, whereas Deut 20 prohibits spoils from within the cities of the land, allowing

³¹ See Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 457; Milgrom, *Numbers*, 260.

³² Brad E. Kelle, “Postwar Rituals of Return and Reintegration,” in *Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts*, eds. Brad E. Kelle, Frank Ritche Ames, and Jacob L. Wright, AIL 18 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 213.

³³ Susan Niditch, “A Messy Business: Ritual Violence after the War,” in *Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts*, eds. Brad E. Kelle, Frank Ritche Ames, and Jacob L. Wright, AIL 18 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 196–97.

³⁴ On the division of spoils in warfare, see Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 470–72; David Elgavish, “The Division of the Spoils of War in the Bible and in the Ancient Near East,” *ZABR* 8 (2000): 242–73. For depictions of the post-war distribution of spoils in the Hebrew Bible, see Gen 14:17–24; Josh 22:7–9; Judg 5:28–30; 1 Sam 30:21–25; Ps 68:11–14.

³⁵ The accounting of the division of the spoils utilizes the rare mathematical term חֲמֵסָה, which only appears here in Num 31:30, 47; and 1 Chr 24:6, thus strengthening the connection between Num 31 and Chronicles. See Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 460.

³⁶ 11QT^a 58:13–15 contains a different distribution formula. There, the priests are given one part per every thousand and the Levites “one percent” or one part per every hundred. The remainder is *then* divided equally between the

them only from distant cities and Deut 21:10–14 allows for women to be taken as spoils of war, Num 31 develops these traditions, allowing only virgin women to be taken as spoil and adding the tribute given to the priesthood in times of war. While a priestly portion within the context of offerings can be seen in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Num 7:1–89; 18:8–32; 28:1–31), the practice of a priestly levy in times of war in Num 31 is unique within the Hebrew Bible.³⁷

Read together, these post-battle functions constitute what Brad Kelle has referred to as rituals of return and reintegration.³⁸ Therefore, these acts of purification and atonement make a path for warriors to return from war, crossing a boundary from death to life and facilitating a return to everyday life post-war.³⁹ For our purposes here, it is noteworthy that the priesthood stands explicitly at these junctions, acting as boundary negotiators.

warriors who fought in battle and those who remained behind in their cities. Sidnie White Crawford has argued that the 11QT^a formula is an example of the authorial tendency within the *Temple Scroll* toward harmonization, proposing that the *Temple Scroll* is working with Num 31:27–30 and 1 Sam 30:24–25, both of which deal with post-war distribution of spoils, but differ from one another. See Crawford, *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*, CQS 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 20–21; Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, rev. ed., 3 vols. and supplement (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:360–62; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 510–12.

³⁷ See Kelle, “Postwar Rituals,” 215. While noting the uniqueness of this prescription, Brian Kvasnica notes that Num 31 might have influenced the rendering of Judas’ distribution of spoils in 2 Macc 8. See Kvasnica, “Shifts in Israelite War Ethics and Early Judaism Historiography of Plundering,” in *Writing and Reading War: Rhetoric, Gender, and Ethics on Biblical and Modern Contexts*, eds. Brad E. Kelle and Frank Ritzel Ames, SBLSymS 42 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 177–78; Jonathan A. Goldstein, *2 Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 41A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 338–39.

³⁸ Kelle, “Postwar Rituals,” 236; see also Zainab Bahrani, *Rituals of War: The Body and Violence in Mesopotamia* (New York: Zone Books, 2008).

³⁹ Rituals of reintegration can also be seen regarding the Roman army, most notably the *lustratio*, a purification ritual for armies before and at the conclusion of a military campaign (Appian, BC 3.89; Julius Caesar, *Bellum Africum* 75). See Sabin, van Wees, and Whitby, *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare*, 1:538; Jonathan P. Roth, *The Logistics of the Roman Army at War (264 BC – AD 235)*, CSCT 23 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 31; Adrian Keith Goldsworthy, *The Roman Army at War: 100 BC–AD 200*, OCM (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 148–49.

3.3 The Priesthood at Qumran

The influence of priestly traditions upon the Qumran corpus is unmistakable, including references to priestly identities, practices, and concerns. These texts reveal a movement deeply concerned with ritual purity issues resulting from the centrality of proper Torah observance and corresponding halakhic concerns, a movement that saw itself as the true covenanters with God. The full publication of the Cave 4 fragments has only enhanced and sharpened this view. A survey of priestly terminology in the Dead Sea Scrolls reveals several noteworthy insights.

3.3.1 Priestly Terminology in the Dead Sea Scrolls⁴⁰

Table 3.1 – Distribution of Priestly Titles in the Qumran Corpus

Term/Title	Frequency	Context
כֹּהֵן “Priest”	Approximately 300 occurrences	Appears widely in the Qumran corpus (community rules, biblical interpretations, apocalyptic works, legal documents, and in mystery and texts).
כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל “High Priest” כֹּהֵן הַרֹאשׁ “Chief Priest”	Twenty-two occurrences כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל (10 occurrences) כֹּהֵן הַרֹאשׁ (12 occurrences)	Occurs in connection to: 1. Eschatological Role – 1QSa 2:12; 1QM 2:1; 12:20; 15:4; 16:13; 18:5; 19:11; 4QShirShabb ^b (4Q401) 13 3 (בְּכֹהֵן רֹאשׁ); 4QM ^a 1–3 17; 11 ii 11; 4QM ^b (4Q492) 10; 4QM ^d (4Q494) 4 2. Sacerdotal Role – 11QT ^a 15:15; 23:9; 25:16; 26:3; 31:5; 11QT ^b (11Q20) 1:21, 24 3. Oracular Role – 11QT ^a 58:18 One reference in the 3QCopper Scroll (3Q15) 6:14–7:1 to the high priest’s burial chamber and one fragmentary reference in 4QapocrJer ^b (4Q348) 13. There is a reference to the כֹּהֵן רֹאשׁ in 4QShirShabb ^d (4Q403) 1 ii 24. This reference has not been counted in the occurrences. NOTE: The title כֹּהֵן הַרֹאשׁ occurs exclusively in an eschatological role, whereas כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל occurs exclusively in sacerdotal and oracular roles.

⁴⁰ Table follows the work of Robert Kugler, especially “Priesthood at Qumran,” 2:93–116 and “Priests,” *EDSS* 2:688–93.

הלויים “Levites”	Approximately 100 occurrences	Regarding the role of the “Levites”: 1. Second to priests in rank and privilege – 11QT ^a 21:4; 22:4; 58:13; 60:7–11; 1QM 2:2; 7:14–16; 8:9; 15:4; 16:7; CD 14:4–5; 1QS 2:20 2. Elevated position, on par with other priests – 11QT ^a 57:12; 60:12, 14; 61:8; 1QM 13:1; 18:5–6; 4QM ^a (4Q491) 1–3 9; 4QM ^c (4Q493) 9–10; CD 13:3; 1QS 1:18–19; 2:11; 11QNJ ar (11Q18) 30 2 3. <i>Possible</i> pre-eminent position – 11QT ^a 21:1; 22:10–12; 44:5, 14; 60:6–7 When mentioned in relationship with the other eleven tribes, Levites are privileged (cf. 11QT ^a 23:9–10; 24:11; 39:12; 40:14–15; 4QRP ^c [4Q365] 23 10).
בני אהרן “Sons of Aaron”	Approximately thirty occurrences	Generally used in the sectarian writings to demarcate and differentiate priests from other community members – 1QSa 1:16, 23–24; 1QM 7:10; 4QM ^c (4Q493) 1; and throughout 11QT ^a “Sons of Aaron” are given positions of authority over the community (1QS 9:7) and are deemed the most holy (4QMMT ^a [4Q394] 1–2 iv 8)—yet, at the same time also shown to share power with the laity (1QS 5:21) and are subject to the judgment of the Maskil (1QS 9:14; 4QD ^a [4Q266] 6 i 15; 6 ii 5, 8, 10, 12).
בני צדוק “Sons of Zadok”	Fifteen occurrences	Occurs in connection to: 1. The person of Zadok – CD 4:1; 5:5; 3QCopperScroll (3Q15) 11:3, 6; and <i>possibly</i> 4QpsDan ^c ar (4Q245) 1 i 7 2. The “sons of Zadok” – CD 4:3; 1QS 5:2, 9; 1QSa 1:2, 24; 2:3; 1QSB 3:22; 4QFlor (4Q174) 1 i 17; 4QD ^a (4Q266) 5 i 16; 4Qpap pIsa ^c (4Q163) 22 3

3.3.1.1 “Priest” (כֹּהֵן)

Including all occurrences with genealogical or role qualifiers, the term כֹּהֵן (“priest”) occurs approximately three hundred times in the Qumran corpus. The term appears in a wide variety of texts, including community rules, biblical interpretations, eschatological works, legal documents, and in mystery and sapiential compositions (e.g., 4QMyst^a [4Q299] 63:3, 75:6; 4QSap Work B [4Q419] 1 3). In writings deemed “non-sectarian,” the term is used within decidedly critical discourse of the Jerusalem priesthood (4QapocrJer C^f [4Q387a] 3 iii 6 and 4QapocrJer C^e

[4Q390] 1–2), as well as in a wide range of literature linking the ideal priesthood to Levi and his immediate descendants (e.g., 4QAramaic Levi^{a-c} [4Q213, 4Q213a, 4Q214, 4Q214a], 4QTestament of Qahat [4Q542], 4QVisions of Amram^{a-f?} ar [4Q543–548], 4QpsJub^a [4Q225] 2 ii 11–12, and 4QpsJub^b [4Q226] 7 4). In writings connected with the Qumran movement, the term is employed not only for those outside the community, namely the Jerusalem establishment who were deemed religiously and morally bankrupt (1QpHab 9:4; 1QpMic [1Q14] 11:1; 4QpNah [4Q169] 3–4 i 11, 3–4 ii 9), but also for those within the community who fulfill a leadership role in community life and governance (e.g., 1QS 6:4–5, 8; CD 9:13, 15; 13:2–3; 14:3, 5). Finally, the term appears in connection with the elevated status of the priesthood in the eschaton in the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa 1:16, 24; 2:3, 12–13) as well as in various facets of sacerdotal leadership in the Qumran war tradition.

The ubiquity of כֹּהֵן in a generalized sense in the Qumran corpus attests to the importance of the priestly matters within the movement’s ideology, if not to the presence of priests within the movement itself.⁴¹ That said, however, it is important to note that nowhere in the scrolls do we find any unequivocal reference to the priesthood as the founders of the community. Moreover, it seems that the priesthood most likely would have been in the minority of the movement’s emerging leadership (cf. the council of the community in 1QS 8:1) and perhaps not the highest authority given that the *Maskil* was most likely a lay person (1QS 9:12–25).⁴²

⁴¹ Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 94.

⁴² Kugler, “Priests,” 2:688. On the statutes of the *Maskil*, see Charlotte Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*, TSAJ 183 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 251–63.

3.3.1.2 “High Priest” (הכוהן הגדול) and “Chief Priest” (כוהן הרואש)

Including all plausible reconstructions, the priestly title הכוהן הגדול (“high priest”) and כוהן הרואש (“chief priest”) occur twenty-two times in the Qumran corpus. The term is most frequently connected to a role in the eschatological age (1QSa 2:12; 1QM 2:1; 12:20; 15:4; 16:13; 18:5; 19:11; 4QShirShabb^b [4Q401] 13 3; 4QShirShabb^d [4Q403] 1 ii 24; 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 17; 11 ii 11; 4QM^b [4Q492] 10; 4QM^d [4Q493] 4) where they preside over eschatological ceremonies as well as various facets of the eschatological war, as we will see in 3.4.1.2. Additionally, the chief priest is associated with various sacerdotal duties within an idealized or restored temple, such as priestly ordination (11QT^a 15:15; 16:1; 11QT^b [11Q20] 1:21, 24), the Festival of Wood (11QT^a 23:9), or the Day of Atonement (11QT^a 25:16; 26:3); or in providing oracular direction to the king before waging war (11QT^a 58:18).⁴³ Additionally, we encounter a single reference in the *Copper Scroll* (3Q15 6:14–7:1) to the high priest’s burial chamber and one reference in the highly fragmentary 4QDeed B heb? (4Q348) 13.

Regarding terminology, one notable feature should be highlighted. The term כוהן הרואש (“chief priest”) appears in texts that are eschatological in nature (cf. those usages in 1QM, 4QShirShabb^{b, d} [4Q401, 4Q403], and 4QM^{a, b, d} [4Q491, 4Q492, 4Q494]), while the term הכוהן הגדול (“high priest”) appears only in the occurrences in the *Copper Scroll* and the *Temple Scroll*. The rationale for such a distinction is not clear. One might suggest this as either evidence of a sectarian tendency in terminology or as somehow related to the idea of a future reconstitution of the properly functioning priestly hierarchical order within eschatological or utopian texts transmitted within the Qumran movement. Regardless, Daniel Falk has argued that the transmitters of the Qumran traditions noticeably avoid using the phrase in connection with any

⁴³ On the militaristic role of the high priest in the *Temple Scroll*, see 3.3.3.

contemporary figure, rather choosing to employ הכוהן (“the priest”), at times including a descriptor, in reference to present figures (cf. 1QpHab 8:16; 11:12; 4QpHos^b [4Q167] ii 3) or to future ideal “high priest” (1QSa 2:12–13, 19; 4QapocMoses B^a [4Q375] 1 i 9; 4QapocMoses B^b [4Q376] 1 i 1; 4QpPs^a [4Q171] 1, 3–4 iii 15; 4QpPs^b [4Q173] 1 5).⁴⁴

3.3.1.3 “Levites” (הלויים)

Including all cognates there are nearly one hundred references to הלויים (“Levites”) in the Qumran corpus. In relation to other priestly designations and functions, the Levites are portrayed as having the same biblically mandated role as secondary in priestly rank and privilege (CD 14:4–5; 1QS 2:20; 1QM 2:2; 7:14–16; 8:9; 15:4; 16:7; 11QT^a 21:4; 22:4; 58:13; 60:7–11), as well as having an elevated role, where they are portrayed as equal with other priests (CD 13:3; 1QS 1:18–19; 2:11; 1QM 13:1; 18:5–6; 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 9; 4QM^c [4Q493] 9–10; 11QNJ ar [11Q18] 30 2; 11QT^a 57:12; 60:12, 14; 61:8).⁴⁵ Robert Kugler has proposed the possibility of the Levites enjoying privileges that even transcended those of the priesthood, for example, being given more generous portions from the offerings as opposed to the those provided for the priests (11QT^a 21:1; 22:10–12; and 60:6–7) as well as being granted more quarters in the idealized Temple (11QT^a 44:5, 14).⁴⁶ Levites, when referenced in relationship to the other eleven tribes,

⁴⁴ Daniel K. Falk, “High Priests,” *EDSS* 1:362; Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn: Privately printed, 1971), 102, 210–20; Michael O. Wise, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the High Priest of the Intersacerdotium: Two Approaches,” *RevQ* 56 (1990): 587–613; Kugler, “Priests,” 2:688. Falk also adds to this understanding the sobriquet “the Wicked Priest” (הכוהן הרשע) in 1QpHab 8:8; 9:9; 11:4; 12:2, 8; 4QpIsa^c (4Q163) 30 3; 4QpPs^a (4Q171) 4 8.

⁴⁵ For a broader discussion on the references to Levi and Levites, see 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*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, *STDJ* 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 465–79.

⁴⁶ Kugler, “Priests,” 2:689. For a broader discussion of the Levite innovations in the *Temple Scroll*, see Jeffrey Stackert, “The Cultic Status of the Levites in the *Temple Scroll*: Between History and Hermeneutics,” in *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, eds. Mark Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, *AIL* 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 199–214.

are consistently privileged (11QT^a 23:9–10; 24:11; 39:12; 40:14–15; 4QRP^c [4Q365] 23 10). Finally, in so-deemed “non-sectarian” writings, Levi is portrayed as the progenitor of all priests and is often exalted for priestly wisdom, judgment, and purity (4QpsJub^a [4Q225] 2 ii 11–12; 4QpsJub^b [4Q266] 7 4; 5QRule [5Q13] 2 7; 4QTest [4Q175] 14–20; 4QAramaic Levi^{a-c} [4Q213, 4Q213a, 4Q214, 4Q214a]; 4QTestament of Qahat [4Q542]; and Visions of Amram^{a-f?} ar [4Q543–548]).⁴⁷

The textual evidence regarding the variant portrayals of the Levites has resulted in a variety of interpretations. George Brooke proposed that the elevation of the Levites in the Qumran corpus is due to an influx of Levites at Qumran, bringing with them a set of traditions advocating their own perspectives out of which they “attempted to redraw the shape and practice of the community to their own ends.”⁴⁸ Robert Stallman suggested the elevation of the Levites is distinctly a literary phenomenon, one that may have no basis in the real-life experience of the community outside the text.⁴⁹ Kugler concluded that the community simply found texts elevating Levi to be attractive and useful for their opposition of the Jerusalem establishment. Here they found a vehicle by which they could move beyond Aaron and Zadok to the person of Levi, positing an ideal priesthood through which they could legitimate their own priestly conception.⁵⁰ More recently, Jeffrey Stackert has argued that the Levite innovations in the *Temple Scroll*

⁴⁷ See Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, EJS 9 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996); Andrew B. Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*, JAJSup 19 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015).

⁴⁸ George J. Brooke, “Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac, Volume I: General Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls; Qumran and the New Testament; the Present State of Qumranology*, ed. Zdzislaw Jan Kapera, QM 2 (Kraków: Enigma Press, 1993), 105–29; repr., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 115–39. Quote from p. 105 and 115, respectively.

⁴⁹ Robert C. Stallman, “Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *JSP* 10 (1992): 163–89; repr., *Qumran Questions*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, BibSem 36 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 164–90.

⁵⁰ Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 105.

specifically may represent the attempt to persuade the Levites to side with its authors' position against the Jerusalem priesthood—what Stackert refers to as an “opportunistic egalitarianism.”⁵¹

In the end, what can be said regarding the portrayal of the Levites is that the Qumran corpus contains variant traditions, some of which reflect the biblical traditions regarding the Levites, while other texts and traditions, such as the war tradition, which elevate the role and leadership scope of the Levites. That the Levites occur so frequently in the Qumran corpus is evidence of the importance of the tribe of Levi as well as the extensive theological reflection attached to Levitical traditions.⁵²

3.3.1.4 “Sons of Aaron” (בני אהרֹן)

The designation בני אהרֹן (“sons of Aaron”) appears nearly thirty times in the scrolls, where it is rarely focused on the person of Aaron, but rather refers to the Aaronic priesthood.⁵³ Within various writings, the designation functions in several ways.⁵⁴ First, the phrase is employed within a non-community specific context emphasizing cultic duties of the Aaronide priesthood (4QMMT B 17 [4Q394 3–7 i 19 –ii 1; 4Q395 1 10–11; B 79 [4Q396 4 8]). Second, the phrase acts as a means of demarcating the priests from the Levites (e.g., 1QSa 1:16, 23–24; 1QM 7:10; 4QM^c [4Q493] 1; 11QT^a) as well as from the community writ large. Third, the בני אהרֹן are portrayed as authority figures in matters of judgment and property over the entire community (cf.

⁵¹ Stackert, “The Cultic Status,” 213.

⁵² See Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 89.

⁵³ Gary A. Anderson, “Aaron,” *EDSS* 1:1.

⁵⁴ See 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*, eds. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar, *JSJSup* 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 207–24; repr., *The Qumran Rule Texts*, 195–210.

4QS^d [4Q258] 7:7b).⁵⁵ That said, however, the sons of Aaron are also portrayed as sharing power with the laity (1QS 5:21) and being subject to the judgment of the *Maskil* (1QS 9:14; 4QD^a [4Q266] 6 i 15; 6 ii 5, 8, 10, 12). The title “Aaron” is also used to describe the priestly messiah, who was expected alongside the “messiah of Israel” (CD 12:23; 14:9; 19:11; 20:1; 4QD^a [4Q266] 10 i 12; 4QD^d [4Q269] 11 i 2; 1QS 9:11).

The terminological tension between the designations “the sons of Aaron” and “the sons of Zadok” has been the subject of much scholarly discussion.⁵⁶ Some have argued that the designations should be understood as synonymous.⁵⁷ Others, such as Charlotte Hempel, have argued convincingly that the designations belong to differing strata of tradition growth and development, arguing that the earliest stratum of the D and S traditions lack reference to the “sons of Zadok.”⁵⁸ Moreover, Hempel has argued for references to “the sons of Aaron” as reflecting an earlier strand in the Qumran corpus, including those compositions so deemed sectarian or community-focused.⁵⁹

3.3.1.5. “Sons of Zadok” (בני צדוק)

In the Qumran corpus, the phrase בני צדוק (“sons of Zadok”) and its cognates appears approximately fifteen times and in two main contexts: in the context of the person of Zadok and

⁵⁵ It is noteworthy that 1QS 5:2–3 afford this authority to the sons of Zadok and 4QS^b (4Q256) 9:2b–3 and 4QS^d (4Q258) 1:2b–3a to the “the Many.” On the growth of the S tradition in this matter, see Hempel, *The Rules of the Community*, 136–38, 245–46.

⁵⁶ See Charlotte Hempel, “Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If So was it Mutual?” *RevQ* 24 (2009): 135–53; repr., “Consider Ourselves in Charge: Self-Assertion Sons of Zadok Style,” in *The Qumran Rule Texts*, 211–27.

⁵⁷ Anderson, “Aaron,” 1:1; Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, CCWJCV 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 105; A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of the Qumran and Its Meaning*, NTL (London: SCM Press, 1966), 177.

⁵⁸ Charlotte Hempel, “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 253–69; Hempel, “Do the Scrolls Suggest,” 152–53; Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 100–3.

⁵⁹ Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 224.

as the priestly classification the “sons of Zadok.”⁶⁰ The name צדוק (“Zadok”) is used to reference the person of Zadok in CD 4:1; 5:5; 3QCopperScroll [3Q15] 11:3, 6; and possibly 4QpsDan^c ar [4Q245] 1 i 7. Here, the term refers to a historical figure, namely that of David’s high priest, including two references in the *Copper Scroll* to the “grave of Zadok” (11:3) and the “garden of Zadok” (11:6), however, the Zadok in question is uncertain.⁶¹ In the case of the priestly designation בני צדוק (“sons of Zadok”), the sons of Zadok are portrayed as holding positions of authority and leadership within the community both in this world and in the eschatological age (1QS 5:2–3, 9, 1QSa 1:2, 24; 2:3). Similar to the sons of Aaron, the sons of Zadok are also portrayed as being limited in power (4QD^a [4Q266] 6 i 14) and likewise subject to the judgment of the *Maskil* (1QS 9:14). More importantly, whereas 1QS 5:2–3, 9 indicate that the sons of Zadok were in fact community leaders, the parallel passages in 4QS^b (4Q256) 9:2b–3 and 4QS^d (4Q258) 1:2b–3a—copies of an earlier stratum of *Community Rule* tradition—lack reference to the sons of Zadok, rather conferring the same authority upon the הרבים (“the many”).⁶² This calls into question the early narrative of the sons of Zadok being the founders of the community.⁶³ What now seems apparent in light of the full publication of the Cave 4 fragment is that the designation בני צדוק belongs to a later stratum of the development of the *Community Rules*

⁶⁰ On the use of “the sons of Zadok” in the Qumran corpus, see Philip R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, BJS 94 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 51–72; Davies, “Zadok, Sons of,” *EDSS* 2:1005–7; Baumgarten, “The Zadokite Priests at Qumran,” 137–56.

⁶¹ Davies, “Zadok,” 2:1006.

⁶² Hempel, “Do the Scrolls Suggest,” 148–50; Hempel, *The Rules of the Community*, 136–38, 245–46.

⁶³ For an early expression of the idea of the descendants of Zadok as founders of the Qumran community, see Jacob Liver, “The ‘Sons of Zadok the Priests’ in the Dead Sea Sect,” *RevQ* 6 (1967): 3–30. See also, Geza Vermes, “The Leadership of the Qumran Community: Sons of Zadok—Priests—Congregation,” in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Peter Schäfer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 375–84; Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), 99–140; Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 100–120.

tradition and, subsequently, the notion of the Zadokite origins of the community is not supported by the textual evidence.⁶⁴

Recently, debate has arisen as to the exact nature of “the sons of Zadok” at Qumran, as well as the possibility of the title “sons of Zadok” being employed in a decidedly metaphorical or exegetical context. While there are indeed usages of the “sons of Zadok” which seemingly refer to priestly lineage (1QS 5:2, 9; 1QSa 1:2; 2:3; 1QSB 3:22), there are other usages which present a different conceptual viewpoint. In CD 3:21–4:3, a pesher-like interpretation of Ezek 44:15, the sons of Zadok are referred to as “the chosen of Israel, those called by name who will stand in the end of days” (CD 4:3).⁶⁵ The usage here appears to equate the sons of Zadok with the entire community in a metaphorical sense, as the chosen of Israel who will stand (or appear) in the Last Days.⁶⁶ The question is whether or not this usage offers exegetical insight into the self-definition of the Qumran movement as a whole.⁶⁷ In other words, does this pesher-like interpretation of Ezek 44:15 show the Qumran movement as positioning itself as the true and faithful “chosen ones of Israel”? This opens the possibility that the usage of the term “sons of Zadok” at Qumran is more than a priestly distinction, but could likewise reflect a metaphorical, self-referential

⁶⁴ See Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 57–72; Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 223–24; Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 97–100; Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 60–65. For a different proposal as to the relationship between the Aaronides and Zadokites at Qumran, see Fabry, “Priests at Qumran,” 247–58.

⁶⁵ Translation from Steven D. Fraade, *The Damascus Document*, OCDSS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 41.

⁶⁶ See Hempel, “Do the Scrolls Suggest,” 138–39. Hempel further suggested that the same interpretation may be at work in 4QD^a (4Q266) 5 i 16 // 4QD^b (4Q267) 5 ii. Hempel’s observation that the references to the “sons of Zadok” in CD do not refer to priests, but to the community as a whole strengthens the notion that the references to “the sons of Zadok” in CD as being self-referential of the community. See Hempel, “Do the Scrolls Suggest,” 148.

⁶⁷ Interpretation of the evidence has led to a wide array of scholarly opinion on the nature of the designation “the sons of Zadok.” See Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 57–72; Davies, “Zadok,” 2:1006–7; Maxine L. Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*, STDJ 45 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 185–209; Grossman, “Priesthood as Authority: Interpretive Competition in First-Century Judaism and Christianity,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*, ed. James R. Davila, STDJ 46 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 117–31; Fabry, “Priests at Qumran,” 247–58. Gary Anderson sees Aaron and Zadok functioning “as ciphers for the sect as a whole.” See Anderson, “Aaron,” 1:2.

understanding of the movement itself irrespective of genealogical or historical reference.⁶⁸ In this light, “the sons of Zadok” was a symbolic reference for the “those called by my name who will stand in the end of days,” which the movement understood itself as being—the true “sons of Zadok.”

3.3.2 Priestly Roles and Functions at Qumran

The priesthood in the Second Temple period fulfilled a variety of sacerdotal roles and functions: sacrificial responsibilities, ceremonial leadership, instruction and interpretation of Torah, the establishment and maintenance of ritual purity and holiness boundaries, judging disputes, and various administrative duties regarding Temple wealth and affairs.⁶⁹ The priesthood at Qumran presumably were involved in many of the same sacerdotal functions, except perhaps sacrificial rites, which has been a focus of debate.⁷⁰ The consensus view has been that the traditional sacrificial functions of the priesthood would be reinstated with the inauguration of the eschatological age.⁷¹ Questions regarding the evidence of animal bone deposits has raised the possibility however that sacrifice might have been a part of life at Khirbet Qumran. While there

⁶⁸ Grossman, *Reading for History*, 187–88.

⁶⁹ See Nelson, *Raising Up a Faithful Priest*, 39–53; Fraade, ““They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob,”” unpublished paper; Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Volume 2: Religious Institutions* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), 345–405; repr., *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Livonia: MI: Dove Booksellers, 1997)

⁷⁰ See Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarials of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls,” *HTR* 46 (1953): 141–57; Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021), 142–60; Magness, “Were Sacrifices Offered at Qumran? The Animal Bone Deposits Reconsidered,” *JAJ* 7 (2016): 5–34; Alison Schofield, “An Altar in the Desert? A Response to Jodi Magness, ‘Were Sacrifices Offered at Qumran?’,” unpublished paper, <https://www.academia.edu/30247242>.

⁷¹ Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community’s Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel, Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalem Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, eds. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 267–84; Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 111.

is no explicit listing of the priestly functions at Qumran preserved, now with the full publication of texts we can infer the roles and functions the priesthood exercised.⁷²

The priesthood at Qumran is portrayed as having a prominent role in the community as ceremonial leaders. They are centrally situated within both the rites of admission (1QS 1:18–2:12; 4Q256 2:1–6, 12–13; 3:1–4; 4Q257 2:1–8) and expulsion (4QD^a [4Q266] 11 5–17; 4QD^d [4Q269] 11 ii+15; 4QD^e [4Q270] 7 i–ii), as well as the annual procession and confirmation of the community (1QS 2:19–25a).⁷³ They pronounce blessings and curses (1QS 1:18–20; 2:1–18; 1Qsb 3:28), including blessings upon meals (1QS 6:4–5; 1Qsa 2:17–20).

Priest also fulfilled teaching functions, although not exclusively as we see references to the teaching functions of both the *Mebaqqer* and the *Maskil*. The Teacher of Righteousness, a priestly figure (4QpPs^a [4Q171] 3:15), had an essential teaching and interpretive function within the movement (1QpHab 2:2–9) as one to whom divine revelation had been given (1QpHab 7:4–5) and to whom the people were to be faithful (1QpHab 8:1–3).⁷⁴ Teaching functions were also attributed to other figures, such as the פקד or Inspector (CD 14:6–8 4Q266 11 8; 1QS 6:14) and the “sons of Zadok,” who received interpretive revelation regarding the Law of Moses and were “the priests who keep the covenant and seek His favor” (1QS 5:8–9). Additionally, according to the *Damascus Document*, whenever there is a gathering of ten people a priest learned in the “Book of Hagu” (ספר ההגי) must be present (CD 13:6; cf. 10:6). The same knowledge is required

⁷² See Florentino García Martínez, “Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple,” in *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 64 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 77–93; Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 109–12; Kugler, “Priests,” 2:690–91.

⁷³ On rites of passage, see Daniel K. Falk, “Liturgical Texts,” CDSS, 427–28.

⁷⁴ On the hermeneutical role of the Teacher of Righteousness, see Timothy H. Lim, *The Earliest Commentary on the Prophecy of Habakkuk*, OCDSS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 32–33.

for the priest who is appointed “[head] of the Many” (CD 14:6–8). These references suggest a curriculum of study and teaching.⁷⁵

Priests are also given a central role in matters of ritual purity and impurity. Priests were to determine the status of skin diseases (CD 13:4–7; 4QD^a [4Q266] 6 i). Moreover, the priesthood is portrayed as involved in the purification rituals with the ashes of the red heifer (4QTohorot B^a [4Q276]; 4QTohorot B^b [4Q277] 1 ii).⁷⁶

Regarding the judgment of disputes, the role was not exclusive to the priesthood, but they are portrayed as being involved in the judicial process (cf. 11QT^a 17:11–15). The *Damascus Document* notes that the judicial council should consist of ten members from the congregation, including “four from the tribe of Levi and Aaron, and from Israel, six, learned in the Book of Hagu” (CD 10:4–10; cf. 4QD^e [4Q270] 6 iv 15–19). In 4QOrdinances^a, the make-up of the judicial council is twelve members, including two priests (4QOrd^a [4Q159] 2 4). In the *Rule of the Congregation*, every member of the community once they reach of the age of thirty may be a part of judicial disputes (1QSa 1:13–16), however authority still falls under the “sons of Zadok” and the heads of the judges (1QSa 1:24). What this evidence tells us is that the priesthood played a central role in the judicial affairs of the movement and, in the case of 1QSa, had preeminent status in the judicial body.⁷⁷

The priesthood is portrayed as fulfilling various roles concerning general community governance. The *Community Rule* (1QS 5:2, 9, 21; 8:1; 9:7–8) and the *Damascus Document* (CD 10:5; 13:3; 14:6) both explicitly state that the priesthood was to govern the community, although,

⁷⁵ See Jonathan Ben-Dov, “The Book of HGY and Ancient Reading Practices,” in *Is There a Text in this Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*, eds. Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioatã, and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 423–37; Steven D. Fraade, “Hagu, Book of,” *EDSS* 1:327.

⁷⁶ On the red heifer rite at Qumran, see John Bowman, “Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?” *RevQ* 1 (1958): 73–84; Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Red Cow Purification Rites in Qumran Texts,” *JJS* 46 (1995): 112–19.

⁷⁷ García Martínez, “Priestly Functions,” 88.

as we have already noted, in conjunction with the laity. They occupy a place of privilege in community gatherings (1QS 6:8; 1QSa 1:2; 2:3, 12–13; CD 14:3, 6; 4QD^c [4Q270] 11 i 16). They had oversight of matters of community wealth (1QS 5:2–3; 9:7–8; CD 9:13, 15) as we noted above, and judged the acceptability of new members (1QS 5:21 [cf. 4QSD^d (4Q258) 2:1]; 6:19).

3.3.3 The Militaristic Role of the Priesthood in the *Temple Scroll* (11QT^a)

One priestly function, however, which has garnered minimal exploration is the role of the priesthood in the imagined eschatological battle of the Qumran war tradition. Within the texts found at Qumran, reference to the function of the priesthood in times of war are preserved only in the *Temple Scroll* and the war tradition. Whereas the *Temple Scroll*, expanding upon the biblical traditions in Deuteronomy, addresses priestly activity only within pre-battle contexts, the war tradition affords the priesthood unprecedented functions within the eschatological battle. Before turning our attention to the Qumran war tradition, a few brief comments regarding the occurrences in the *Temple Scroll* are appropriate.

Within the Deuteronomic Paraphrase in columns 55–66, two locations address the function of the priesthood in times of war. In columns 56–59, a literary unit typically referred to as the “Law of the King” and a substantive expansion of Deut 17:14–20,⁷⁸ includes instructions regarding the king’s undertaking of an offensive war (11QT^a 58:15–21).⁷⁹ Lines 18–21 read:

⁷⁸ Schiffman proposes that the “Law of the King” was a pre-existent source incorporated by the author/redactor in their own re-working of the Deuteronomic Paraphrase. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Deuteronomic Paraphrase of the Temple Scroll,” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 543–67; Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord*, 487–504. For a discussion on the textual development and contents of the Deuteronomic Paraphrase and the Law of the King, see Crawford, *The Temple Scroll*, 57–62; Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 93–102.

⁷⁹ Yadin refers to this as a “war of choice” as opposed to a “war of duty.” Yadin suggests the general conception of these laws do not differ from what is codified in rabbinic law, citing Maimonides (*Code: Laws Concerning Kings and Wars*, 5:1–2). See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:358–59. See also *m. Sanh.* 2:4 and *m. Sotah* 8:7.

¹⁸And they are not to go forth until he [the king] has entered before the High Priest and he has consulted for him the decision of the Urim ¹⁹and Thummim. On his orders he shall go out and on his orders he shall (re-)enter, he and the children of Israel who ²⁰are with him; he shall not go out on the advice of his heart until he has consulted the decision of the Urim ²¹and Thummim. And he will have success in all his paths as he has gone out according to the decision which...⁸⁰

The instructions stipulate that the king may not go out to battle until he has come before the High Priest to inquire of divine sanction through the Urim and Thummim (58:18–19 and 20–21) a near direct quote of the instructions God gives Moses in Num 27:21 regarding Joshua and Eleazar, the High Priest.⁸¹ This requirement is further emphasized stating that the king must not go out to war “by the counsel of his heart (מעצת לבו)” (58:20).⁸² The overall effect is clear; the writer(s) of “the Law of the King” is subordinating the king to the priesthood in matters of governance and war, the latter concern altogether absent in Deut 17:14–20. Here in 11QT^a 58:18–20 specifically, the writer(s) accomplishes the heightened subordination by introducing the stipulations regarding necessary oracular direction found in Num 27:21.

Found in a collection of stipulations in columns 60–66, 11QT^a 61:12–15 contains a paraphrase of Deut 20:1–3 instructing the priest to exhort the army prior to engagement with the enemy:

When ¹³you go out to war against your enemy, and you see horses and chariots and a people more numerous than you, do not be afraid ¹⁴of them, because I, he who made you come up from the land of Egypt, am with you. And when you advance to battle, ¹⁵the priest shall come forward and he will speak to the people and shall say to them: “Listen, Israel, you are approaching...”

⁸⁰ Translations of 11QT^a from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE.

⁸¹ Yadin notes the use of “Urim and Thummim” in 58:18–19 and 20–21, whereas in Num 27:21 only the Urim is mentioned (cf. Ezra 2:63; Neh 7:65). See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 2:264.

⁸² Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord*, 513. Schiffman adds that the word עצה (“counsel”) in line 20 is characteristic of the Qumran movement suggesting the “Law of the King” might be an independent composition originating within the movement or related circles. That said, Schiffman highlights the fact that the *Temple Scroll* is a “pre-sectarian” composition.

Whereas 11QTa 61:12–15 follows closely upon Deut 20:1–3, the exhortation in Deut 20:3–4 is quoted in 1QM 10:2–5 (cf. 15:6b–18; 4QM^a [4Q491] 10 ii 13–17) albeit with a slightly variant reading:

²He taught us long ago concerning our successive generations, saying “When you draw near for battle, the priest shall take position and address the people, ³saying, “Hear, Israel, you are drawing near today for battle against your enemies. Do not be terrified, let not your hearts be faint, ⁴do not be alar[med, and do n]ot tremble before them, for your God is going with you to do battle for you against your enemies, to save ⁵you!” (1QM 10:2–5)

Even though the content of the exhortation is lost due to the damage at the beginning of column 62, what can be said is that the tradition of a priestly exhortation to the army prior to engagement with the enemy was a well-established feature both in the *Temple Scroll* and the war tradition.⁸³

3.4 Priestly Roles in the Qumran War Tradition

By far the most expansive portrayal of the function of the priesthood in times of war is the war tradition from Qumran. No other composition from the Second Temple period affords the priesthood the roles and functions pre-, mid-, and post- battle portrayed in the war tradition.

What follows is a close examination of priestly terminology employed within the Qumran war tradition as well as a survey of the ritual, liturgical, and tactical functions portrayed. Our hope is that the following examination provides fresh data and discussion points for advancing our understanding of this unprecedented feature.

⁸³ Yadin reconstructs the opening lines of column 62 according to Deut 20:3–6. See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 2:280.

3.4.1 Priestly Terminology in the Qumran War Tradition⁸⁴

Table 3.2 – Distribution of Priestly Titles in the Qumran War Manuscripts

Term/Title	Frequency	Context
<p>כֹּהֵן “Priest”</p>	<p>Sixty-seven total occurrences (Twenty-five in 4QM)</p>	<p>Predominantly used without any genealogical qualifier. There are five occurrences where it is used in distinction to the Levites (i.e., “the priests and Levites” in 7:15; 8:15; 13:1; 15:4; 18:5).</p> <p>There are five additional occurrences of “the priests and Levites” in 4QM fragments (4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 9, 17; 4QM^b [4Q492] 11; 4QM^d [4Q494] 2–3).</p> <p>One reference to “a priest appointed for the time of vengeance” (15:6).</p> <p>One reference to “the priest designated for battle” (4QM^a [4Q491] 10 ii 13).</p> <p>One reference to “the priests, the sons of Aaron” (4QM^e [4Q493] 1).</p>
<p>כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ “Chief Priest”</p>	<p>Ten total occurrences</p>	<p>Appears once in column 2, but mostly concentrated in the battle instructions in columns 15–19.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Named in ranking of the “chief of priests” in the priestly division/courses (2:1; 4QM^d [4Q494] 4). 2. Standing before the army pre-battle proclaiming blessings upon God and curses upon Belial and his lot (12:20–13:5) and offering prayers (15:4). NOTE that in 15:5–6 it is the Chief Priest who “forms the battle lines.” 3. Strengthens the hearts and hands of the combatants for battle (16:13, cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 11 ii 11). 4. Offering post-battle blessings to God for victory (18:5; 19:11; 4QM^b [4Q492] 10).
<p>הַלְוִיִּים “Levites”</p>	<p>Twenty-five total occurrences (Ten in 4QM)</p>	<p>Occurs 6 times in conjunction with the priests (“the priests and the Levites” in 7:15; 8:5; 13:1; 15:4; 18:5; and 19:11–12).</p> <p>Occurs 9 times on its own (1:2; 2:2; 5:1; twice in 7:14; 7:16; 8:9; 16:7; 17:3).</p> <p>Appears in conjunction with all contexts and functions within in the war tradition—pre-battle, battle-engagement, and post-battle contexts, as well as ritual, liturgical, and tactical functioning.</p>

⁸⁴ Data collection on frequency of terms and plausible reconstructions performed utilizing QUMENG in conjunction with Martin G. Abegg, Jr., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2003–2016).

בני אהרן “Sons of Aaron”	Five total occurrences	Appears twice in reference the person of Aaron and three times in reference the sons of Aaron: 1. “Aaron” as a name written on the grand banner (3:14). 2. “Aaron” as a name written on the shield of the Prince of all the congregation (5:1). 3. The “sons of Aaron” take up positions in front of the battle lines (4QM ^c [4Q493] 1). 4. Seven “priests of the sons of Aaron” dressed in “garments of battle” go forth amidst the battle lines (7:9–11). 5. A reminder is given of the judgment against Nadab and Abihu, the “sons of Aaron” (17:2).
בני צדוק “Sons of Zadok”	No occurrences	There are no references to the sons of Zadok in 1QM or in any of the 4QM fragments.
ומשנהו “His Deputy”	Three total occurrences	Two references in 1QM (2:1 and reconstructed in 19:11) and one reference in 4QM ^d [4Q494] 4. ⁸⁵

3.4.1.1 “Priest” (כֹּהֵן)

Including all reconstructions, the general term כֹּהֵן (“priest”) occurs sixty-seven times in the Qumran war tradition, forty-two times in 1QM. Eight times the term appears in the singular form and thirty-four times in the plural form. The term is predominantly used without any specific genealogical qualifier. We do, however, see five occurrences in 1QM where the term is used in distinction to the Levites (“the priests and the Levites” in 7:15; 8:15; 13:1; 15:4; 18:5) as well as five occurrences of the same usage in the 4QM fragments (4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 9, 17; 4QM^b [4Q492] 11; 4QM^d [4Q494] 2–3). Importantly, explicit references to the “seven priests of the sons of Aaron” in 1QM 7:9–10 and “the priests, the sons of Aaron” in 4QM^c [4Q493] 1 as standing before the combatants in pre-battle settings seem to suggest the priesthood has Aaronite connections. Two notes of caution should be added here. First, these are the only references to the sons of Aaron connected with active roles or functions in the Qumran war tradition. Second,

⁸⁵ There is also a fragmentary reference to הכֹּהֵן הַשֵּׁנִי (“the second priest”) in 11QT^a 31:4.

the textual development of 1QM and the 4QM fragments should be taken into consideration before making any definite conclusions.⁸⁶ Finally, the references to “a priest appointed for the time of vengeance” (הכוהן החרוץ למועד נקם) in 15:6 and “the priest designated for battle” (הכוהן החרוץ למלחמה) in 4QM^a [4Q491] 10 ii 13 are noteworthy. In both texts, this figure serves as a distinct priestly military leader exhorting the eschatological combatants with the deeds of God before engaging the enemy in battle. These designations plausibly refer to the same figure and are loosely configured after the priest who exhorts the troops pre-battle in Deut 20:2–4.⁸⁷ Given that both 1QM and 4QM^a (4Q491) date contemporaneously, this suggests that two separate traditions were transmitted concurrently at Qumran.

3.4.1.2 “Chief Priest” (כוהן הרואש)

The priestly title כוהן הרואש (“chief priest”) occurs ten times in the war tradition, six times in 1QM, where the title is mostly concentrated within the battle instructions in columns 15–19.⁸⁸ Outside of these columns there is a singular reference to the כוהן הרואש in 1QM 2:1–2 regarding the ranking of the priests who were to serve in the regular offering before God (cf. 4QM^d

⁸⁶ For a more recent discussion utilizing 4QM fragments, see Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 20–43; Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World*; Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts,” 23–27, 34–37, and 44–50; Vanonen, *The War Tradition*. Duhaime dates 1QM as the second half of the first century BCE, with the following as similar recensions: 4QM^f (4Q496) dated to the first half of the first century BCE, 4QM^b (4Q492) and 4QM^c (4Q496) as contemporary with 1QM, and 4QM^d (4Q494) dated to the first half of the first century CE. The following reflect a different recension: 4QM^e (4Q493) and 4QWar Scroll-like Text A (4Q497) both dated to the first half of the first century BCE, as well as, following Abegg’s designations, 4QM^{a/a} and 4QM^{a/b} as contemporary with 1QM. Kipp Davis has argued, based on digital reconstruction, for re-joining the 4QM^a (4Q491) fragments which Abegg had separated. See Davis, “‘There and Back Again,’” 125–46.

⁸⁷ As Yadin observed, while the content of the exhortation in 1QM 15:6–18 is related in theme and purpose to the priestly exhortation in Deut 20:2–4, it is not as close in correspondence as that of the priestly exhortation in 1QM 10:2–5. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 217. André Dupont-Sommer suggested that this is figure be identified with the chief priest. See Dupont-Sommer, “‘Règlement de la Guerre,’” 170. Johannes van der Ploeg and Jean Carmignac rightly disagree. See van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 166; Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 218.

⁸⁸ Yadin suggested the use of the title “chief priest” points to a date of composition during or at the end of the Hasmonean period, and further that it represents a renunciation of the rule of the Hasmonean priests. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 208.

[4Q494] 4). Within 1QM 15–19, the chief priest predominantly appears within a liturgical capacity: offering blessings to God and pronouncing curses upon Belial and his lot (12:20–13:5), reading the prayer of the appointed time for war before “forming the battle lines” (15:4–6a), and leading various post-battle blessings to God for victory (18:5; 19:11; 4QM^b [4Q492] 10). Additionally, in 16:13–14 the chief priest is portrayed in a more militaristic role standing before the battle lines mid-battle to “strengthen their heart *b*[...of Go]d and their hands for his battle” (cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 11 ii 11).

The predominant liturgical function of the chief priest has led some scholars, such as Géza Xeravits, to suggest that the sole function of the Chief Priest was “purely spiritual.”⁸⁹ That said, however, the reference to the chief priest “arraying all the battle lines” (1QM 15:5b–6a) seems to hint at a decidedly tactical role for the chief priest as potentially does the exhortation of the combatants delivered in 1QM 16:13–14.

3.4.1.3 “Levites” (הלויים)

As for the term הלויים (“Levites”), there are twenty-five occurrences of the term in the war tradition, fifteen of which occur in the text of 1QM. The term appears in various non-battle contexts, including references to the tribal “sons of Levi” and the “chiefs of the Levites” connected with the institution of the priestly courses (1QM 2:1–2; cf. 4QM^d [4Q494] 2–3), and the name “Levi” being written on the shield of the “prince of the whole the congregation” along with Aaron (1QM 5:1). Significantly, however, the majority of the references to the Levites occur within a battle context, including during the pre-battle assessment of the ritual purity of the

⁸⁹ Géza Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*, STDJ 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 167.

combatants (4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 9), during the offering of pre-battle encouragement and blessings (1QM 7:14–16; 13:1), the tactical orchestration of the battle through a series of horns (1QM 8:9, 15; 16:7; 17:3; 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 17; 11 ii 6, 22; 13 6; 4QM^c [4Q493] 9), and during the offering of post-battle blessings to God for victory over the forces of Belial (1QM 18:5; 19:12; 4QM^b [4Q492] 11).

What is striking about the function of the Levites in the war tradition is the elevation they receive in non-combat as well as combat contexts.⁹⁰ In a cultic setting, they serve cultic leadership positions alongside the priests regarding the re-institution of the priestly courses. They likewise are portrayed in a liturgical leadership role alongside the rest of the priesthood. In decidedly militaristic contexts, the Levites play a key tactical function orchestrating various maneuvers of the sons of Light in battle. This elevated prominence in the Qumran war tradition comports well with the elevation of the Levites seen in other traditions and compositions within the Qumran corpus, especially those focused on movement life and governance, like the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*, as well as future-oriented material, such as the *Rule of the Congregation* and *Temple Scroll*.⁹¹

3.4.1.4 “Sons of Aaron” (בני אהרֹן)

The designation בני אהרֹן (“sons of Aaron”), or simply אהרֹן, occurs only five times in the war tradition.⁹² Twice we find reference to the person of Aaron, regarding the name of Aaron being written on the grand banner (1QM 3:15) and on the shield of the Prince of the Congregation (1QM 5:1). Additionally, there are three references to the sons of Aaron. In 4QM^c (4Q493) 1 the

⁹⁰ See Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 173–78.

⁹¹ Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 189–90.

⁹² On the “sons of Aaron” in the war tradition, see Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 218.

priests instructed to take up position in front of the battle lines and blow the trumpets of memorial are further delineated as “the sons of Aaron.” There is reference to the “seven sons of Aaron” dressed in battle garments who are instructed to go forth amid the battle lines, while one of the seven “strengthens their hands for battle” (1QM 7:9–11). Noteworthy is the parallel reading in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 17–18 which does not include the reference to the seven sons of Aaron, but rather describes them only as priests. Finally, in the chief priest’s exhortation of the combatants, we find reference to the judgment brought upon “Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron” as opposed to the preservation of Eleazar and Ithamar to “an eternal covenant” (1QM 17:2–3; cf. Lev 10:1–20; Num 3:4).

3.4.1.5 “Sons of Zadok” (בני צדוק)

Strikingly, the phrase בני צדוק (“sons of Zadok”) does not appear in any stratum of the Qumran war tradition. This is surprising given the presence of the “sons of Zadok” in the late stratum of various movement-focused writings, such as the *Community Rule*. This aligns this text with other texts that fail to reference the sons of Zadok, including 4QMMT, the legal portion of CD, the 4QS manuscripts, and 4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.⁹³ This evidence suggests that, while some texts from Qumran might have originated within or been influenced by groups ideologically associated with the Zadokite priesthood, the validity of speaking of the “the sons of Zadok” as central to the founding process of the Qumran movement must be questioned.

Furthermore, given the metaphorical nature of “the sons of Zadok” in the peshet-like interpretation of Ezek 44:15 in CD 3:21–4:3, the notion of the designation also fulfilling a more

⁹³ Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 218; Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 57; Heinz-Josef Fabry, “Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran,” in *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments: Festschrift für Erich Zenger*, eds. Frank Lothar Hossfeld and Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger, HBS 44 (Freiburg: Herder, 2004), 210; Vermes, “Leadership of the Qumran Community,” 379.

exegetical function cannot be ruled out. The importance of the lack of the phrase “the sons of Zadok,” as well as the limited usage of “the sons of Aaron,” in the Qumran war tradition is a topic that requires further examination.

3.4.1.6 “His Deputy” (משנהו)

There are also two unique references to a “deputy” of the Chief Priest, משנהו (“his deputy”) in 1QM 2:1 and 19:11 and in 4QM^d [4Q494] 4.⁹⁴ The reference to the deputy (literally, “his second”) is a unique designation usually rendered as “second, second in rank or importance.”⁹⁵ The term denotes a priestly assistant to the chief priest, a figure potentially parallel to the rabbinic סגן in b. Yoma 39a.⁹⁶ Jongeling suggested that this term could be rendered as “le remplaçant,” thus hinting that this figure could potentially be the next in succession for the position of Chief Priest.⁹⁷ In the references within the war tradition, this figure is always mentioned in conjunction with the Chief Priest and appears in the ranking of the priesthood for the priestly courses (2:1; 4QM^d [4Q494] 4) and in the offering of post-battle blessings to God (19:11). A fuller examination of this term with reference to the priestly hierarchical stratification in 1QM 2:1 and 4QM^d (4Q494) 4 will be taken up in Chapter 4.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ We also find a fragmentary reference הכוהן המשנה (“the second priest”) in 11QT^a 31:4. Cf. 2 Kgs 25:18 and Jer 52:24, where “the captain of the guard took the chief priest Seraiah, the second priest Zephaniah, and three guardians of the threshold” into exile.

⁹⁵ “משנהו,” *DCH* 5:549–51.

⁹⁶ Kugler, “Priests,” 2:688. Yadin refers to this figure as “a second in command.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 207 n. 6).

⁹⁷ Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 80.

⁹⁸ See 4.5.2.

3.4.2 The Role of the Priesthood in Qumran War Tradition

As mentioned previously, the role and function of the priesthood in the militaristic context of the *War Scroll* intrigued early commentators. With the full publication of the Cave 4 fragments, the picture of the function of the priesthood has become sharper. What follows is an attempt to present a preliminary sketch of role of the priesthood in terms of their cultic, liturgical, and tactical functions within the war tradition.

3.4.2.1 Cultic Function of the Priesthood

Whereas the locations in which the priesthood operate within the Qumran war tradition are decidedly liturgical and tactical in nature, we do observe the priesthood functioning within a specific cultic context in 1QM 2:1–6 and 4QM^d [4Q494].⁹⁹ These locations describe the hierarchical stratification of the priesthood and lay leadership regarding the re-institution of sacrificial activity in the Jerusalem Temple, of which a fuller examination of its importance in the ideology of the eschatological battle will be undertaken in Chapter 4. The instructions included in 1QM 2:1–3 refer specifically to the re-institution of the daily sacrifice (תמיד) providing instructions for those who “serve continually” as well as those who serve during their allotted course under them.¹⁰⁰ The allotted courses are twenty-six in number, as opposed to the twenty-four we see instituted in 1 Chr 24, seemingly to reflect the 364-day solar calendar expressed in various texts from Qumran and in Jubilees.¹⁰¹ As we will see in Chapter 4, the instructions in 2:1–6 are situated within a larger narrative setting as taking place in “the year of

⁹⁹ See also 4QM^d (4Q494) 1–5 which present a similar context to 1QM 1:19–2:3. Duhaime, following Baillet, classifies 4QM^d (4Q494) as a similar recension, with minor variants, to 1QM dating from the first half of the first century CE due to the Herodian script. See Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 21, 40–43; Baillet, DJD 7:53–54.

¹⁰⁰ See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 26–27.

¹⁰¹ This reflects fifty-two weeks, divided into four seasons of thirteen weeks each, thus twenty-six weeks in each of the two periods. For a discussion of the twenty-six courses, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 204–06.

remission” (2:6), a year of “Sabbath rest for Israel” (2:8), occurring after the first six years of war between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness in which the re-occupation of Jerusalem and the re-institution of Temple sacrifice is the first military objective.¹⁰²

The distinct nature of the instructions in 1QM 2:1–6 and 4QM^d (4Q494) is highlighted by the employment of specific terminology unique in the war tradition. For example, 1QM 2:1–3 and 4QM^d (4Q494) both utilize the designation “chiefs” with regard to both priestly and lay entities: “chiefs of the priests” (ראשי הכוהנים) and “twelve chiefs” (ראשים שנים עשר) in 2:1, “chiefs of the divisions” (ראשי המשמרות) in 2:2, “chiefs of the Levites” (ראשי הלויים) in 2:2, “chiefs of their divisions” (ראשי המשמרותם) in 2:3–4, and “chiefs of the tribes” (ראשי השבטים) in 2:3.¹⁰³ Moreover, striking is the elevation of lay leadership, “the chiefs of the tribes and the fathers of the congregation” (2:3) to prominent roles in cultic activity. They are instructed “to take up their station continually in the gates of the sanctuary” as well as serve in their divisions (המשמרותם) with their appointed subordinates for festivals, new moons and sabbaths, and “for all the days of the year” (2:4). The instruction that “these shall take their stand at the burnt offering” (2:5) seems to suggest that lay leadership is afforded a specific sacerdotal role potentially assisting at the burnt offering and sacrifices.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² The first six years of war prior to “the year of remission” seem to be hidden from literary view. We are shown how the remaining thirty-three years of forty-year war proceeds, but the first six are not elaborated upon. Davies suggests the possibility that the description containing the first six years has either “been lost or removed.” See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 25.

¹⁰³ The term “chiefs” (ראשי) appears three times in 4QM^d (4Q494) 2, 4, and 6. Due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscript, however, we cannot fully determine the exact designations.

¹⁰⁴ See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 27. Whereas Davies sees “these” as referring to the laity alone, Yadin sees the reference as representing all previously mentioned parties. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 264. Regardless, however, an elevated role for laity is envisaged in 1QM 2:5–6 regarding sacerdotal responsibilities.

Equally intriguing is the description of the priestly garments described in 1QM 7:10–11:¹⁰⁵

⁹When they array the battle lines against the enemy, line against line, they shall march out, from the middle gate towards the space between the lines, seven ¹⁰priests 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, ¹¹both purple and scarlet, with a many-colored design, a skillful work, (wearing) turban head-dress on their heads. (These are) war garments; into the sanctuary they shall not ¹²bring them. (1QM 7:9–12)

The garments worn by the seven priests is based upon a collage of texts from the Hebrew Bible describing the priestly garments (Exod 28:40; 39:27–29; Lev 16:3–4; Ezek 44:17–18).¹⁰⁶ The description is based primarily on Exod 39:27–29 but adds the description “linen” to each article of clothing.¹⁰⁷ Yadin suggested that the emphasis on “byssus,” “white,” and “linen” reflects the Rabbinic and Targumic understanding of the Exodus 39 description as well as suggests that for battle the priests should wear garments distinct yet associated with their priestly cultic functioning.¹⁰⁸ Thus, these “war garments” are not portrayed as different in nature from the priestly garments, only designed for a different use, that of times of war (cf. the “garments of vengeance” in Isa 59:17). Importantly, the prohibition against taking them to the sanctuary, presumably for fear of ritually defiling the sanctuary with corpse-blood impurity,¹⁰⁹ links the description with that in Ezek 44:17–19, where the priests are instructed to take off the priestly garments when going out into the outer courts to the people “so that they may not communicate

¹⁰⁵ See Avi Hurvitz, “The Description of the Clothes of Aaron and his Sons according to the War Scroll (1QM 7:9–10),” in *Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East: Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on His Seventieth Birthday*, eds. Yitzhak Avishur and Joshua Blau (Jerusalem: Rubenstein Publishing House, 1978), 139–44 (Hebrew), 198 (English summary). For a philological discussion of 1QM 7:10–11, see Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 108–09.

¹⁰⁶ On priestly garments in the Hebrew Bible, see, Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service*, 165–74; Carmen Joy Imes, “Between Two Worlds: The Functional and Symbolic Significance of the High Priestly Regalia,” in *Dress and Clothing in the Hebrew Bible: “For All Her Household are Clothed in Crimson,”* ed. Antonios Finitis, LHBOTS 679 (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 29–62.

¹⁰⁷ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 219.

¹⁰⁸ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 219–20; Maimonides, *Yadh Hazaqah*. Hil. Klei Ha-Mikdash 8. See also Rashi on Lev 16:4.

¹⁰⁹ For a discussion on the corpse impurity in the Qumran war tradition, see 7.4.2.

holiness to the people with their vestments” (Ezek 44:19; cf. 42:14). While the priestly garments in 1QM 10–11 are described differently from those described in the priestly tradition, the correspondence between the descriptions, however, suggests the sacral nature of the priesthood as they tactically orchestrate the eschatological struggle with darkness.

3.4.2.2 Liturgical Function of the Priesthood

Whereas the biblical text offers no priestly liturgy in the time of war, one of the central features of the war tradition, particularly in 1QM, is the extensive liturgical material contained within the tradition.¹¹⁰ Prayers and words of encouragement, thanksgiving, and blessing are interspersed throughout all phases of the battle. As would be expected, the priesthood plays a central role in the liturgical settings in the war tradition, with the Chief Priest undertaking a lead role.

Within a pre-battle context there are two liturgical sections in which the priesthood plays an explicit role, one in the liturgy collection in 1QM 10–14 and one in the battle instructions in 1QM 15–19. In 12:20–13:2a, we see the Chief Priest and “his brothers,” that is the priests and the Levites, and all the elders of the army coming before the battle lines.¹¹¹ From their station, they bless the God of Israel and all “his works of truth” on behalf of his people against the Sons of Darkness (13:2–3) and curse Belial and all the spirits of his forces for their “wicked purpose” and “their works of impure uncleanness” (13:4–6). The remainder of column 13 preserves a prayer of thanksgiving for God’s faithfulness to the remnant and preservation of the covenant

¹¹⁰ Daniel Falk has convincingly argued that the common language and formulas found in liturgical prayers and the *War Scroll* suggests a close connection between daily liturgy and the eschatological warfare in the Qumran movement’s ideology. He sees a “living liturgical context” whereby the movement regarded their daily prayers as a participation in the defeat of darkness as they awaited the final victory over the Sons of Darkness. See Daniel K. Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 275–94. See also Matthias Krieg, “Mo’ed Naqam,” 3–30; Robert North, “‘Kittim’ War or ‘Sectaries’ Liturgy?” *Bib* 39 (1958): 84–93; Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 395–475.

¹¹¹ The formula “and his brothers, the priests and the Levites” also occurs in 15:4 and 18:5–6. Cf. 1 Chr 16:39; Ezra 3:2; Neh 3:1.

with terminology reflecting the ideology of the movement (cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 7; 4QM^c [4Q495] 2).

A second pre-battle liturgical scene occurs in 15:4–7a (cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 10 ii 7–14), where the Chief Priest is instructed to take his position alongside other priestly and lay leadership and read aloud the “prayer of the appointed time of battle” after which a lacuna is present ending with the phrase *ספר סרך עתו*. This reference could be to a distinct composition of prayers entitled “the Rule of His Time” or possibly a general description of a composition.¹¹² Some commentators have chosen to read this location as a chronological scheme in the reading of the prayer was performed in accordance to “the rule of that time.”¹¹³ In any event, after reading the prayer the Chief Priest “forms all the battle lines, as is written in the Book of War (*בספר המלה*)” (15:5b–6a). As mentioned previously, this later description is highly suggestive of the Chief Priest possessing a decidedly tactical function. Subsequently, the “priest appointed for the time of vengeance” walks about the battle lines, encouraging them for battle (15:6b–18; 4QM^a [4Q491] 10 ii 13–17). While the setting is reminiscent of Deut 20:2–4, the words of exhortation differ from those and demonstrate the influence of Josh 10:25; Deut 31:2; 2 Chr 32:2; 2 Sam 2:7; and 13:28.¹¹⁴

In what appears to be a mid-battle context, the Chief Priest is described as offering words of blessing and exhortation to the combatants in 1QM 16:13–17:9 (cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 11 ii 11–18). In 16:13–15 the Chief Priest approaches and stands before the battle lines to “strengthen

¹¹² See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 16–17. Yadin leaves the phrase untranslated, thus *Serekh 'Itto*. Christophe Batsch proposed that the contents of the book might be related to divine revelation and God’s will for the eschatological age. See Batsch, “Priests in Warfare,” 174.

¹¹³ Duhaime renders the fragmentary phrase as “the bo]ok (?) of the rule of that time.” See Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:129.

¹¹⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of War*, 332.

their hearts... and their hands for battle” (16:14).¹¹⁵ While the words of the Chief Priest begin with a reminder of the mysteries of God before the column breaks off (16:15–16), the remainder of the exhortation is preserved through 17:9. The text of the exhortation resumes in column 17 with a historical recounting of the judgment of Nadab and Abihu (17:2–3), followed by an exhortation to take courage and to not fear as the divinely appointed time for the destruction of the enemy had come (17:4–9). A parallel reading of this tradition is contained in 4QM^a (4Q491) 11 ii 11–18, which begins with the same opening (ll. 11–13) yet preserves a fragmentary text substantially shorter and different from that contained in 1QM.¹¹⁶ The exhortation in 4QM^a (4Q491) ends with the proclamation of God’s kingship and salvation and peace upon the people in the appointed times (ll. 17–18).

Columns 18 and 19 incorporate two post-battle liturgical sections.¹¹⁷ The first is a prayer found in 18:6b–19:8, which is presumably given between the sixth and decisive seventh lot, a portion of which is preserved in 1QM 12:7–16 albeit with minor variants.¹¹⁸ After the assembling of the troops “to completely destroy (להחרימם)” the forces of the Kittim (18:3–5a) and as the sun begins to set, the Chief Priest, as well as the rest of the priestly and lay leadership, stand to bless the God of Israel for his wondrous deeds and his faithfulness in keeping the covenant (18:6b–12) as well as inviting God to triumph over the enemy (18:6b–19:5a; cf. 12:7–13a). The prayer concludes with a “hymn of Jerusalem,” in which Zion and the daughters of

¹¹⁵ In contrasting this location with the earlier strengthening done by the “priest appointed for the time of vengeance” (15:6b–7a), Yadin suggests that the change of procedure here to the Chief Priest delivering the words of encouragement was due to special circumstances “which required the full moral authority of the chief priest, as well as the contents of the speech, designed to explain the defeat.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 220.

¹¹⁶ See Baillet, DJD 7:30–35, esp. 34.

¹¹⁷ There is some question as to the relationship between columns 18 and 19, as the latter was not connected to the rest of the scroll when 1QM was discovered. Here I follow Davies, Yadin, and others in placing column 19 at the end of column 18. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 81–83; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 12–13.

¹¹⁸ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 222.

God's people are called on to rejoice in the victory (19:5b–8; cf. 12:13b–16).¹¹⁹ As we will more fully examine in Chapter 6, the prayer here shows a remarkable connection with the Joshua conquest narratives, especially the defeat of the Amorites in Josh 10:12–14 and the execution of the five kings in Josh 10:16–27. Noteworthy is a parallel reading in 4QM^b (4Q492) 1 1–13 preserving several variant readings of the end of the priestly prayer in 1QM 19:1–8 (ll. 8b–13) and the post-destruction narrative of 1QM 19:9–14 (ll. 8b–13).¹²⁰ Significantly, Baillet proposed that in at least three instances—lines 1, 2, and 7—that 4QM^b (4Q492) reflects a shorter text than that of 1QM.¹²¹ Given the contemporaneous dating of both 1QM and 4QM^b (4Q492) to the latter half of the first century BCE, coupled with Baillet's suggestion that both manuscripts could be the product of the same scribe, the slight variant readings and shorter text suggest a certain degree of textual fluidity within the contemporaneous transmission of the war tradition.¹²²

The final reference to priestly prayer occurs the morning after the battle (1QM 19:13; 4QM^b [4Q492] 1 12–13). The men of battle reconvene on the battlefield where the slain of the enemy lie fallen. While standing before the slain of the Kittim, the Chief Priest and the priestly and lay leadership offer praise to the God of Israel, “the Most High” (4QM^b [4Q492] 1 13). Unfortunately, the words of this blessing are lost in both 1QM 19 and 4QM^b (4Q492) but based upon the several extant words at the top of column 20, the blessing might have continued.

¹¹⁹ Yadin suggested that the petition is for the extension of daylight so that the enemy might be annihilated as the pursuit of the seventh lot had begun at dusk. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 222–23; André Dupont-Sommer, “Règlement de la Guerre,” 27. Davies argues that the petition is for God himself to destroy the enemy. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 82.

¹²⁰ See Baillet, DJD 7:45–49.

¹²¹ Baillet, DJD 7:47–49; Eshel and Eshel, “Recensions of the War Scroll,” 352–56. Eshel and Eshel concluded that the readings in 1QM 19:1–8 and 4QM^b (4Q492) represent a closer recension than that preserved in 1QM 12.

¹²² Baillet, DJD 7:45. For a detailed comparison of 1QM 12; 19; and 4Q492, see Vanonen, *War Traditions*, 126–45.

3.4.2.3 Tactical Function of the Priesthood

The war tradition contains a third functional context for the priesthood, namely that of “sacerdotal combatants” tactically orchestrating the eschatological conflict.¹²³ This is an unprecedented role in Second Temple Jewish literature.¹²⁴ We have already explored several locations where the priesthood plays a preparatory function strengthening the hearts and hands for battle. Here, we will focus specifically on the *tactical* aspects of the priesthood’s functioning in 1QM, or *the specific maneuvering of the position and engagement of the army in mid-battle contexts*.

Across all manuscripts, the war tradition contains instructions for conducting the eschatological battle in 1QM 7:9–9:9; 16:3–18:5; 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 11–20; 11 ii; 13; 18; 4QM^c (4Q493). In all these texts, the priesthood is instructed on how to orchestrate the military positioning and engagement maneuvers of the battle lines through a series of trumpet blasts. Listed below is an outline of the most extensive preservation of battle instructions, those contained in 1QM 7:9–9:9 and 16:3–18:5.

Table 3.3 – Priestly Battle Instruction in 1QM 7:9–9:9 and 16:3–18:5

1QM 7:9–9:9	1QM 16:3–18:5
<p>Priests blow the two trumpets of assembly (7:15).</p> <p>Priests blow trumpets to direct the hurlers until they have completed hurling seven times (8:1).</p> <p>Priests blow the trumpet of return, signaling the hurlers to return to the battle formation (8:2).</p>	<p>Priests blow the trumpets of remembrance to open the gates or war and send out the infantry to the battle line. (16:3–4).</p> <p>Priests blow a signal for the formation and for the columns to deploy (16:4–5).</p>

¹²³ See Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 109.

¹²⁴ I have argued elsewhere that the militaristic functions of the priesthood in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple literature are strictly found within pre- and post-battle contexts, never in a tactical context. Michael DeVries, “The Priesthood in Times of War: Sacerdotal and Militaristic Functions” (paper presented at the Western Jewish Studies Association 2017 Annual Conference, Claremont, CA, 26 March 2017).

<p>Priests blow the trumpets of assembly (8:3).</p> <p>Priests blow a “level note,” signals for the order of battle (8:5).</p> <p>Priests blow a second signal, “a low legato note,” signals for advance (8:7).</p> <p>Priests blow “a sharp staccato note” on the six trumpets of the slain to direct the battle (8:8–9).</p> <p>Levites and all the people with rams’ horns (שופרות) blow “a great battle alarm” to melt the heart of the enemy. Darts fly out to bring down the slain (8:9).</p> <p>While rams’ horns (שופרות) cease, priests blow “a sharp staccato note” to direct the signals of the battle until they have hurled into the battle line seven times. (8:12).</p> <p>Priests blow “a low note, level and legato” on the trumpets of withdrawal (8:13).</p> <p>When the first division throws, the priests and the Levites and all the people with rams’ horns blow “a great alarm” to direct battle until they have hurled seven times (8:15).</p> <p>After the seven times of hurling, the priests blow the trumpets of withdrawal (8:16).</p> <p>While the Levites and all the people cease blowing, the priests continue blowing the trumpets of the slain to direct the fighting until the enemy are defeated and turn in retreat (9:1).</p> <p>Priests blow the alarm to direct the battle (9:2).</p> <p>Priests blow the trumpets of assembly for the infantry to go out and destroy the enemy—a total annihilation (9:3).</p> <p>Priests blow the trumpets of pursuit for the infantry to divide themselves for a pursuit of the annihilation (בלה) of the enemy (9:6).</p> <p>After the annihilation (החרם), the priests continue to blow from afar. Prohibition for priests to not</p>	<p>Priests blow a second signal, “signs for confrontation” (16:5–6).</p> <p>Six priests blow “a sharp staccato note” on the trumpets of the slain to direct the fighting (16:7).</p> <p>The Levites and all the people with rams' horns blow “a battle signal, a loud noise.” The infantry will bring down the slain (16:7–8).</p> <p>While the Levites and all the people cease blowing, priests continue blowing the trumpets of the slain and the battle shall prevail against the Kittim (16:9).</p> <p>Priests blow the trumpets of assembly so that another line may go forth. (16:12).</p> <p>Priests blow the trumpets of withdrawal (16:13)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Exhortation of the Chief Priest (16:13–7:9)</i></p> <p>Priests blow trumpets as a signal to form the divisions of the battle lines (17:10).</p> <p>Priests blow another signal, “signs for confrontation” (17:11)</p> <p>Priests blow the trumpets of the slain and the Levites and all the people with rams’ horns (שופרות) sound “a signal for battle.” The infantry attacks the army of the Kittim (17:12–13).</p> <p>While the Levites and all the people continue the sound of the signal, priests continuously blowing the trumpets of the slain and the battle shall prevail against the Kittim and the troops of Belial are defeated (17:14–15).</p> <p>Priests sound a signal on six trumpets of remembrance, all the battle formations gather to them and divide against the camps of the Kittim to annihilate them (להחרים) (18:3–5).</p>
--	---

enter the midst of the slain and be defiled by unclean blood (9:7).	
---	--

The battle sequence contained in 1QM 7:9–9:9 is the longest preserved battle in the war tradition. The instructions generally follow the terminology and order of the trumpets preserved in 2:16–3:12, as well as the battle formations contained in 5:16–6:18. There are two deviations, however. First is the exclusion of the “trumpets of ambush” mentioned in 3:1–2 from the list of trumpets in 7:12–13; and second, the lack of utilization of the “trumpets of memorial” in the battle, even though they are listed in 7:12–13 as being present in the hands of the priests.¹²⁵

The battle plan presented in 7:9–9:9 is straight forward: there are three waves of “skirmishers” (אנשי הבינים) who attack one after the other in succession to force the enemy into retreat, whereupon the whole army will pursue them “until the annihilation” (עד החרם) (9:6)—all under the tactical orchestration of the priesthood.¹²⁶ This orchestration is accomplished through a series of blasts on varying trumpets—specifically, the “trumpets of assembly” (7:15; 8:3; 9:3), “trumpets of the slain” (9:1–2), “trumpets of pursuit” (9:6), and “trumpets of return or withdrawal” (8:2, 13, 16).¹²⁷ There are several instances of the priests sounding various directional signals in 8:5, 7, 12; and 9:2. While not explicitly identified in the text, these signals are presumably sounded on the “trumpets of alarm” mentioned in 7:13. The text describes several of these blasts with varying descriptions: “a low and legato sound” (8:7), “a shrill staccato sound” (8:9, 12), and “a low, level, legato sound” (8:14).¹²⁸ A differentiation should be

¹²⁵ This led Davies to suggest that 7:12–13b represents an independent source incorporated into the present battle sequence. See Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 43.

¹²⁶ For a detailed discussion on the tactics and organization employed in the 1QM, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 141–97; Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 48–56.

¹²⁷ On the use of trumpets in warfare and the use specifically in the Qumran war tradition, see 5.4.

¹²⁸ On the terminology used for sounds and its meaning, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 101–4.

made here between the trumpets (חצוצרות) and the rams' horns (השופרות) used in the battle sequence.¹²⁹ The former being used exclusively by “the priests,” while the latter are employed by “the Levites and all the people” in blowing “a great battle alarm” (תרועת מלחמה גדולה) to melt the heart of the enemy (8:9–10; cf. 16:8).¹³⁰

The second battle narrative, contained in 16:3–18:5, mirrors that found in 7:9–9:9, with several notable deviations. First, whereas 7:9–9:9 indicates the utilization of varying sounds on the trumpets, in 16:3–18:5 we find only one such case, “a shrill staccato sound” in 16:7. Second, the sequence in 16:3–18:5 differs in the naming of the trumpets seen in 7:9–9:9. Noteworthy is the use of “trumpet of memorial” in 16:3–4 as opposed to the “trumpet of assembly” in 8:3 and in 17:4 as opposed to the “trumpet of pursuit” in 9:6.¹³¹ Third, whenever the word “enemy” is used in 7:9–9:9, the term is replaced in 16:3–18:5 with the term “Kittim.” Finally, whereas 7:9–9:9 presents one sustained encounter with the enemy, 16:3–18:5 includes the interpolation of the Chief Priest’s exhortation to the battle lines (16:13–17:9).

The battle instructions preserved in the Cave 4 fragments show varying degrees of correspondence to the battle instructions contained in 1QM. The instructions in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 11–20, although fragmentary, incorporates similar terminology and tactics as presented in 1QM 7:9–9:9, however, appears to present a slightly different, shortened tradition, describing the priestly war garments during a battle sequence (l. 18) rather than prior to the first engagement with the enemy, as seen in 7:10–11. Instructions preserved in 4QM^a (4Q491) 11 ii and 13, likewise fragmentary, parallel those contained in 16:3–17:14.¹³² Of note is 4QM^a (4Q491) 13,

¹²⁹ For a discussion on the use of the term שופרות and its connection with the Joshua conquest tradition, see 6.3.1.

¹³⁰ Of note should be the reference in 8:15 where it seems that the Levites’ blowing of the rams’ horn could be read as helping direct the battle itself. This would be based upon the reconstruction offered by Yadin and Abegg. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 296–97.

¹³¹ For a detailed discussion of the trumpets of memorial, see 5.4.3.

¹³² The preserved text in 4QM^a (4Q491) 18 is too fragmentary to make any conclusive determination as to context.

where the instructions, while similar to portions of 16:3–7 and 17:10–13 (cf. ll. 3b–6), are placed between words of exhortation in lines 1–3a and a general exclamation by all the people in lines 8–9, both of which do not appear in any form within the Qumran war tradition.¹³³ Finally, the priestly prohibition against corpse defilement preserved in 4QM^c (4Q493) 4–6 parallel those in 1QM 9:7–9. Outside of this correspondence, the priestly battle instructions preserved in 4QM^c reflect an earlier stratum of war tradition, the first half of the first century BCE, and unlike that preserved in 1QM or 4QM^a (4Q491).¹³⁴

In sum, what is remarkable about the priestly battle instructions is the utilization of trumpets and horns tactically by the priesthood. Whereas both trumpets and horns are used in the Hebrew Bible to sound the alarm for the initiation of war (cf. Num 10:9; 31:6; Josh 6; Judg 7:16–22; 2 Chr 13:12–14), in the war tradition we see trumpets being sounded specifically to orchestrate tactical maneuvers. This again is unprecedented within Second Temple Jewish literature.

3.5 Conclusion

The role and function of the priesthood in the Qumran war tradition is extensive and pervasive, spanning cultic, liturgical, and tactical contexts. The examination of the function of the priesthood emphasizes several conclusions. While clearly demonstrating a reliance on varying locations in the Hebrew Bible for the militaristic role of the priesthood, the war tradition represents a growth in ideological vision through several priestly innovations, including the elevation of the Levites, the liturgical and tactical roles afforded to the Chief Priest, and

¹³³ See Baillet, DJD 7:35–37. Baillet tentatively suggested that the exhortation in lines 1–3a could be those of the chief priest in 11 i 12–18, thus potentially placing the fragment at the top of the next column and furthermore could correspond to the lost text at the bottom of 1QM 16.

¹³⁴ See Baillet, DJD 7:49–53.

particularly the tactical function of the priesthood as sacerdotal combatants. That said, there are several additional implications that require highlighting.

The lack of reference to the “sons of Zadok” across the entirety of the war tradition is striking. Moreover, given that Hempel has demonstrated that the phrase “sons of Zadok” belongs to the later stratum of the *Community Rules* traditions, this complete absence, even in the later stratum of the war tradition, is remarkable.¹³⁵ While there is at least some interest in the genealogical background of the priesthood in the war tradition, as noted by references to both the sons of Aaron and the Levites, this seems to suggest that Zadokite tradition had little, if any, influence on the war tradition. Furthermore, this adds evidence that the notion of the Zadokites as founding members of the Qumran movement should rightly be questioned.¹³⁶ If the Zadokites were influential founders and members of the Qumran movement, it is difficult to account for their absence in the war tradition given its eschatological importance to the movement. Perhaps, as Philip Davies astutely concluded, we should indeed “forget the ‘Zadokite’ label until we can find evidence at Qumran which tells a different story.”¹³⁷

Finally, while it is undeniable that the Qumran war tradition is priestly oriented and indebted to priestly traditions, this does not necessitate an identification of the Qumran movement as “priestly” in origins and even communal make-up. It does evidence, however, that the movement was drawn to priestly traditions, especially those regarding wilderness warfare and constructs of cult and ritual purity, as well as holiness traditions regarding impurity and

¹³⁵ See Hempel, “The Literary Development of the S Tradition – A New Paradigm,” *RevQ* 22 (2006): 389–401; Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 212–14, 223–24; See also Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, STDJ 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Metso, “The Redaction of the Community Rule,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 377–84.

¹³⁶ Hempel concludes that it is the sons of Aaron who are present in the earliest community-focused traditions. See Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron,” 223–24. Also, Fabry, “Priests at Qumran,” 256–58.

¹³⁷ Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 72.

defilement, as we will demonstrate in future chapters. The interest in these traditions, we will argue, imagined the future eschatological war as a ritualized war, characterized by a strong concern for purity and defilement, which focused on the purification of the land from pollution. This eschatological conflict with the forces of Belial was not merely an earthly campaign, but a cosmic one. This cosmological focus is clearly seen in the objective of the first campaign in 1QM 1–2, namely, the re-occupation of Jerusalem and the re-institution of a properly functioning Temple cult.

CHAPTER 4 – THE TEXTUALIZATION OF RITUAL AND COSMOLOGICAL ORDERING

4.1 Introduction

As early as 1955, the term “ritual” has been employed to describe various features and elements contained in the *War Scroll*. That year, Yigael Yadin, in his commentary on the *War Scroll*, designated columns 9:17–14:15 as the “Ritual Serekh Series” describing this section as consisting of “forms of prayers for the various phases of the war.”¹ Moreover, Yadin committed an entire chapter to what he considers to be the rites of the congregation in which he explores the organization of the Temple service preserved in column 2, as well as the various prayers, thanksgivings, and exhortations offered before, during, and after the war.² Of greatest interest for Yadin was not only the content of the content of the rites, which he deemed as offering the strongest connection between the War Scroll and other sectarian writings, but also the description of the division of tasks of the priesthood and the precise times of the prayers within the schema of the war.³ Subsequent to the work of Yadin, early commentators continued to take particular note of ritual elements within 1QM. Jean Carmignac, in his 1958 commentary, suggested the post-battle cleaning of garments and bathing by the returned combatants in 1QM 14:2–3 was reflective of the post-battle ritual purification of the combatants as instructed by

¹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 10. For Yadin, this section relied on two sources: first, the book of Deuteronomy with insertions from Numbers, Samuel, and Isaiah; and second, what Yadin deemed a “sectarian source” which he corresponds to “The Book of *Serekh 'Itto*” (15:5), a “kind of prayer book for the various festivals and occasions which the sect observed.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 17.

² See Chapter 8 of Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 198–228. Here, I am assuming a conceptual relationship between the use of the term “rites” and “ritual” in Yadin’s understanding. This assumption is based upon the inclusion of the organization of the Temple service in column 2.

³ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 208.

Eleazar the priest in Num 31:19–24.⁴ In the same year, Millar Burrows proposed that the presence of instructions for priestly “rites” in 1QM 2:1–6 suggested that the Qumran movement was not opposed to the Temple and its associative activity in principle but rather expected “the full exercise of the priestly office” to be reinstated sometime in the future.⁵ What caught the attention of Yadin and early commentators was the central role of the priesthood in the eschatological war and the presence of various features associated with the cultic realm and temple operations. It was these features, therefore, which led early scholars to utilize terminology such as “rituals” and “rites” in connection with the *War Scroll*.

Since then, scholars have continued to acknowledge the “ritualistic” character of the *War Scroll*. John Collins described the regulations in columns 2–9 as having “a strongly ritualistic character,” specifically highlighting “the ritualistic character” of the regulations regarding the purity of the camp in 7:3–7.⁶ Noting the central role of the priesthood in leading the eschatological war, Lester Grabbe described the battle as being “ritualized.”⁷ More recently, Daniel Falk, in his analysis of liturgical performance in 1QM, referred to the blessings and curses found in column 13 as “blessing and cursing rituals.”⁸ Finally, Alex Jassen has proposed that the recitation of prayers as well as the inscription of violent language on the trumpets and banners, demonstrate a ritualistic use of words akin to ancient omens, curses, and spells, and function as a “violent imaginary” for the Qumran movement.⁹

⁴ Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 201. See also Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth I*, 24 and 26; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 226.

⁵ Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 363.

⁶ John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 96–97.

⁷ Lester L. Grabbe, “Warfare: Eschatological Warfare,” *EDSS* 2:965. Similarly, Emma Wasserman has described the “idiosyncratic battle plan” of the War Scroll as “one that involves a very precise, ritualized sequence and that has priests serving as military leaders.” See Wasserman, *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul*, AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 101.

⁸ Daniel Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 284.

⁹ Jassen, “Violent Imaginaries,” 202.

What these representative examples highlight is the notable latitude with which terms such as “ritual,” “ritualistic,” and “ritualized” have been applied to the *War Scroll*. While it is undeniable that the *War Scroll* contains a number of literary phenomena which lend themselves to being described within the realm of ritual, the question remains as to what the employment of these terms are meant to describe as well as what their presence is meant to convey to the reader or audience. Does their presence, as often implied, merely signify the priestly character and outlook of the Qumran movement generally or the war tradition in specific, or do they reflect particular concerns within the imagined eschatological war? While there is little doubt concerning the priestly character of the war tradition, I would suggest that the presence of “ritualistic” features in the *War Scroll* are equally reflective of a particular rhetorical strategy, one meant to convey specific ideological beliefs concerning the cosmos and the nature of the eschaton as the authors looked toward an imagined eschatological future.

Since the first observations on the ritualistic nature of the *War Scroll* there has been a significant amount of scholarly engagement on the nature and function of ritual that has richly informed our understanding of ritual and priestly concerns in the Hebrew Bible. The aim of this chapter is not to offer a thorough exploration of ritual theory and its application to the Qumran war tradition but is more singular: to explore one such example—the cultic service regulations preserved mainly in 1QM 2:1–6, but also in 4QM^d (4Q494) and potentially 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471) 1. Such an analysis will illuminate the potential rhetorical and performative function of this and other “ritualistic” elements in the war tradition and their place within the larger eschatological imagination of the Qumran movement.

4.2 Ritual and the Shaping of Reality

As modern scholarship on ritual theory has amply demonstrated, the concept of ritual is multivalent and defies reduction to a single theory. While various contributors to ritual studies have emphasized the structural, phenomenological, cognitive, performative, functional, and cultural facets of ritual, any singular definition of ritual remains elusive.¹⁰ That said, rituals are often distinguished from quotidian activities by their formality, repetition, frequency, and strategic nature.¹¹ Whereas an examination of the overall meaning of “ritual” and the breadth of ritual studies is beyond the scope of this chapter, our concern here is to examine the nature of the textualization of ritual as a communicative and performative medium.¹²

At their core, rituals, and ritual texts as we will see, serve a distinct function; they seek to achieve a desired goal or bring about a desired status. Rituals present a particular understanding of the world and seek to have participants join themselves to this understanding as the ritual is enacted. In this manner, rituals are communicative and performative as well as maintaining and legitimizing a particular understanding of the world. Moreover, rituals can also create reality, bringing about realized understandings of the world. In this regard, rituals do not merely reflect

¹⁰ For overviews on theories and approaches, see Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 13–54; Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 1–60; Bell, “Ritual” in *The Blackwell Companion to the Study of Religion*, ed. Robert A. Segal (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 397–411; Gerald A. Klingbeil, *Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible*, BBRSup 1 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 1–69; Barry Stephenson, *Ritual: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

¹¹ Ritual theorists from a cognitive approach also speak of “goal-demotion” and “opacity” as general features of ritualized behaviors. See Barry Stephenson, “Ritualization and Ritual Invention,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Ritual*, ed. Risto Uro, et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 18–37, esp. 21–23. Other theorists have spoken of rituals as “meaningless.” See Frits Staal, *Rules Without Meaning: Ritual Mantras and the Human Sciences* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989) and Pascal Boyer and Pierre Liénard, “Whence Collective Rituals? A Cultural Selection Model of Ritualized Behavior,” *American Anthropologist* 108 (2006): 814–27. Roy Rappaport defined ritual as “the performance of more or less invariant sequences of formal acts and utterances not entirely encoded by the performers.” See Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 24.

¹² For an overview of the communicative function of rituals, see Günter Thomas, “Communication,” in *Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts*, eds. Jens Kreinath, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg, SHR 114–1 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 321–43.

received social arrangements, but also have the power to shape and bring about a realized social reality, as Saul Olyan has aptly argued.¹³ More than simply being reflective of a particular worldview, rituals can also be argued as having an active role in the creation and inculcation of the worldview itself. Thus, rituals can be said to have persuasive force or the ability to exert influence, a reality that David Janzen described as “a kind of social rhetoric” meant to persuade participants to give their fidelity to the social group.¹⁴ Along similar lines, Gerald Klingbeil has argued that ritual action has a “strategic dimension,” one which seeks to convince and persuade participants that the ritual world is a true reflection of the real world.¹⁵

4.3 Ritual and Ideology

Regarding the meaning of any specific ritual, the work of Frank Gorman on the ideology of priestly rituals in the Hebrew Bible is instructive. Following Roy Rappaport, Gorman argued that the beginning point for the study of ritual lies within the recognition that a ritual act at its core is a social act embedded within a specific socio-cultural context and must therefore be interpreted within the social and cultural contexts within which they occur.¹⁶ Admitting the inherent difficulties of retrieving the precise historical and social context of priestly rituals, Gorman suggested a fruitful way forward was to examine the wider worldview that gave rise to the rituals

¹³ Saul M. Olyan, *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of Cult* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 4.

¹⁴ David Janzen, *The Social Meanings of Sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible: A Study of Four Writings*, BZAW 344 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004), 10.

¹⁵ Klingbeil, *Bridging the Gap*, 225.

¹⁶ Frank H. Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology*, JSOTSup 91 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 14. See Roy Rappaport, *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion* (Richmond, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1979), 174. Gorman defines socio-cultural context as “the context of meaning which gives rise to and is embedded in the rituals. It is the world of meaning that gives shape to and is shaped by the rituals.” *Ideology of Ritual*, 15. On the importance of context for understanding ritual, see also Janzen, *Social Meanings of Sacrifice*, 12–19 and Cat Quine, *Casting Down the Hosts of Heaven: The Rhetoric of Ritual Failure in the Polemic Against the Host of Heaven*, *OtSt* 78 (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 40–43.

themselves and within which they were conceptualized and enacted.¹⁷ For Gorman, worldview is “one means by which a society attempts to structure the world and human existence within the world... to bring order into existence.”¹⁸ Gorman envisaged worldview as consisting of three elements: first, a body of knowledge which serves to identify and categorize the cosmos; second, a set of meanings related to the structure which serve to locate human existence within the cosmos and give it meaning; and third, a system of conduct or praxis which guides proper conduct within a particular world of meaning.¹⁹ It is important to note that worldview is not a static phenomenon, but a dynamic one as it is itself shaped by experience as well as internal and external factors.²⁰ Ritual practice, therefore, can be seen as an element within the system of praxis by which the individual locates themselves within the cosmos and through participation realizes and enacts a sense of cosmological order.²¹

The priestly worldview articulated in the Hebrew Bible within which rituals are conceptualized and enacted is one in which order is central. Beginning with the creation narrative in Gen 1:1–2:4a that highlights the creation of order out of chaos, priestly ideology demonstrates a central focus on the establishment and maintenance of cosmological order. This cosmological order is realized and sustained through the enacting of cultic ritual practice as well as the maintenance of societal order of which boundary demarcation and maintenance with regards to purity and defilement are but one example. As we will see, this concern for cosmological order will also be of central concern within the Qumran war tradition.

¹⁷ Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 15–18.

¹⁸ Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 16. Here, Gorman follows Victor Turner. See Turner, “The Anthropology of Performance,” in *Process, Performance, and Pilgrimage: A Study in Comparative Symbolology*, RAS 1 (New Delhi: Concept, 1979), 76–85.

¹⁹ Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 16–17.

²⁰ Klingbeil, *Bridging the Gap*, 12.

²¹ Gorman, *Ideology of Ritual*, 17. See also Rappaport, *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion*, 93–97; Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion*, 381–82.

4.4 The Textualization of Ritual

As has been long noted, there is a distinction to be drawn between a ritual act and a “textualization” of a ritual, a distinction made clear by James Watts when he pointed out that “texts are not rituals and rituals are not texts.”²² In other words, there is a phenomenological distinction between a ritual practice as an embodied act in a realized world and a literary representation of ritual act, a text containing a description or prescription of a ritual act.²³ When we speak of a textualization of ritual or a “ritual text,” therefore, we are referring to a text which engages in the description of or prescription for the performance of certain ritual acts.²⁴ A ritual text as written artefact is not completely divorced from practice as it may represent a form of ritual praxis, but it is important to note that a textual representation does not always equate to a particular ritual praxis. In other words, what we encounter in a textualized ritual may not be a full representation of an embodied ritual in the realized world. The relationship between a textualization and a ritual act in the real world is not a one-for-one relationship but could contain varying degrees of coherence. Understanding the interrelationship between a particular ritual act and the textualization of a ritual requires a sensitivity to the socio-cultural context of a ritual as well as the literary world created by the textualization and its influence upon the social reality of the readers and audience.

²² James W. Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus: From Sacrifice to Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 29. Also, James W. Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 63. On the matter of textualization of rituals, see also Quine, *Casting Down the Hosts of Heaven*, 48–55.

²³ For a broader discussion, see David P. Wright, “Ritual Theory, Ritual Texts, and the Priestly-Holiness Writings of the Pentateuch,” in *Social Theory and the Study of Israelite Religion: Essays in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. Saul M. Olyan, RBS 71 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 195–216, esp. 195–99; Frank H. Gorman, “Ritual Studies and Biblical Studies: Assessment of the Past; Prospects for the Future,” *Semeia* 67 (1994): 13–36.

²⁴ Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric*, 2–3.

Catherine Bell has defined textualization as “the generation of textual objects that structure the social interaction around their use and transmission.”²⁵ Ritual texts, therefore, not only represent varying aspects of ritual practice; they can also exert influence on social interactions as they have their own particular context, intention, and purpose apart from the codification of ritual instruction. Textualization can serve to authorize or control a specific tradition through systematizing and homogenizing various aspects of ritual practice, ensuring their transmission.²⁶ On a functional level, textualization can serve to evoke emotion within the reader or audience, activate memory, signal particular values and beliefs, or function as a medium for the mediation of knowledge.²⁷ Textualization of ritual, therefore, can be more than mere codification of ritual instruction; the text itself becomes an actor, an agent of change with transformative power in the realized world.²⁸ It therefore follows that encountering such a textualization as hearer or reader can be as effective in bringing about influence as the performing of the ritual itself.

Several considerations are worth mentioning here. First, it is important to maintain a distinction between a textualization of a ritual and the ritual practice itself as the purpose of a textualization may not necessarily be the preservation and transmission of the ritual practice.²⁹ Textualized rituals can have a function beyond that of mere ritual instruction, whether rhetorical or performative. As Watts has argued, “Written texts usually encode rhetorical purposes different

²⁵ Catherine Bell, “The Ritualization of Texts and the Textualization of Ritual in the Codification of Taoist Literature,” *HR* 27 (1988): 390.

²⁶ Christian Frevel, “Practicing Rituals in a Textual World: Ritual and Innovation in the Book of Numbers,” in *Ritual Innovation and the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism*, ed. Nathan MacDonald, BZAW 468 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), 136.

²⁷ On the function of mediating knowledge, see Jutta Jokiranta, “Rituals as Media: Shared, Embodied, and Extended Knowledge Mediation in Rituals” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Ancient Media Culture*, eds. Travis B. Williams, Chris Keith, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *STDJ* 144 (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 385–414. I would like to thank Professor Jokiranta for sharing a pre-publication version of the chapter.

²⁸ See Bell, “The Ritualization of Texts,” 367–69.

²⁹ Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric*, 27–29.

from the goals that motivate ritual performances.”³⁰ Ritual texts should, therefore, be approached as literature with special attention given to their rhetorical strategy and function.³¹ Second, as I have argued elsewhere, it is equally important to acknowledge that the relationship between social reality and its depiction in the Scrolls is complex.³² We must recognize what Charlotte Hempel has referred to as the possibility of texts being “curated” by the Qumran movement, whereby texts are intentionally shaped to present an idealized community.³³ This kind of curative quality is arguably on display within the imagined eschatological future of the *War Scroll*.

I would like to suggest that the inclusion of textualized rituals and ritual elements within the *War Scroll* and the larger tradition function to intentionally shape and transmit a particular eschatological worldview.³⁴ Specifically, I will argue that the inclusion of the cultic service regulations in 1QM 2:1–6 (cf. 4QM^d [4Q494]) serve to imbue the eschatological war with cosmological significance. The war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, more than the mere eradication of evil, is envisaged as a constitutive element for the re-establishment of order over chaos within the unfolding cosmic drama. First, we will examine 1QM 2:1–6 giving considering to various cosmological concerns within the text, specifically the importance of hierarchical stratification, the cosmological significance of the re-institution of cultic service in the Temple, and the specific use of the terms מעמד and משמרות in 2:1–6. Second, we will

³⁰ Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, 63.

³¹ See Bryan D. Bibb, *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus*, LHBOTS 480 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009).

³² Michael DeVries and Jutta Jokiranta, “Ritual Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Review,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Ancient Media Culture*, eds. Travis B. Williams, Chris Keith, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, STDJ 144 (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 156–96.

³³ Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 9–10 where Hempel suggests the possibility of reading the Community Rule as a “curated” text. See also Hempel, “Curated Communities: Refracted Realities at Qumran and on Social Media,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Ancient Media Culture*, eds. Travis B. Williams, Chris Keith, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, STDJ 144 (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 335–57.

³⁴ As Jutta Jokiranta has noted, “The medium, whether the ritual practice as practice (including engagement with texts or not) or the text itself, in any case, are not reflecting the “real” world so much as it *is* the real world where information about social relations, the cosmos, and God are established and transmitted.” See Jokiranta, “Rituals as Media,” 387.

explore the connection between cosmic order and eschatological judgment present in other writings within the Qumran corpus, specifically 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1. Finally, we will briefly address the potential performative role these ritual textualizations within the community, which offered readers and hearers not only a way of anticipating the coming re-creation, but also a means of joining themselves in active participation in bringing about the re-created eschatological cosmic order.

4.5 Cultic Service in the War Tradition

Regulations regarding cultic service are preserved in three textual witnesses: 1QM 2:1–6, 4QM^d (4Q494), 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471) 1, and potentially in a fourth, 4QM^f (4Q496) 7.³⁵

The presence of these regulations is striking for two reasons: first, the introduction of a highly formalized description of cultic activity within a manuscript that is markedly militaristic is highly unusual, and second, the prevalence of these regulations within the wider war tradition suggests their importance within the larger tradition. Commonly accepted as beginning the organizational and tactical instructions for war in columns 2–9, column 2 begins with instructions for the organization of the priestly and lay leadership for cultic service during “the year of remission” (2:1–6a). This year of remission is considered “a sabbath of rest for Israel” (2:8) and occurs after an initial six years of fighting, a description of which has been proposed as occurring within the non-preserved end of column 1. Column 2 concludes with instructions on the mobilization of the troops for the remaining thirty-three years of the war (2:6b–14) including a description of the “war of divisions” (2:10–14), a twenty-nine-year campaign in which Israel

³⁵ Baillet suggested 4Q496 7 as a parallel reading of 1QM 2:5–6 stating, “La surface est très abîmée, et il ne reste que quelques bribes d’écriture. L’identification semble pourtant sûre.” Duhaime follows Baillet’s suggestion. See Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:180. While possible, given the damaged state of the ink any determination remains speculative, thus it has not been included here for discussion. See Baillet, DJD 7:59.

will engage a collection of specified nations, all of which are ordered chronologically from the first year of the campaign to the twenty-ninth.³⁶

From a material perspective, line 14 ends with a *vacat* extending from the last word in the line to the end of the line, a frequently occurring phenomena in 1QM indicating a section division (cf. 1:7, 15; 4:5, 14; 5:2; 9:9, 16; 11:12; 13:3, 6; 14:1, 15; 15:3; 16:14; 17:3, 9; 18:8; 19:8).³⁷ Here in column 2, line 14 is followed by a full empty line marking what Emanuel Tov referred to as the strongest section division between the preceding material and what follows.³⁸ Subsequently, the fragmentary material in lines 16 and 17 and continuing to the bottom of the column represents a different section of the text consisting of the beginning of the listing of the trumpets and their inscriptions which continues in 3:1–11. If this is correct, given a column length of approximately 20 lines or more, approximately one third of the subsequent rule of the trumpets is no longer preserved within the *War Scroll*.³⁹

Important for our study is the discussion surrounding the relationship of column 2 with its surrounding material. Columns 2–9 are commonly accepted as comprising a distinct literary unit containing organizational and tactical instructions for the war, thus leading to the description of these columns as constituting a military manual or “tactical treatise,” that is a collection of instructions concerning the organization, equipment, movement, and tactics of the army as well

³⁶ It is generally accepted by commentators that the war against the various nations was envisaged as lasting forty years. The first seven years consisting of an assumed description of the first six years in the non-preserved end of column 1 and the seventh year, the year of remission, described in 2:1–6. These seven years are added to the remaining thirty-three years described in 2:6 for a total of forty years. For a more expansive discussion on the reckoning of years, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 20–21 and Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 171–83.

³⁷ Section division is also demarcated in 1QM by a full blank line as seen in 5:15; 6:7; 7:8; and 16:2, 10.

³⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 147–48. The same phenomenon occurs in 3:11–12 marking the section division between the rule of the trumpets and the rule of the standards (3:13–end 4), in 7:7–8 marking the division between the purity rule for the war camp and the battle narrative in 7:9–9:9, and possibly in 12:5–6 marking the division between liturgical prayers. Tov only references the divisions in 2:14–15 and 3:11–12.

³⁹ See 2.2.1 n. 22 and 23 for approximate column lengths and lines per column. Qimron has suggested column 1 as potentially containing 29 or 30 lines of material. See Qimron, *מגילת מדבר יהודה*, 111.

as the signals and commands given by the officers.⁴⁰ Jean Duhaime proposed that 1QM 2–9 was particularly patterned after the model of Greco-Roman tactical treatises similar to that preserved in the work of Asclepiodotus, which was later expanded upon by Arrian.⁴¹ Whereas both Asclepiodotus and 1QM 2–9 share a similar concern to record tactical principles with technical terminology, Duhaime rightly highlighted the religious character of the *War Scroll* over and above the logical and mathematical precision in Asclepiodotus.⁴² Thus, for Duhaime, the *War Scroll* is a priestly composition designed “to set the religious rules for the war and the facilitate their implementation by the people in charge of such an operation.”⁴³ Strikingly, however, Duhaime does not include the cultic service regulations in 1QM 2:1–6 in his discussion of the religious character of the *War Scroll*. The absence is conspicuous given the fact that these regulations present a significant departure in comparison with the works of Asclepiodotus and Arrian. Nowhere in Greco-Roman tactical treatises do we encounter sustained instruction for the proper performance of cultic activity during times of warfare, thus making their inclusion in the Qumran war tradition even more pronounced.

In describing these lines, early commentators near universally referred to the material in 2:1–6 as representing a marked change in subject from that of column 1 with most identifying these lines as containing instructions for the organization of worship or religious ceremonies

⁴⁰ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 141–97; Delcor, “La guerre des fils de lumière,” 372–99; André Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1959), 179–81; Theodor H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 386–87.

⁴¹ Jean Duhaime, “The *War Scroll* from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 133–51; Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:83–84. See also *Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, and Onasander*, trans. Charles Henry Oldfather and William Abbott Oldfather, LCL 156 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928), 227–340. For Arrian’s treatise, *Ars tactica* (Τέχνη τακτική), see *Flavii Arriani Quae exstant omnia*, ed. A. G. Roos, with corrections and additions by G. Wirth, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1968) 2:129–76. On the history of Arrian’s treatise and its relation to the work of Asclepiodotus, see Philip A. Stadter, “The *Ars Tactica* of Arrian: Tradition and Originality,” *CP* 73 (1978): 117–28.

⁴² Duhaime, “The *War Scroll* from Qumran,” 142–43 and 150–51.

⁴³ Duhaime, “The *War Scroll* from Qumran,” 143. Duhaime rightly notes that the similarities with Asclepiodotus’ treatise are limited to 1QM 2–9 adding weight to the notion of the *War Scroll* being a composite work.

during the time of war.⁴⁴ The cultic material seems at first glance to be foreign to the narrative flow insofar as it is distinctively cultic in nature whereas the surrounding material addresses strictly military concerns. Read together, the cultic and militaristic instruction imbue the war with a distinctly religious character, even offering a sacralization of the eschatological war as has been noted by commentators. That said, however, the function of these cultic service regulations vis-à-vis the surrounding material has not garnered enough attention.⁴⁵ The text of 1QM 2:1–6 reads as follows:⁴⁶

4.5.1 Text and Translation of 1QM 2:1–6

אבות העדה שנים וחמשים ואת ראשי הכוהנים יסרוכו אחר כוהן הראש ומשנהו ראשים שנים עשר להיות משרתים	1
בתמיד לפני אל וראשי המשמרות ששה ועשרים במשמרותם ישרתו ואחריהם ראשי הלויים לשרת תמיד שנים עשר אחד	2
לשבט וראשי משמרותם איש במעמדו ישרתו וראשי השבטים ואבות העדה אחריהם להתיצב תמיד בשערי המקדש	3
וראשי משמרותם עם פקודיהם יתיצבו למועדיהם לחודשיהם ולשבתות ולכול ימי השנה מבן המשים שנה ומעלה	4
אלה יתיצבו על העולות ועל הזבחים לערוך מקטרת ניחוח לרצון אל לכפר בעד כול עדתו ולהדשן לפניו תמיד	5
בשולחן כבוד את כול אלה ⁴⁷ יסרוכו במועד שנת השמטה	6

1 fathers of the congregation, fifty-two. They shall arrange the chiefs of the priests after the chief priest and his deputy, twelve chiefs to serve

⁴⁴ Representative of this is Johannes van der Ploeg's description of this column: "Le sujet traité est différent de celui de la première colonne... Il s'agit maintenant de l'organisation du culte de la communauté en temps de guerre, et de la guerre même, qui durera quarante ans." See van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 69. Also Bastiaan Jongeling, "Dans la deuxième colonne il s'agit tout d'abord de l'organisation de la communauté pendant la sainte guerre en vue des cérémonies religieuses." See Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 79. Jean Carmignac notes that the instruction here "réglemente l'organisation religieuse qui assurera le service de Dieu pendant que les combattants seront en campagne." See Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 24.

⁴⁵ Attempts to account for the presence of the Temple service regulations in 2:1–6 have tended to focus on what it might tell us about the relationship between the Jerusalem Temple with its cultic service and the community itself. Both Yadin and Burrows envisage these regulations as an eschatological expectation of the return of proper and legitimate sacrifice to the Jerusalem Temple, whereby the member of the community could once again exercise the priestly office. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 201; Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 363–64.

⁴⁶ Text of 1QM 2:1–6 taken from Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:98. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

⁴⁷ The word אלה appears as a supralinear addition above the term יסרוכו.

- 2 at the daily offering⁴⁸ before God; the chiefs of courses, twenty-six, shall serve in their courses. After them, the chiefs of the Levites (are) to serve continually, twelve, one
- 3 to a tribe; the chiefs of their courses shall serve, each one in his position. The chiefs of the tribes and the fathers of the congregation after them (are) to take up station continually at the gates of the sanctuary;
- 4 the chiefs of their courses with their appointed (men) shall take up station for their festivals, for their new moons and sabbaths, and for all the days of the year, from the age of fifty years upwards.
- 5 These shall take up station at the burnt offerings and the sacrifices to prepare a soothing incense for the pleasure of God, to atone for all his congregation and to grow fat before him continually
- 6 at the table of glory. All these they shall arrange during the appointed time of the year of remission.

4.5.2 Stratification of Cultic and Lay Leadership

Column 2 begins with a stratified hierarchical structure of cultic and lay leadership with the chief priest and his deputy (משנה) occupying the premiere status. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the term משנה (literally, “his second”) is typically rendered as “second, second in rank or importance.”⁴⁹

The term is a specific designation for a priestly assistant to the chief priest, potentially parallel to the rabbinic designation סגן in b. Yoma 39a.⁵⁰ The term appears infrequently within the Hebrew Bible and always within a tripartite hierarchical listing of priests (2 Kgs 23:4; 25:18; Jer 52:24).

The phrase כוהן הראש ומשנהו appears here in 2:1, in a reconstructed lacuna in 19:11, and in 4QM^d (4Q494) 4. There is also a fragmentary occurrence of הכוהן המשנה in 11QT^a 31:4. The term משנה also appears in connection with the angelic priesthood in the Songs of the Sabbath

⁴⁸ The rendering of בתמיד has been the subject of scholarly discussion. Duhaime translates בתמיד adverbially as “to serve steadily.” See Duhaime, PTSDDP 2:99. Also, Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 391; Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 81; Eduard Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1971), 83; García Martínez and Tichelaar, DSSSE 1:115. Yadin chooses to translate בתמיד as “daily burnt-offering.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 262. Also, Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 27; van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 69. While either is distinctly possible, I have chosen the later rendering in light of the use of the preposition ב in the phrase בשערי המקדש (“at the gates of the sanctuary”) in line 3 and בשולחן כבוד (“at the table of glory”) in line 6, both of which demarcate the location at which various entities serve before God. Subsequently, I agree with Davies’ suggestion as to the importance of the preposition and have rendered the phrase בתמיד as a preposition/noun construction.

⁴⁹ “משנה,” *DCH* 5:549–51.

⁵⁰ Kugler, “Priests,” 2:688.

Sacrifice, particularly in the eighth song preserved in the fragmentary manuscripts of 4QShir Shabb^d (4Q403), 4QShirShabb^f (4Q405), and 11QShirShabb (11Q17) where the term appears within a hierarchical listing of seven angelic deputy princes (נשיאי משנה) who proclaim blessings in succession of one another.⁵¹ Notably, all of these instances are either connected to the human priesthood within an eschatological or utopian setting or to the angelic priesthood within a heavenly Temple.⁵² This seems to suggest that proper priestly hierarchy was a constitutive component within highly idealized Temple-focused literature.

Following the chief priest and his deputy, the remaining leaders are arranged in a tripartite structure consisting of the priests, the Levites, and the laity. The first grouping consists of the priests sub-divided into two distinct groups: twelve “chiefs of the priests” who are to serve in the daily offering (להיות משרתים בתמיד) and the twenty-six chiefs of the courses (משמרות) who are to “serve in their courses (במשמרותם)” (2:1b–2a). The presence of the prefix preposition ב in the phrase בתמיד vis-à-vis the use of תמיד in the remainder of the column has led to the suggestion of the former as being a reference to the *Tamid*, or daily offering, as opposed to the conventional “continually” or “steadily.”⁵³ While both renderings are possible, the difference is immaterial, as noted by van der Ploeg.⁵⁴ Regardless of the preferred reading of בתמיד, there

⁵¹ See 4QShirShabb^f (4Q405) 11 3; 13 4, 7; 11QShirShabb (11Q17) 1–2 i 8; 12–15 ii 9; 16–18 9; cf. 4QShirShabb^a (4Q400) 3 + 5 ii 2; 4QShirShabb^b (4Q401) 3 4. Also, Carol A. Newsom, “Shirot ‘Olat HaShabbat,” DJD 11:194–95, 200–01, 327–30; Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, “11QShirot ‘Olat ha-Shabbat,” DJD 23:259–304; and Newsom, et al., “Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400–4Q407, 11Q17, Mas1k),” PTSDSSP 4B:24–25, 28–29, 84–87, 116–17, 122–25. Newsom has suggested that this reference appears to indicate that the heavenly temple was envisaged as containing seven holy places in which seven angelic priesthoods served, headed by seven angelic high priests and seven deputies. See Newsom, “‘He Has Established for Himself Priests,’” 108–09

⁵² The designation is reconstructed in 4QM^b (4Q492) 1 11 based upon 1QM 19:11, itself a reconstruction. See Baillet, DJD 7:45–49. While the reconstruction is possible, based upon the PAM images of 4QM^b (4Q492) the condition of the ink at the beginning of line 11 is too damaged to make any identification with certainty. See PAM 41.351, 41.848, 42.475, 44.018, and LLDSSDL B-295678

⁵³ See n. 48 for a discussion on the rendering of בתמיד.

⁵⁴ Van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 69

remains an implied hierarchical distinction between the twelve chiefs of the priests who serve continually and the twenty-six chiefs of the divisions who serve on a rotational basis—a distinction that is perpetuated in the subsequent groupings.⁵⁵ The second grouping consists of the Levites who are similarly sub-divided into two distinct groups: twelve chiefs of the Levites who are “to serve continually (לְשֵׁרֵת תְּמִיד), one to a tribe” and the chiefs of their divisions “each one in his position (מֵעֵמֶד)” (2:2b–3a). The final grouping includes the chiefs of the tribes and the fathers of the congregation who are to “take up station continually at the gate of the sanctuary” and the chiefs of their divisions with their appointed men who “take up station for their festivals, for their new moons and sabbaths, and for all the days of the year” (2:3b–4).

A concern for hierarchical stratification is seen elsewhere within the Qumran corpus in CD 14:3–6 (cf. 4QD^b [4Q267] 9 v 6–10); 1QSa 2:11–17; and most notably in the Covenant Ceremony in the *Community Rule*, both in the admission rite in 1QS 1:18–2:18 (cf. 4QS^b [4Q256] 2:1–6, 12–13; 3:1–4; 4QpapS^c [4Q257] 2:1–8; 5QS [5Q11] 1 i) and the procession and confirmation of the initiates in 1QS 2:19–25.⁵⁶ In these occurrences of hierarchical stratification a similar tripartite pattern is observed: the priesthood, the Levites, and the laity or in some cases “Israel.” The one exception is the mustering of all the camps in the *Damascus Document* (CD 14:3–6), which records a fourth level of distinction, that of the proselyte.⁵⁷ This concern for hierarchical stratification is noteworthy, not only for its demonstration of an organizing principle for the movement, but also for what communicates regarding divine order. Foregrounded in

⁵⁵ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 202 and Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 26–27.

⁵⁶ On 1QS 1:18–2:18 and 2:19–25, see Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 67–95.

⁵⁷ CD 14:3–6 reads, “They shall all be mustered by their names; the priests first, the Levites second, the sons of Israel third, the proselyte(s) fourth. And they shall be inscribed by their names, one after the other, the priests first, the Levites second, the sons of Israel third, and the proselyte(s) fourth. Thus shall they sit and thus shall they inquire about any (matter).” Translation from Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, PTSDSSP 2:57. In the parallel reading of 4QD^b (4Q267) 9 v 6–10, the first mention of the proselyte is lacking while the second is preserved. On the reading in 4QD^b (4Q267), see Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction*, STDJ 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 134–35.

these instructions is an adherence to a divinely instituted order, one which is led by the priesthood and subsequently followed by the Levites and lastly by the larger circumscribed laity.

The concern for a proper hierarchical structure in 1QM 2 is further signaled in lines 1 and 6 with the use of the verbal form of סרך, an infrequent form occurring only six times in the Qumran corpus and only once outside of the war traditions in 4QWays of Righteousness^b (4Q421) 1 i 3.⁵⁸ Within a militaristic context, the nominal form of the term סרך typically denotes a rule, order, custom, or even a collection of individuals arrayed into a formation or carrying out a prescribed order. The verbal usage, on the other hand, indicates an action undertaken either in a certain sequential order or according to a prescribed rule for carrying it out.⁵⁹ Rather than an ordering of military formation, significantly here in lines 1 and 6 the verb has been extended into the cultic realm, denoting a regulation of the proper ordering and arranging of the cultic and lay leadership for cultic service. The resulting presentation is that of a careful, systematic, and multi-dimensional stratification of priestly and lay leadership necessary for the proper implementation of cultic service during the year of remission. There is a notable distinction in 1QM 2 with the focus being upon priestly and lay leadership stratification as opposed to the hierarchical stratification of the community writ large seen in other texts.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ The verbal form of סרך is preserved in 1QM 2:1, 6; 7:1; 4QM^a (4Q491) 8–10 17; and in 4QWays of Righteousness^b (4Q421) 1 i 3 where the line reads [הו] לטרך הכול איש לפני רע[הו] “to arrange everyone before his neighbor.” The sixth occurrence has been plausibly reconstructed in 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471) 1 3 based upon the assumption of being a parallel reading of 1QM 2. 4QM^d (4Q494) 3 has been reconstructed similarly in connection with 1QM 2, but this reading remains speculative. On the root סרך in the Qumran corpus, see Charlotte Hempel, “סרך sārək,” ThWQ 2:1111–117; Alexander, “Rules,” 2:799–803; and Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, SJLA 16 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 60–68.

⁵⁹ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 148–50. Schiffman argues that the original use of this term is in the military context. See Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, 64.

⁶⁰ The description of the priests as processing “in order one after another (each) according to their spirits” (1QS 2:20) is noteworthy as this demonstrates a certain hierarchical stratification within the priesthood itself as we see here in 1QM 2.

What is additionally significant is the elevated role the laity performs within the cultic service in IQM 2. Unlike the מעמד of the rabbinic sources, which, as we will see, focuses on the priesthood, here the lay leadership is envisaged as having a presence and a place of prominence within cultic activity and celebration, if not a central role within the actual sacrificial duties themselves. The chiefs of the tribes and the fathers of the congregation are instructed to “take up station continually at the gates of the sanctuary” while the chiefs of their courses and their subordinates are to “take up station for the festivals, for their new moons and sabbaths, and for all the days of the year” (2:3b–4). “These” are to take up station at the burnt offerings and the sacrifices “to arrange a soothing incense for the pleasure of God, to atone for all his congregation and to grow fat before him continually at the table of glory” (2:5–6a). The antecedent of אלה at the beginning of line 5 has been the subject of some debate, with most commentators reading the term as referencing either the immediately preceding lay leaders or all three tripartite groupings as a collective whole.⁶¹ Exact identification notwithstanding, what seems clear is that the lay leadership are included in this group. This suggests that the lay leadership was envisaged as fulfilling an elevated role within the prescribed cultic service, potentially even a role assisting the priesthood with these sacrifices.⁶² This kind of involvement is not completely out of the realm of

⁶¹ Yadin (*The Scroll of the War*, 264) and Jongeling (*Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 85) understand “these” as referring to all mentioned, whereas Dupont-Sommer (“Règlement de la Guerre,” 34) and Carmignac (*La Règle de la Guerre*, 30) as referring to the priests and the Levites only. Esther and Hanan Eshel see the antecedent as the Levites and lay leaders. See Eshel and Eshel, “4Q471 Fragment 1,” 2:618. Davies and Schultz take “these” as referring to either the lay leaders only or all three groups. Davies, however, seems to favor the lay leaders. See Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 27; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 219–21.

⁶² There is still a slight distinction made between the priesthood and laity that should be highlighted. The priests and the Levites are said to “serve” or minister (שרת in 2:1–3a), whereas the lay leadership are expressly said to “take up station” (יצב in 2:3b–4). This creates a slight distinction between the priesthood and laity. Given the difference in verb, it is noteworthy that the “these” in line 5 are also said to “take up station” (יצב). On the potentiality of the lay leadership assisting the priesthood, see Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 27.

possibility as in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 8–9 we see the laity being exempted from military duty to fulfill their role within cultic service.⁶³

The concern for hierarchical stratification demonstrated in 1QM 2:1–6 accords well with what is seen in other so-called “sectarian” writings at Qumran, such as the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*. Hierarchical stratification played a central role in the Qumran movement providing order as well as serving to symbolically represent the pre-ordained orderliness of the universe. As we will see, in maintaining an ordered hierarchy the movement participated in the ordering of the cosmos, which itself is hierarchically organized. The inclusion of instructions for the hierarchical stratification of the priestly and lay leadership within the cultic activity outlined in 1QM 2 proposes that cosmological ordering is plausibly within the purview of the authors and transmitters these traditions.⁶⁴ As we have seen, this concern is also expressed in other Temple-focused utopian literature.

4.5.3 The Temple and Cosmological Ordering

Two phrases within 2:1–6 suggest that the cultic service in this column is to take place at the Jerusalem Temple. First, the lay leadership is instructed to take up their station continually “in the gates of the sanctuary” (בשערי המקדש) at the end of line 3 seemingly a direct reference to the gates of the sanctuary in Ezek 44:1. Second, the phrase “at the table of glory” (בשולחן כבוד) at the beginning of line 6 can plausibly be read as a circumlocution for the altar of sacrifice in the

⁶³ 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 8–9 reads, “When they march out to set up the battle [to humili]ate [the enemy...] among them set free by l[ot] for each tribe, according to the its numbered men, for the daily duty. [...] (on) that day, from their tribes, they [shall m]arch out of the camps towards the house of meet[in... shall m]arch out toward them the [priest]s, the Lev[i]tes, and all the camp commanders.” See Esther and Hanan Eshel, “4Q471 Fragment 1,” 2:613–14.

⁶⁴ On cosmic and historical ordering as reflective of divine political order in 1QM, see Wasserman, *Apocalypse as Holy War*, 101–5.

Temple. Although the exact phrase does not occur within the Hebrew Bible, the term “table” does appear in parallel with “altar” in Ezek 44:16 and Mal 1:7, 12 (cf. Ezek 41:22) where the sacrificial altar is the focus of discussion. The notion that the Jerusalem Temple is in view here is strengthened by the description of the trumpet of the way of withdrawal as signaling a return “from the battle of the enemy to come back to the congregation in Jerusalem” in 3:11 as well as the prohibition in 7:4 that “no young boy or woman shall enter their camps when they leave Jerusalem to go to battle until their return.” In these cases, the army is envisaged as taking leave from and returning to Jerusalem, thus presenting a re-occupied Jerusalem and, by extension, the Temple under the control of the sons of light.

This re-occupation of Jerusalem has been cogently argued as being an objective during the first six years of the eschatological war, a description of which is proposed as occurring in the non-preserved lines at the end of column 1.⁶⁵ Subsequently, the instruction that the cultic regulations of 2:1–6 are to be arranged (את כול אלה יסרוכו) “during the appointed time of the year of remission” is significant. The re-occupation of Jerusalem and the Temple during the first six years culminates with the first sabbatical year of the eschatological war, a pattern which is observed throughout the forty years of war (cf. 2:6b–8).⁶⁶ By explicitly linking the cultic regulations with the first sabbatical year, the re-institution of cultic activity is thus given an elevated prominence.

Given that a ritual space, such as a temple or temple-like area, is a requirement for the proper engagement of ritual practice, the vision of a secured Jerusalem Temple with a re-

⁶⁵ The idea of the re-occupation of Jerusalem as an objective in the first six years of eschatological war was suggested by both Philip Davies and David Flusser. See Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 27–28 and David Flusser, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period, Volume 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism*, trans. Azzan Yadin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Jerusalem: Jerusalem Perspective, 2007), 146–47, 153.

⁶⁶ See n. 36 for a discussion on the accounting of the forty-year duration of the eschatological war.

constituted cultic activity, especially regarding cosmological ordering, should not be understated. Scholars have long noted the micro-cosmological symbolism of the Temple suggesting the earthly temple as either symbolic of the cosmos or as an analogue to a heavenly sanctuary.⁶⁷ In either case, the earthly temple is closely associated with the cosmos and thus the proper maintenance of the earthly temple, including the cultic activity that occurs there, can be seen as playing an integral role in the maintenance of the world and cosmological order.⁶⁸

This association between the earthly temple and the cosmos is clearly articulated in the writings of both Josephus and Philo.⁶⁹ Josephus notes that the construction of the tabernacle, the priestly vestments, and the objects used for sacred ministry are “intended to recall and represent the universe” (*Ant.* 3:180 [Thackeray, LCL]). He envisages the embroidered veil hanging above the temple gate opening as symbolizing the universe (*J.W.* 5:212–213). He likens the tripartite division of the tabernacle, two of which are open and approachable to all priests, to the elements of the universe: earth, sea, and the heavens, two of which are open and accessible to the people, but a third which is reserved for God alone (*Ant.* 3:181, cf. 3:123). Additionally, Josephus suggests the seven lights of the candelabrum as representing the seven planets, the twelve loaves of bread as signifying the twelve months or the Zodiac, and the incense burned on the altar of incense as consisting of the thirteen spices from the sea and land, thus signifying that “all things are of God and for God” (*J.W.* 5:217–218 [Thackeray, LCL]; cf. *Ant.* 3:146; 3:182).⁷⁰ Regarding the high priestly vestments, Josephus ascribes to them cosmological significance. Josephus sees

⁶⁷ For a discussion of the two suggestions, see Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 111–44.

⁶⁸ See C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996), 6–8.

⁶⁹ On Josephus, see Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 142–53. For Philo, see Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 108–41.

⁷⁰ Josephus also sees the colors of the tabernacle coverings as designed “exactly to resemble those that meet the eye in the heavens” (*Ant.* 3:132 [Thackeray, LCL]). He sees the decorative tapestries woven of four materials as denoting the four elements of earth, sea, air, and fire (*Ant.* 3:183). For additional commentary on these passages, see Louis H. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary*, ed. Steve Mason (Leiden, Brill, 2000), 3:256–83.

the tunic of the high priest as symbolic of earth, including connecting the golden bells and pomegranates with the cosmological phenomena of thunder and lightning, respectively. The head-dress is representative of heaven as it carries the name of God upon the gold nameplate, which shines forth with brilliant rays of light (*Ant.* 3:183–187; *J.W.* 5:231).⁷¹

The connection between the earthly temple and the cosmos is likewise exhaustively addressed by Philo. He likewise ascribes cosmological significance to the priestly garments (*Spec. Laws* 1:82–97; *QE* 2:107–124),⁷² the twelve loaves as symbolic of the twelve months (*Spec. Laws* 1:172), the candelabrum as representing the sun, moon, and planets (*Moses* 2:102–103; *QE* 2:75), the altar of incense as “a symbol of thankfulness for earth and water” (*Moses* 2:101 [Colson, LCL]), and burning of incense on the altar as representing the four elements (*Heir* 196–197).⁷³ Significantly, Philo universalizes the cosmic significance of the high priestly vestments. For Philo, the vestments represent the entire universe: in the wearing of them the high priest in a sense is “transformed from a man into the nature of the world” becoming “a little world, a microcosm” (*Moses* 2:135 [Colson, LCL]). Thus, the high priest has “the whole universe as his fellow-ministrant” as he offers prayer and sacrifice on behalf of the world (*Spec. Laws* 1:96–97 [Colson, LCL]; cf. 2:163–164; *Moses* 2:134–135).

Taken in full, the earthly temple is clearly presented as micro-cosmological in nature. Both Philo and Josephus ascribe symbolic qualities to the construction of the Temple, as well as the sacred objects and the priestly vestments. The variance in the symbolic correspondence

⁷¹ See Joabson Xavier Pena, “Wearing the Cosmos: The High Priestly Attire in Josephus’ *Judean Antiquities*,” *JSJ* 52 (2021): 359–87.

⁷² Whereas Philo sees the two emeralds on the shoulder of the ephod as representing the two hemispheres he notes that others see them as representing the sun and moon (*Moses* 2:122–123). This latter interpretation is what we find in Josephus in *Ant.* 3:184–187 thus demonstrating the multivalent interpretations regarding the cosmological significance of the Temple expressed in Second Temple literature.

⁷³ Philo also notes that some see the two cherubim as representing the two halves of the hemisphere (*Moses* 2:98). Additionally, Philo sees cosmic symbolism in the veil (*QE* 2:91–93).

between Philo and Josephus has been argued as demonstrating a wider multivalent tradition. Where both agree, there appears to be an earlier Jewish tradition upon which both are dependent, such as finds expression in Ben Sira and Jubilees.⁷⁴ More significant, however, is the idea of Temple service as providing stability and order to the cosmos. Both Philo and Josephus when discussing priestly vestments allude to the cosmic universality of priestly service, with Josephus describing priestly activity as “cosmic worship” (*κοσμική θρησκεία*; *J.W.* 4:324) most likely a reference to either the universal nature of priestly service or that the cosmos itself joins in the worship of God.⁷⁵ Robert Hayward suggests that in making the correspondence between the tripartite division of the Temple and the elements of sea, earth, and heaven, Josephus may be alluding to the idea of Temple service as “a stabilizing and unifying centre for the universe.”⁷⁶ If so, this would accord with earlier traditions, such as that in Jubilees, which focuses on the harmony between earth and cosmos within the framework of proper calendrically observed worship, as well as that expressed by Pseudo-Philo (*LAB* 13:7–11) more contemporaneous with Josephus.⁷⁷ The latter grounds its understanding of Moses’ ordering of the Temple as a continuance of Noah’s ordering of the world after his covenantal sacrifice in Gen 8:20–22.⁷⁸

While it is difficult to say how much and to what degree the conceptual thinking of Philo and Josephus is reflected within that of the Qumran movement, there do appear to be wide and multivalent traditions in the Second Temple period that attached cosmological significance to the earthly temple, priestly vestments, or the ministration of an earthly temple. Moreover, the idea of

⁷⁴ Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 146.

⁷⁵ Thackeray translates this phrase as “ceremonies of world-wide significance” but adds in the footnote that the term *κοσμική* is literally “cosmical,” perhaps meaning “open to the whole-world” or “emblematic of the mundane system” (LCL 487, 252–53). Here I follow Hayward’s translation as this maintains the consistency of the cosmological nature of the Temple and Temple service expressed throughout Josephus’ writings. See *The Jewish Temple*, 144.

⁷⁶ Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 148.

⁷⁷ Cf. Let. Aris. 89 where the foundations of the Temple are linked with the foundation of the earth.

⁷⁸ Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 159–61, 164–66.

properly ordered Temple service as a cosmologically stabilizing and unifying force is likewise attested and plausibly influential upon the traditions of 1QM, especially given the status of Jubilees within the Qumran movement. I would contend that the re-occupation of the Jerusalem Temple as a military objective in the opening columns of 1QM, more than demonstrating the priestly character of the Qumran war tradition, signifies the importance of the re-establishment of cosmological order to the success of the eschatological war. The re-institution of proper, ritually ordered cultic activity in a re-constituted Jerusalem Temple is the first step in ordering the cosmos and putting things aright for the eschaton. The connection between cosmological order and eschatological judgment is also present in other writing within the Qumran corpus, most notably 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1, which we will address in 4.6. Within 1QM 2:1–6, the eschatological concern for cosmological order extends beyond the re-constitution of the Jerusalem Temple. It is further elucidated in the utilization of the terms **מעמד** and **משמרות**, both of which strongly suggest the centrality of order.

4.5.4 Levitical Position (**מעמד**) and the Creation of Order

The concern for cosmic order, especially as it relates to the proper ritual ordering in cultic service, is strengthened by the employment of the term **מעמד** regarding the chiefs of the Levitical divisions who are said to serve “each one in his position (**איש במעמדו**)” (2:2b–3a). The term **מעמד** is known from rabbinic sources where it refers to a delegation of priests, Levites, and Israelites representing each of the twenty-four courses:

Now what is the delegation [*maamad*]? Since it is said, *Command the children of Israel and say to them, My obligation, my food [for my offerings made of fire, of a sweet savor to me, shall you observe to offer me in their due season]* (Num. 28:2)—now how can a person’s offering be made, while he is not standing by its side? The early prophets made the rule of twenty-four watches, and for each watch there was a delegation [*maamad*] in Jerusalem, made up of priests, Levites, and Israelites. When the time for a watch came to

go up to Jerusalem, its priests and Levites go up with it to Jerusalem. And Israelites who belong to that watch gather together in their towns and study the story of the works of creation (m. Ta'an. 4:2).⁷⁹

The usage within the Qumran corpus differs from that of later rabbinic usage, however, as the term is usually rendered as “position” and occurs within varied contexts within the corpus, including the war tradition where the term is widely employed to describe the position of the soldiers when they stand arrayed for battle.⁸⁰

There is a strong resemblance between the usage in 1QM 2 and that of 1QS 2:19–25a, where the term is employed in the context of the tripartite hierarchical positioning during the procession of the Covenant Ceremony. While the usage of מעמד in 1QM 2 focuses strictly on the positioning of the chiefs of the Levitical division as opposed to people as a whole, the employment of the term in relation to a hierarchical positioning is expressed in both texts. After the procession of the priests and the Levites, 1QS 2:21–23 reads:

²¹And all the people shall follow in third place in order (בסרכ) one after another according to their thousands and hundreds ²²and fifties and tens so that every Israelite may know his position (בית מעמדו) in the community of God ²³according to the eternal scheme (לעצת עולמים). And no one shall be denigrated from the position of his standing (גורלו) nor raised up from the place of his lot (מבית מעמדו).⁸¹

Whereas the term מעמד occurs in other locations in the *Community Rule* within the context of hierarchically assigned positions during assemblies in 1QS 6:12, as Hempel has noted, the phrase גורל בית מעמד occurs only here.⁸² Hempel suggested that the use of מעמד and the parallel use of גורל

⁷⁹ Translation from Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University, 1988), 313. Cf. t. Ta'an. 3:3; b. Ta'an. 26a; y. Ta'an. 4:2, 67d. While the term מעמד can refer to all three categories, Schultz noted that its meaning is often restricted to designate the laity only. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 226–28.

⁸⁰ Jarod Jacobs, “עמד, āmad,” ThWQ 3:146–50. Cf. 1QM 2:3; 4:4; 5:4; 6:1, 4; 8:3, 6, 17; 9:10; 13:16; 14:6, 8; 16:5; 17:9, 11; 18:13; 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 15, 16; 8–10 i 4, 6; 11 ii 17. On the use of מעמד in 1QM, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 146, 206–7.

⁸¹ Translation from Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 72.

⁸² Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 89. Hempel notes that the more common term employed for hierarchical positioning within the community in the *Community Rule* is תבון or “rank” (1QS 6:4, 8, 9, 10, 22; 8:19;

“lot,” as well as the reference to “the eternal scheme” suggested that more than a mere administrative concern is in view here. This linguistic cluster points to “a larger salvation historical scheme.”⁸³ This assigned position, therefore, is envisaged as pre-ordained, eternally stationary, and representing the individual’s ordered place within the larger schema of the community. The employment of מעמד, as well as that of גורל, in the war traditions, as we will see, advances this understanding into the eschatological realm, suggesting that proper ordering is an essential component of the eschatological war.

Another correlative reading of מעמד to that of 1QM 2 is found in 1QSa 1:22–25:

And the Sons of Levi shall take their stand, each in his position (יעמודו איש במעמדו), according to the Sons of Aaron, to bring in and lead out all the Congregation, each according to his (place in the) register (בסרכו), at the hand of the heads of [the magis]trates of the Congregation, as rulers, and judges, and officers, according to the number of all their hosts, according to the Sons of Zadok, the priests, [and all] the heads of the magistrates of the Congregation.⁸⁴

Here in 1QSa, the role of the Levites, described here as their מעמד (“position”), is not that of cultic assistants, but that of officers overseeing the eschatological mustering of the congregation so that each member of the community is in their proper place.⁸⁵ This mustering of the people is conducted under the guidance of the sons of Zadokites, the priests, and the heads of the congregation. This role is similar to that assigned to Joshua in Num 27:18–21, who was to stand before Eleazar the priest and all the congregation and receive a portion of Moses’ authority so that at Eleazar’s instruction the entire congregation “shall go out, and at his word they shall come

9:2 and in parallel readings in 4QS manuscripts). See Arjen Bakker, “תכן,” ThWQ 3:1123–28. Regarding the phrase בית מעמד, see also Jacob Licht, מגילת הסרכים ממגילת מדבר יהודה (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1965), 72–73.

⁸³ Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 89.

⁸⁴ Translation from James Charlesworth and Loren Stuckenbruck, PTSDSSP 1:115. Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck read סרך here as “register.” So also, Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, 65–67; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, SBLMS 38 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 28.

⁸⁵ Cf. 1 Chr 23:4 and 2 Chr 34:13. See Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 28–29. Cf. 1QSa 1:17; 2:5, 15.

in” (Num 27:21). This role has been extended from Eleazar to the Levites in 1QSa and is described with the term מעמד. Significantly, in both 1QSa and 1QM 2, this term is employed with reference to the Levites and the duties assigned to them within the eschatological community, a reality which is further suggestive of an elevation of the Levites in the eschatological realm.⁸⁶

The extensive use of מעמד in the *serekh* texts in relation to an ordered position or role signals the necessity within the Qumran worldview of a carefully demarcated and stratified hierarchy not only within the present age, but also continuing into the age to come. Within 1QM specifically, properly ordered arrangement is a central component of the eschatological battle as מעמד is employed not only in descriptions of the arrangement of the combatants in their battle arrays, but also is extended into the cultic realm to describe the role of the Levites in cultic service. The result is an imagined eschatological battle conducted under a properly ordered and eternal scheme with each participant deployed within their proper and prescribed מעמד. Victory for the sons of light, therefore, appears to be at least somewhat contingent upon the proper ordering and arranging of the community as they enter the eschatological fray. As we will suggest, this eternal scheme is more than administrative in nature but reflects a larger concern: the adherence to and perpetuation of the divinely pre-ordained cosmological order.

4.5.5 Priestly Courses (משמרות), Divine Chronology, and Cosmological Order

While the term משמרות does not explicitly appear in calendrical texts at Qumran, partial listings of priestly watches are preserved in several calendrical fragments (4Q320–324a, 324c–325, 328–

⁸⁶ On the elevated status of the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Robert C. Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 163–89.

330) as well as a fragment within the *Community Rule* tradition (4QS^e [4Q259], also published as 4QOtot [4Q319]).⁸⁷ The term is, however, preserved in a handful of texts associated with priestly watches, including CD 4:1, 11QT^a 45:3, 1QM 2:2–4, and 4QM^d (4Q494) 3, 5.⁸⁸

The twenty-four priestly divisions (מחלקות in 1 Chr 24:1) are described in 1 Chr 24:7–18 and appear within a larger section of text addressing priestly procedures and organization.⁸⁹ The divisions reflect a way to organize priestly service at the Temple by establishing a rotational schema consisting of twenty-four priestly houses, each serving for a limited time. Assigned by lot, the priestly houses are listed in 1 Chr 24:7–18 starting with the house of Jehoiarib and continuing to the house of Maaziah, the twenty-fourth. The priestly rosters preserved in the Qumran calendrical fragments contain a similar listing of names to that of the biblical tradition with the only change being that the list begins with Gamul, who is envisaged as serving at the time of creation (4QCal. Doc./Mishmarot A [4Q320] 1 i 3–5, 3 i 10–12, 4 ii 10–14; 4QOtot [4Q319] 4 10–11).⁹⁰

⁸⁷ For a summary of *mishmarot* in the calendrical fragments, see Shemaryahu Talmon, With the assistance of Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Introduction,” DJD 21:8–13. For 4QOtot specifically, see Jonathan Ben-Dov, “4QOtot,” DJD 21:195–244. For 4QS^e, see Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 266–69; Hempel, “A Tale of Two Scribes: Encounters with an Avant-Garde Manuscript of the Community Rules (4Q259),” in *Hokhmat Sopher: Mélanges offerts au Professeur Émile Puech en l'honneur de son quatre-vingtième anniversaire*, eds. Jean-Sébastien Rey et Martin Staszak, Études Bibliques. Nouvelle Série 88 (Leuven: Peeters, 2021), 115–28.

⁸⁸ Cf. CD 4:1; 1QpHab 6:12; 1QM 2:2–4; 1QH^a 22:24; 1QHymns (1Q36) 16 2; 4QJub^d (4Q219) 2:28; 4QJub^f (4Q221) 1 5; 4QTohorot B^a (4Q276) 1 8; 4QRP^b (4Q364) 29 2; 4QRP^c (4Q365) 27 5; 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 7; 11QT^a 45:3. Within the war tradition, the term has also conjecturally reconstructed in 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471) 1 5 and 4QM^d (4Q494) 1 4. The occurrence in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 7 is questionable as to whether or not it is linked to the priestly watches. The line reads, “The craftsmen [and the] sm[el]ters and those appointed to the me[n of] mm[...] their [...] יָעָי to their stations (למשמרותמה) in [...] the line until their return.”

⁸⁹ On the proposed origins and development of the twenty-four priestly courses, see H. G. M. Williamson, “The Origins of the Twenty-Four Priestly Courses: A Study of 1 Chronicles XXIII–XXVII,” in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, ed. J. A. Emerton, VTSup 30 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), 251–68. Also, Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 423–25, 429–31.

⁹⁰ Talmon and Ben-Dov, DJD 21:8. For early scholarship on the twenty-four courses, see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A. D. 135)*, eds. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black, rev. ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 2:245–50.

As opposed to the customary number of divisions as twenty-four as described in 1 Chr 24:7–18 and known from Josephus (*Ant.* 7:365–66) and the Mishnah (m. Ta’an. 4:2), 1QM 2:2 appears to present the priestly courses (משמרות) as being twenty-six in number. Yadin understood this discrepancy as reflecting the existence of the 364-day calendar as described in Jub. 6:23–31 in operation at Qumran; whereby, the fifty-two weeks per year are divided into four sections of thirteen weeks with a day of remembrance in between each period. Thus, for Yadin, thirteen courses would serve weekly in each section and after two periods of service, or twenty-six weeks, the first course would return to service again.⁹¹ While the dominance of the 364-day calendar in Qumran sources has been subsequently established, the notion of a singular “Qumran calendar” is not substantiated based on the calendrical evidence. Rather, textual evidence suggests there were several calendrical schemes expressed at Qumran, all of which appear to have the 364-day calendar as a common denominator but include adjustments and attempted synchronization.⁹²

Significantly, both 4QCalendrical Document/Mishmarot A and B (4Q320–321) evidence a twenty-four-course schema attesting to the desire of the movement to maintain biblical tradition.⁹³ Rather than adding two priestly courses every year, a system was established to accommodate the twenty-four-courses to the fifty-two weeks of the 364-day calendar: a six-year cycle with a staggered rotation of *mishmarot*. The extra four weeks within the 364-day calendar

⁹¹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 204–206. Also, Carmignac, *Le Règle de la Guerre*, 94, Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 81; Jacob Liver, *Chapters in the History of the Priests and Levites: Studies in the Lists of Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah* (Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1968), 36–37; Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 27. See also, Paul Winter, “Twenty-Six Courses,” *VT* 6 (1956): 215–17; Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, 2nd ed., *ScrHier* 4 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965), 162–99.

⁹² For a summary on the calendrical evidence, see Sacha Stern, “Qumran Calendars and Sectarianism,” *OHDSS*, 232–53. Also, James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London: Routledge, 1998), 110–116; and Helen R. Jacobus, “Calendars,” *CDSS*, 435–48.

⁹³ Talmon and Ben-Dov, *DJD* 21:37–79.

would be taken up by four courses each serving one week and thus serve three times annually as opposed to twice. Over the course of six years, all twenty-four courses would serve thirteen times.⁹⁴ Given the evidence that the Qumran movement held to the biblical tradition of the twenty-four courses, we are left with rectifying the reference to “the twenty-six chiefs of the divisions” (2:2). While various explanations have been offered, the statement to my mind is best read not as a reference to the number of distinct priestly courses, but rather to the number of courses that actually served yearly in conjunction within the 364-day calendar and established sexennial cycle.⁹⁵ Regardless of the exact identification, the presence of *mishmarot* in 1QM 2 and 4QM^d (4Q494) serves as a reminder that adherence to proper calendrical ordering of cultic service is considered paramount during the eschatological war.

That the notion of *mishmarot* would be important to the Qumran movement is not surprising given what we read in CD 3:21–4:4a, where Ezek 44:15 is interpreted as a proof-text supporting the identification of the movement as a “faithful house” built in Israel:

As God swore to them through the hand of Ezekiel, the prophet, saying, “The priests and the Levites and the Sons of Zadok, who kept the watch of my sanctuary (שמרו את (משמרת מקדשי) when the children of Israel strayed from me, they shall present to me fat and blood.” “The priests” are the penitents of Israel who depart(ed) from the land of Judah, (“the Levites” are those) who accompany them, and “the Sons of Zadok” are the chosen ones of Israel, those called by name, who stand in the end of days.”⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Talmon and Ben-Dov, DJD 21:12. Also, Uwe Glessmer, “Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1999; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019), 2:213–78, esp. 240–43.

⁹⁵ VanderKam sees the number twenty-six as referring solely to the number of the leaders of divisions and not the priestly courses, suggesting the number refers to the total two-week shifts served annually by the priestly courses. See VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 49–50. Talmon and Ben-Dov propose the number is reference to the twenty-six courses which actually served and whose leaders collectively make up the “fifty-two fathers of the community.” See Talmon and Ben-Dov, DJD 21:12. Eshel suggests the twenty-six courses was a sabbatical year phenomenon occurring between established six-year cycles with each course serving as two-week period for the fifty-two weeks in the year. See Esther and Hanan Eshel, “Two Notes on Column 2 of the War Scroll (1QM),” in *Exploring the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeology and Literature of the Qumran Caves*, eds. Shani Tzoref and Barnea Levi Selavan, JAJSup 18 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 91–92. Schultz argues that the number twenty-six does not reference the number of priestly courses but “the number of *weeks of courses*” within a six-month period. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 233.

⁹⁶ Translation taken from Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, PTSDSSP 2:17–19.

It is noteworthy that in Ezek 44:15 it is the faithful administration of the *mishmarot* which is held up as an example of fidelity to God and the covenant. This same fidelity to God, which set apart the priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok in Ezek 44:15 from those who have strayed from God, similarly marks the movement's calling as the chosen ones who will stand in the eschaton.⁹⁷ The interest in the *mishmarot*, as evidenced in the *mishmarot* rosters found in several calendrical texts, coupled with the extensive amount of calendrical tradition at Qumran, demonstrates the integral role matters of proper chronology and calendrical ordering occupied within the Qumran movement. For the movement, history was moving in accordance with a pre-ordained, divinely established schedule. The precise implementation of the proper sacred schedule of festivals, celebrations, and the *mishmarot*, was an integral part of this divine choreography. In adhering to the proper chronology, the movement joined themselves in participating in and maintaining the pre-ordained, sacred chronological scheme. It is for this reason that we see calendrical concerns included at the conclusion of various sectarian writings, such as 1QS 10, 4QS^c (cf. 4QOtot [4Q319]), and 11QPs^a (11Q11) 27, or at their beginning, as is the case in 4QMMT.⁹⁸

The purpose and function of the *mishmarot* within the Qumran tradition should be understood in relation to these larger calendrical concerns. On the one hand, interest in the *mishmarot* is highly suggestive that the Qumran movement considered their absence from the Jerusalem Temple and involvement in its sacrificial operations to be temporary. There was an expectation that with a newly reconstituted Temple the movement, under new priestly leadership, would once again be involved in properly conducted cultic service.⁹⁹ This future expectation is

⁹⁷ On the prophetic interpretation employed here, see George J. Brooke, "Shared Exegetical Traditions," OHDSS, 576–80.

⁹⁸ Talmon and Ben-Dov, DJD 21:1.

⁹⁹ Talmon and Ben-Dov, DJD 21:8.

expressed in the cultic service regulations of 1QM 2 where a re-instituted cultic service, including the sacred schedule of festivals and *mishmarot*, is envisaged as taking place “at the gates of the sanctuary” (2:3) and “at the table of glory” (2:6) in the year of remission presumably after the re-occupation of Jerusalem by the sons of light during the first six years of the war.¹⁰⁰ The proper observance of the *mishmarot* is therefore an integral component to the eschatological war and signals a hope for a future reconstituted Temple in which proper cultic requirements would be conducted.

On the other hand, and significantly for our discussion, the inclusion of the *mishmarot* within the larger calendrical system, one concerned with the integration of cultic events with the movements of the heavenly bodies, as we see attested in both 4Q320 and 321, elevates properly conducted cultic service into the cosmic realm and imbues it with cosmological implication.¹⁰¹ For the movement behind this literature, the faithful adherence to proper, sacred chronology, including the *mishmarot*, was considered an essential component for the establishment and perpetuation of the cosmic order. The presence of calendrical concerns in 1QM and 4QM^d (4Q494) represents not only a concern for proper chronology, but also a concern for the re-establishment of cosmic order. By instituting a proper chronology in connection with the 364-day calendar, the war tradition envisages a correction of what is aberrant in the created order in the current age. The adherence to the improper calendar has led to cosmic disorder, alluded to in antiquity as the planets having gone astray.¹⁰² Such is the reality in the mind of the writer of

¹⁰⁰ See n. 65.

¹⁰¹ Stern, “Qumran Calendars,” 236–37. In his treatment of the term *דוקה* in 4QCalendrical Document/Mishmarot B and C (4Q321 and 4Q321a), Michael Wise noted the religious dimension of proper calendar reckoning, suggesting the proper measure of time was a religious act. See Michael O. Wise, *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*, JSPSup 15 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 231.

¹⁰² Personal correspondence with George Brooke.

1QM. It is noteworthy, therefore, that 1QM begins with the reconstitution of the Jerusalem Temple and the reinstatement of the properly conducted cultic service governed by the 364-day calendar. It is nothing less than the re-establishment of cosmological order from disorder. The presence of these regulations at the beginning of the eschatological war in column 2 suggest that the re-establishment of cosmological order is envisaged as being of primary importance to the eschatological war as well as a requisite feature for the impending eschaton itself.¹⁰³

4.6 Cosmological Order and Eschatological Judgment in 4QInstruction^b (4Q416)

The themes of cosmic order and judgment can also be seen in 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1 (cf. 4QInstruction^d [4Q418] 1, 2; 212, 213). Generally considered to be the opening column of 4QInstruction, lines 1–9 discuss the ordering and the establishment of cosmic order while lines 10–14 focus on the theme of the eschatological judgment of the wicked. Taken together, 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1 places judgment within the framework of cosmological order thus presenting eschatological judgment as an expression of God’s dominion over the cosmic order.¹⁰⁴

Although only a few words are preserved in lines 1–3, Eibert Tigchelaar has plausibly reconstructed these lines based upon his join of 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 212 and 229.¹⁰⁵

Tigchelaar’s full reconstruction of 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1 reads:¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ Philip Davies tentatively suggested that the occupation of the Temple itself may have been seen as an objective of the first phase of the war noting that the Temple may perhaps be “in improper hands.” See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 28.

¹⁰⁴ Matthew J. Goff, *4QInstruction*, WLAW 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 45.

¹⁰⁵ Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*, STDJ 44 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 74, 175–81; Tigchelaar, “Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels),” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, eds. Charlotte Hempel, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Armin Lange, BETL 159 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 99–126.

¹⁰⁶ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 175–76.

1 every spirit [stars of light,]
 2 and to mete out the tasks of [they run from eternal time,]
 3 season upon season, and [without standing still. Properly they go,]
 4 according to their host, to ke[ep station (?), and to for kingdom]
 5 and kingdom, for pr[ovince and province, for each and every man,
 6 according to the poverty (?) of their host. [And the regulation of them all belongs to
 Him
 7 And the hosts of heavens He has established ov[er and luminaries]
 8 for their portents, and signs of [their] se[asons
 9 one after another. And all their assignments [they] shall [complete, and they shall]
 count (?) [
 10 in heaven He shall pronounce judgment upon the work of wickedness, and all His
 faithful children will be favorably accepted by¹⁰⁷ [
 11 its end. And they shall be in terror. And all who defiled themselves in it, shall cry out.
 For the heavens shall fear, and the earth too shall be shaken (from its place)]
 12 The [s]eas and the depths shall be in terror, and every spirit of flesh will cry out. But
 the sons of heaven [in the day of]
 13 its [judg]ment. And all iniquity shall come to an end, while the period of truth will be
 completed [
 14 in all periods of eternity, for He is a God of truth. And from before the years of [
 15 to let the righteous understand (the distinction) between good and evil, to [] every
 regula[tion
 16 [incl]ination of the flesh is he/it. And from understanding (?) [
 17 His creatures, for [
 18 [] [

The mention the “stars of light” in the opening lines introduce the idea of the heavenly
 luminaries, which will be the subject of lines 1–9. The preserved phrase *ולתכן הפצי* in line 2 is
 difficult and rendered as “and to mete out the tasks” or equally as “to arrange the delights of/his
 delights.”¹⁰⁸ Significantly, however, the statement in line 2 that the stars “run from eternal time”
 seems to denote the idea of a regularity and order to the movement of the luminaries, an idea
 continued in line 3 with the mention of the seasons and that statement that they “properly” move.

¹⁰⁷ Or “and all His faithful children (angels) will run to [” as per Tigchelaar. See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 176 and 180.

¹⁰⁸ On the later, see John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, “4QInstruction^b,” DJD 34:84 and Goff, *4QInstruction*, 46–47.

The luminaries are said “to keep station” (למשור במשורה), or possibly “rule by dominion” as suggested by John Strugnell and Daniel Harrington.¹⁰⁹ Matthew Goff has suggested that the term משורה can also be rendered “measure” potentially conveying the structured and orderly nature of the cosmos.¹¹⁰ Lines 7–9 suggest that God has established the “hosts of heaven” over the luminaries “for their portents, and the signs (למופתיהמה ואתות) of [their] se[asons...]” drawing upon the language of the seven-day creation narrative in Gen 1 to articulate God’s control over the cosmos.¹¹¹ Central to lines 1–9 is not only a description of God’s orderly rule over the cosmos, but that the luminaries comply with God’s decree, as Tigchelaar has convincingly argued.¹¹²

The text then transitions to God’s pronouncement from heaven of judgment upon the “works of wickedness” (עבודת רשעה) in line 10, suggesting that judgment is being pronounced not only on the wicked, but also upon wickedness in a more generalized sense. The eschatological judgment described here includes not only the elimination of the wicked and wickedness, but also the “favorable acceptance” of all God’s faithful children. Importantly, line 11 highlights the effects of the eschatological judgment upon both the wicked and creation itself as the cosmos expresses distress and is shaken. As Goff has noted, this kind of cosmic upheaval is also seen within biblical theophanies to mark a disruption in the natural world caused by the advent of the Divine Warrior (cf. Judg 5:4–5; Hab 3:10; Mic 1:3–4; Sir 16:17–23).¹¹³ Significant to the schema of eschatological judgment in 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1 is the term קץ (“period,

¹⁰⁹ Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:84.

¹¹⁰ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 47.

¹¹¹ See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:83 and Goff, *4QInstruction*, 49. Cf. Gen 1:14 where the terms “signs” and “season” appear together.

¹¹² Tigchelaar, “Towards a Reconstruction,” 126.

¹¹³ Goff, *4QInstruction*, 51.

time, end, or era”) in lines 11, 13, and 14.¹¹⁴ The term signifies that the coming eschatological judgment will come to pass at a determined, specific moment in history. The continued use of קָץ in these lines serves to highlight the orderly control of God not only over the cosmos but also time itself. This term also plays a role within the schema of the eschatological war (cf. 1QM 1:4, 5, 8; 10:15; 11:8; 4QM^a [4Q491] 23 2). Most significant, the term occurs within the prayer preserved in column 11, “Through your anointed ones, seers of fixed times, you have told us the tim[es of] the war (קָץ הַמַּלְחָמָה) of your hands, to cover yourself with glory against our enemies, to bring down the troops of Belial, the seven nations of vanity...” (1QM 11:7–9). Like 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1, the use of קָץ signifies the determined, specified moment in history of God’s victory over the sons of darkness.

Unfortunately, the exact relationship between the establishing of cosmological order in lines 1–9 and the eschatological judgment of lines 10–14 is not made explicit in the preserved text. Tigchelaar suggested that the section on the luminaries (lines 1–9) introduces the larger theme within 4QInstruction of humanity complying with their determined tasks, while the section on judgment (lines 10–14) potentially refers to the consequences of obedience or disobedience to the decrees of God.¹¹⁵ Benjamin Wold has suggested a similarity between 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1 and 1 En. 5:1–6 where wickedness is described as “a failure on the part of humanity to observe the created order and seasons.”¹¹⁶ Regardless, the vision offered in 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1 is that of properly structured and ordered cosmos established and maintained under the control of God who will bring about the judgment of the wicked and all

¹¹⁴ On the use of קָץ in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple literature, see DCH 7:275–78 and TDOT 13:79–86, esp. 83–86.

¹¹⁵ Tigchelaar, “Towards a Reconstruction,” 126.

¹¹⁶ Benjamin Wold, *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*, STDJ 123 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 23.

wickedness at a determined and specific moment in human history. The connection between cosmic order and eschatological judgment is likewise expressed in 1QM 2:1–6 where the establishment of cosmological order plays an integral role in the early stages of the eschatological war. We will see this concern for cosmic order expressed once again in our exploration of the concept of *herem* in relation to the Qumran war tradition.

4.7 Performance and Cosmological Ordering

Recently, the Qumran war tradition has drawn attention for its plausible performative quality.¹¹⁷ While a full examination of the potential performative nature of 1QM is beyond the scope of our study, a few comments are in order. As referenced earlier in our study, Rebekah Haigh has argued that the text of 1QM demonstrates a variety of textual indicators of orality and performativity which suggest its potential as a performative spoken text.¹¹⁸ Haigh examined not only the material contained in the prayers in columns 10–14 and the narrative portions of columns 15–19, but also, significantly, what she describes as “prescriptive material” contained in columns 2–9. She concluded there is a “dense clustering of aural techniques within columns 2–9—such as textual rhythm, amplification, and alliteration” all of which demonstrate that 1QM does not reside purely within a textual realm.¹¹⁹ While she does not specifically address the cultic regulations of 2:1–6 in her analysis, I would suggest that if 1QM was indeed a performative text,

¹¹⁷ In addition to the following studies, see Steven Weitzman, “Warring Against Terror: The War Scroll and the Mobilization of Emotion,” *JSJ* 40 (2009): 213–41; Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 275–94; Andrew R. Krause, “Performing the Eschaton: Apotropaic Performance in the Liturgy of the War Scroll,” *RevQ* 30 (2018): 27–46; Krause, “Apotropaic Means and Methods in the Rules of the Trumpets and Banners (1QM 3–4),” *Henoah* 42 (2020): 117–35.

¹¹⁸ Rebekah Haigh, “Oral Aspects: A Performative Approach to 1QM,” *DSD* 26 (2019): 189–219. See also Aksu, “The Qumran Opisthograph,” 312–14.

¹¹⁹ Haigh, “Oral Aspects,” 211.

the oral performance of this textualized ritual would have the power to intentionally shape and inculcate the centrality of cosmological ordering within its audience of listeners.

More specific to 1QM 2, Alex Jassen has argued that the column represents an example of a performative representation of imagined violent stagecraft whereby a fully constituted Israel does battle with the nations of the world. Jassen pointed to the idealized nature of the sabbatical year, including the reconstituted Temple service, and the cessation of war every subsequent seventh year as demonstrating the eschatological war follows “a carefully crafted script.”¹²⁰ For Jassen, the text of 1QM allows the reader to rehearse the eschatological battle and imagine its fulfillment through a textual medium. I would further suggest that on encountering the text of 1QM 2:1–6, the reader is drawn into the larger cosmic drama, both anticipating the re-establishment of cosmological order and invited into a participatory role in bringing about order.

4.8 Conclusion

From the earliest generation of scholarship, the cultic service regulations in 1QM 2:1–6 have stood out as distinctive from the surrounding material. Traditionally, these lines have been understood as either being reflective of the priestly character of the composition or as evidence of a belief that the proper Temple-focused cultic activity would be re-instituted sometime in the future under the auspices of the renewed priesthood. Our examination has ventured to propose another possibility, namely that the inclusion of these cultic regulations signaled a concern for the ordering of the cosmos as an integral and constitutive element of the unfolding eschatological drama.

¹²⁰ Jassen, “Violent Imaginaries,” 193.

Set at the beginning of the eschatological war and presumably continuing throughout the forty-year campaign, the cultic regulations of 1QM 2:1–6 imagine a time in which Jerusalem has been re-occupied and the Temple, with its cosmological connections, has been re-constituted by sons of light. The textualization of these ritual instructions intentionally shape and transmit a particular eschatological worldview, one connected with priestly tradition regarding the ordering of the cosmos. The implementation of proper hierarchical stratification and the re-institution of cultic activity under the divinely pre-ordained chronological schema point to a concern for cosmological ordering within the framework of eschatological judgment, a similar concern of which plausibly seems to lie behind 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1 as well but is not made explicit.

What is at stake in the unfolding eschatological drama of the *War Scroll* was nothing less than a re-establishment of cosmological order over the forces of chaos. On reading the text, the reader and listener were drawn into the eschatological struggle in their present moment, anticipating the coming re-creation and, through the embodiment of the divinely pre-ordained eternal scheme, offered a participatory role in the re-establishment of cosmological order in the present and into the eschaton.

CHAPTER 5 – WILDERNESS AND WARFARE

5.1 Introduction

The notion and image of the “wilderness” (מדבר) has played a substantial role in Israelite history and memory. On the one hand, the wilderness is a physical backdrop upon which the ancestral narratives are told as well as the formative period of the Israelites in which the wider narratives of the Torah are thematically set. On the other hand, the wilderness is a reoccurring literary motif within the Hebrew Bible drawing upon the narratives and images found within the Torah. From a historical perspective, the wilderness is often conceived of as a negative experience, a locus of sin and punishment. The wilderness has also elicited a more positive conception, however, one in which spiritual purification and divine revelation are foregrounded. Here, the wilderness is envisaged as a locus of divine access, where the people prepare themselves to meet with God, where divine self-revelation and the law are given, and the covenant established. Within the Hebrew Bible and into the literature of the Second Temple period, “wilderness” as a literary motif is thusly variegated and multifaceted.¹

Shemaryahu Talmon in his groundbreaking study on the wilderness motif in biblical and Qumran literature sought to correct the prevailing opinion that the later evocation of the wilderness in the Hebrew Bible reflected a “nomadic ideal.”² Talmon concluded that the theme

¹ See especially James C. VanderKam, “The Judean Desert and the Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold, and Annette Steudel, BZNW 97 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 159–71; Hindy Najman, “Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 99–113; and Alison Schofield, “The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala, TBN 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 37–53.

² Shemaryahu Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif’ in the Bible and in Qumran Literature,” in *Biblical Motifs, Origins and Transformations*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 31–63; repr., *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible: Form and Content* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), 216–54. The latter publication will be the source of reference in this chapter. Early interpreters sought to understand the image of

of disobedience and punishment exerted a greater influence on the formation of the wilderness motif in biblical literature than the conception of the wilderness as a locus of divine revelation or some “nomadic ideal.”³ In the course of his examination, Talmon defined a “motif” within Hebrew biblical literature as follows:

A literary motif is a representative complex theme that recurs within the framework of the Hebrew Bible in variable forms and connections. It is rooted in an actual situation of anthropological or historical nature. In its secondary literary setting, the motif gives expression to ideas and experiences inherent in the original situation and is employed by the author to reactualize in his audience the reactions of the participants in that original situation. The motif represents the essential meaning of the situation, not the situation itself. It is not a mere reiteration of the sensations involved, but rather a heightened and intensified representation of them.⁴

Talmon goes on to note that given the adaptability of the motif to new settings and compatibility with other themes, motifs can develop into differing configurations from their antecedent formulation.⁵ In other words, motifs are not symbolically static, but rather dynamic, superimposing new symbolism upon previous layers of meaning. While writers may inherit a specific literary motif, they can add additional layers of meaning to the established motif as they rework and redeploy a specific motif. Talmon suggested that motifs cannot be explored in isolation but rather must be understood in connection with “other synonymous and antonymous themes with which it can be linked in recurring and modifiable patterns.”⁶

the wilderness exclusively as an idealization of the nomadic way of life, a “nomadic ideal.” This interpretation failed to consider the multifaceted nature of the idea of the wilderness. See Karl Budde, “The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament,” *The New World* 4 (1895): 726–45; repr., “Das nomadische Ideal im Alten Testament,” *Preussische Jahrbücher* 88 (1896): 57–79; Paul Humbert, “Osée, le prophète Bedouin,” *RHPR* 1 (1921): 97–118; Humbert, “La Logique de la perspective nomade chez Osée et l’unité d’Osée 2, 4–22,” in *Vom Alten Testament: Karl Marti zum 70. Geburtstage gewidmet*, ed. Karl Budde, BZAW 41 (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925), 158–66; John W. Flight, “The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament,” *JBL* 42 (1923): 158–226; and more recently, de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Vol. 1: Social Institutions*, 13–15.

³ Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif,’” 236.

⁴ Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif,’” 225–26.

⁵ Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif,’” 226.

⁶ Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif,’” 226.

This carries significance for the expression of “wilderness” within the Dead Sea Scrolls and, more specific to our study, the Qumran war tradition. The movement behind the Scrolls understood themselves to be an essential part of the transmission of ancient traditions while at the same time they undertook a program of appropriation, adaption, and redeployment of traditions into new literary settings. Regarding the wilderness motif specifically, as Alison Schofield has noted, writers of the Scrolls adopted the symbolism of the wilderness from the biblical tradition and appropriated the motif through intertextuality, allusion, and echoes thus redeploying the motif into new literary settings.⁷ Drawing predominantly upon the wilderness motif within the Ezekiel and Second Isaiah traditions, as we will explore, the Qumran movement deployed the wilderness motif into new literary settings, both within the realm of self-understanding as a movement and with regard to their eschatological understanding in the war tradition.

This chapter seeks to explore the employment of the wilderness motif in the Qumran war tradition in light of the larger understanding of “wilderness” within the Qumran movement. We will explore the use of the term מדבר in the war tradition as well as the presence and utilization of trumpets and banners, both related to traditions found in Num 10. It will be argued that the Qumran war tradition, while indebted to the biblical tradition regarding the wilderness generation, specifically that of Num 10, redeploys the wilderness motif into a newly imagined eschatological setting envisaging the eschatological war in terms of a wilderness campaign of re-entry of the land.

⁷ Schofield, “The Wilderness Motif,” 39.

5.2 The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Despite the paucity of explicit references to the term מדבר and its cognates in the Qumran corpus, the motif of the wilderness holds a significant place within the Qumran movement. The idea of the wilderness played a role in the ideological self-understanding of the movement as seen in the self-descriptions of the movement as “the penitents/returnees of the wilderness” (4QpPs^a [4Q171] 3:1) or, as we will explore in greater detail, “the exiles of the wilderness” (1QM 1:2–3).⁸ That said, however, the deployment of the wilderness motif in the Scrolls is multivalent and complex. On the one hand, the historically negative connotations attached to the wilderness generation in the Torah narratives are readily acknowledged, as we see in CD 3:5–10, where the writer, alluding to Deut 9:23 (cf. Ps 106:24–27), recounts the murmuring and subsequent destruction of the wilderness generation for their disobedience:⁹

And their sons in Egypt walked in the stubbornness of their heart(s), plotting against ⁶God’s commandments, each man doing what was right in his own eyes. And they ate blood and ⁷their male(s) were cut off in the wilderness (when God said) to them in Kadesh, Go up and take possession (Deut 9:23) their spirit and they did not listen ⁸to the voice of their maker (nor to the) commandments of their teacher. And they murmured in their tents and God’s anger was kindled ⁹against their congregation and their sons perished because of it and their kings were cut off because of it and because of it their heroes ¹⁰perished and their land was made desolate because of it. (CD 3:5–10)¹⁰

On the other hand, the wilderness motif exhibits a decidedly more positive nuance. As Hindy Najman has aptly observed, in addition to being a locus of punishment and exile the wilderness

⁸ On the use of 4QpPs^a (4Q171) in the construction of the social identity of the Qumran movement, see Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*, 134–48. On 4QpPs^a as a potential vision of the eschatological return to the land, see David Davage, “Stitching Psalms Together: On the Function and Use of Psalms in 4Q171,” *CBQ* 85 (2023): 256–75. On 4Q171, see John M. Allegro, “Commentary on Psalms (A),” *DJD* 5:42–51.

⁹ For Talmon, CD 3:6–9 demonstrated the Qumran movement’s overarching criticism of the wilderness generation as one marked by disobedience and punishment. Therefore, the employment of the wilderness motif (which for Talmon included their physical movement into the wilderness) “cannot be judged an attempt to identify with the values and to realize the ideals which were supposedly inherent in the historical desert period.” See Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif,’” 247.

¹⁰ Translation from Fraade, *The Damascus Document*, 37.

is also envisaged as a locus of purification and revelation.¹¹ With regard to the Qumran movement, therefore, the wilderness was conceived of not only in terms of time, but also sacred space.

Significant to the discussion of the wilderness motif in the Scrolls is the movement's interpretive deployment of Isa 40:3: "A voice cries out: 'In the wilderness prepare the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God'" (NRSV). As has long been noted, Isa 40:3 held considerable influence regarding the self-understanding of the Qumran movement, specifically as expressed in 1QS 8:12b–16a (cf. 4QS^d [4Q258] 6:6a–8a and 4QS^e [4Q259] 3:3b–6a) and 9:19b–21 (cf. 4QS^b [4Q256] 18:3b–4a; 4QS^d [4Q258] 8:4b–5a; 4QS^e [4Q259] 3:19–4:2a):¹²

When these exist as a community in Israel ¹³according to these rules they shall keep apart from the company of the people of injustice and go into the wilderness to prepare there the way of Him ¹⁴as it is written: "In the wilderness prepare the way of **** *vacat*, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." ¹⁵This is the study of the law w[hic]h He has commanded through Moses to carry out according to all that has been revealed from time to time ¹⁶and according to that which the prophets have revealed by His holy spirit. (1QS 8:12b–16a)

This is the time to prepare the way ²⁰to the wilderness. He shall instruct them (with) all that has been found to do at this time, and they shall keep away from everyone who has not averted his path ²¹from all injustice. (1QS 9:19b–21)

Talmon, as well as others, have understood 8:12b–16a as referring to a literal physical separation of the Qumran sect from sinful contemporaries and flight into the wilderness of Judea to the site of Khirbet Qumran.¹³ Within this interpretation, the sectarians took their cue from Isa 40:3 going into the wilderness to "regain from there God's law" and prepare the way of God's return to the

¹¹ Najman, "Towards a Study," 105–13.

¹² All translations of 1QS from Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*.

¹³ Talmon, "The 'Desert Motif,'" 250. See also Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, Scripta Judaica 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), 128; Licht, *מגילת הסרטים*, 177; VanderKam, "The Judean Desert," 169–71.

promised land.¹⁴ In a similar manner, George Brooke argued that the separation and going into the wilderness, as signaled by their interpretation of Isa 40:3, was best understood as intending a literal departure, noting the use of the term שם (“there”) in 1QS (cf. שמה in 4QS^c [4Q259] 3:4) as being reflective of the wilderness as a physical location. Brooke further suggested that the phrase “preparation of the way” should be understood metaphorically as “the study of the law.”¹⁵ For Brooke, the literal flight into the wilderness by at least some in the movement reflected an eschatological hope that God would soon appear and vindicate those who correctly practiced the law, re-establishing a renewed priesthood in Jerusalem.¹⁶

This position has not gone unchallenged, however, as some have understood the separation into the “wilderness” as purely metaphorical in nature.¹⁷ Devorah Dimant, considering the “preparation of the way” metaphorically as the “study of the law,” noted the metaphorical use of wilderness in 1QM and sees no warrant for a literal separation into the wilderness.¹⁸ Whether a literal or metaphorical withdrawal into the wilderness is envisaged, the fact remains that the wilderness motif is indeed programmatic to the self-understanding of the Qumran movement. It seems that for at least some of those involved in the Qumran movement, the withdrawal, physical or metaphorical, to the wilderness evidenced a multifaceted understanding of מדבר extending far beyond the notion of sin and punishment. For the Qumran movement, the מדבר was sacred space, a locus of revelation and preparation.

¹⁴ Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif,’” 251.

¹⁵ George J. Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, eds. George Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 15 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 124.

¹⁶ Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3,” 132.

¹⁷ Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (New York: Scribner, 1995), 75.

¹⁸ Devorah Dimant, “Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in Spirit: The Peshet of Isa 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community* and the History of the Scrolls Community,” in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, FAT 90 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 455–64.

Important for this study is Talmon's suggestion that the significance of the wilderness motif for the Qumran movement was not to be found in identification with the values and ideals of the historical wilderness period, but rather in the re-experiencing and re-deployment of the "transition-and-preparation motif that crystallized in the trek traditions."¹⁹ The flight into the wilderness was therefore the "last link with Israel's *Unheilsgeschichte*."²⁰ Talmon concluded:

Ultimately the desert became the locale of a period of purification and preparation for the achievement of a new goal. This goal is the conquest of the Holy Land, culminating in the seizure of Jerusalem and the reestablishment of the supreme sanctuary of Israel, in which the Sons of Zadok, YHWH's truly appointed priests, will officiate *in aeternum*. The desert is a passage to this goal, not the goal itself.²¹

Central to this understanding is the conception of wilderness within the Ezekiel and Second Isaiah traditions, which envisage the wilderness not through the prism of sin and punishment, but rather as a time of transition and preparation.²² Just as the wilderness was a locus of preparation within Ezekiel and Second Isaiah (cf. Ezek 20:33–44; Isa 40:3), so too the notion of wilderness at Qumran was envisaged as a time and place for the movement to experience purification and divine revelation as the earlier generation did with Moses. Thus, the connections between Teacher of Righteousness, as well as the Interpreter of the Law, and the figure of Moses take on particular significance.²³ As Moses was a conduit for divine revelation regarding the law at Sinai, so the Teacher of Righteousness could be seen as a mediator of divine revelation and proper exegesis of the law. Moreover, as Talmon suggested, by identifying with the wilderness, whether physically or metaphorically, the Qumran movement understood itself as a experiencing a time

¹⁹ Talmon, "The 'Desert Motif,'" 247.

²⁰ Talmon, "The 'Desert Motif,'" 247.

²¹ Talmon, "The 'Desert Motif,'" 253.

²² Talmon, "The 'Desert Motif,'" 250, as well as Brooke, "Isaiah 40:3," 129.

²³ Schofield, "The Wilderness Motif," 47 and VanderKam, "The Judean Desert," 171. In an unpublished version of this chapter, VanderKam expands this idea concluding, "As they awaited the end, as they prepared the Lord's way, they situated themselves in the very place where God's salvation would become manifest and they arranged themselves in conformity to the pattern established when God had revealed himself at Sinai" (p. 27). Quoted in Najman, "Towards a Study," 109.

of transition and preparation, “preparing the way” for God’s return and triumphal re-entry into the land. It is this facet of the wilderness motif which not only remains underexamined, but is also, as we will see, illuminative of the war traditions.

Building upon Talmon’s suggestion, this chapter seeks to explore various deployments of the wilderness motif in the Qumran war tradition, specifically the explicit references to “wilderness” at the beginning of column 1, the presence and use of trumpets in 1QM and 4QM^c (4Q493), and the rule of the standards in 1QM 3:13–4:17. The employment of these literary features fosters strong allusive connections with the wilderness preparations described in Numbers. These connections imagine the war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness as a return from wilderness exile and, as we will see in subsequent chapters, a re-entry and purification of the land from defilement. Yigael Yadin hinted at this notion when he concluded that the sojourn of the community into the wilderness was “a time of transition corresponding to the forty years’ sojourn of the Israelites in the desert, and, like the latter, preparatory to its own return which would follow the pattern of the first Conquest.”²⁴ That the conception of eschatological war as re-entry into the land seems to be in the mind of the writers is further supported by the fact that the re-occupation of Jerusalem and the re-institution of Temple service were a centerpiece of the first phase of the war, as we discussed in the last chapter. The strong connection with the wilderness narratives of Numbers is a significant feature of the war traditions, one which requires deeper examination.

²⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 38.

5.3 “Exiles in the Wilderness” (1QM 1)

The wilderness motif is introduced in the first few lines of column 1 of the *War Scroll* where the term *מדבר* occurs three times in the first three lines:

¹For *m*[... of] the war. The first engagement of the sons of light shall be launched against the lot of the sons of darkness, against the army of Belial, against the troop of Edom and Moab and the sons of Ammon ²and *h*[...] Philistia, and against the troops of the Kittim of Asshur, in assistance with them those who have violated the covenant. The sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, the exiles of the wilderness (*גולת המדבר*), shall wage war against them ³*b*[...] against all their troops, when the exiles of the sons of light return from the wilderness of the nations (*ממדבר העמים*) to encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem (*במדבר ירושלים*).²⁵

The phrase “exiles of the wilderness” in line 2, although a singular construct, is used collectively in apposition to “the sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin.”²⁶ This collective represents those who will wage war against the entities listed in line 1 along with “those who have violated the covenant.” As previously noted, “exiles of the wilderness” is a self-referential description regarding the Qumran movement.²⁷ Importantly, the phrase places the locus of the exile itself in the wilderness and thus introduces the theme of exile and wilderness, which is developed more fully in line 3 where the “exiles of the sons of light” are said to “return from the wilderness of the nations” and encamp “in the wilderness of Jerusalem.”²⁸ A similar conception is found in CD 4:2–4 for members of the movement when in interpreting Ezek 44:15 it reads, “The priests: They are the returnees of Israel who went out from the land of Judah. [And the

²⁵ Translation my own.

²⁶ See T. Muraoka, *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew* (Leuven: Peeters, 2020), 25. Muraoka notes that the singular *גולה* in the sense of “exiles” is known in LBH (e.g., Est 2:6). See also, van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 57–58. André Dupont-Sommer appears to read the phrase “the sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin” as an apposition to “those who have violated the covenant.” See A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 169.

²⁷ On the function of exile in the self-understanding of the movement, see Michael A. Knibb, “Exile,” *EDSS* 1:276–77; Knibb, “Exile in the Damascus Document,” *JSOT* 25 (1983): 99–117.

²⁸ Jerusalem is referred to as a holy camp in 4QMMT B 29–33 (4Q394 3–7 ii 16–19) and 60–62 (4Q394 8 iv 10–12). In these locations, Jerusalem is spoken of as being “the head of the c[a]mps of Israel” and the place which God has chosen among all the tribes of Israel regarding sacrifice.

Levites: They are] the ones who accompanied them. And the sons of Zadok: They are the chosen of Israel, those called by name who will stand in the end of days.” Whether the “exiles of the wilderness” in 1QM 1:2 should be equated with the “exiles of the sons of light” has been debated, however it seems best to read line 3 as a further description of the “exiles of the wilderness” in line 2.²⁹

The reference to the “wilderness of nations” in line 3 is an allusion to Ezek 20:35 where we find the same phrase used as a description of a “second exodus” from exile in Babylon.³⁰ Just as the first exodus led the Israelites into “the desert of the land of Egypt” (20:36), so too the second exodus from Babylon will lead the people into “the wilderness of nations” (20:35). This sojourn into the wilderness is considered a time of purification for Israel in which a faithful remnant is prepared for a return to the land (20:39–44). For the writer of 1QM, therefore, the “wilderness of the nations” signifies a symbolic locus of purification and preparation leading to a return of a faithful remnant to the land and the eradication of the forces of Belial.³¹ The reference in line 3 that the exiles will “encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem” is without parallel in the biblical tradition and has been read both literally, as referring to the outskirts of the city,³² as well as symbolically. In this latter sense, the phrase could be conceptually linked with the “ruins of Jerusalem” in Isa 52:9, a reference to the desolate state of Jerusalem during the Babylonian exile.

²⁹ Philip Davies argued that these are distinctly different sets of exiles. The “exiles of the wilderness” were awaiting the return of others of their number from exile in the “wilderness of the nations.” See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 115. Davies further suggested that this offers support to the theory that the Qumran movement was established by Jews who had returned from Babylon in the Maccabean period and were distressed by the religious state of those in Jerusalem. See Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14–VI, 1,” *RB* 77 (1970), 201–29, esp. 214–15.

³⁰ See Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1–24*, eds. Frank Moore Cross and Klaus Baltzer, trans. Ronald E. Clements, Hermeneia 26A (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 414–18.

³¹ See Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 5; van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 78–79; Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 55.

³² Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif,’” 251. See also Ted M. Erho, “The Motif of the Eschatological Battle in the *War Scroll* (1QM),” in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*, eds. Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Baek, *EJL* 30 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 368.

Equally, the phrase could carry the same symbolism as 1 Macc 3:45, which describes Jerusalem as “uninhabited like a wilderness.”³³ If taken symbolically, the writer of 1QM envisaged the current state of Jerusalem as a locus of desolation and devastation under the domination of the enemies of God.³⁴

What this seems to suggest is that the writer understood the wilderness as a locus of exile for the purpose of purification and preparation for a future return to land beginning with Jerusalem, which they saw as lying in a state of religious desolation and leading to an engagement with the forces of Belial. This notion of a self-exile into the wilderness is similar to what we find in 1 Macc 2:29–30, wherein those “who were seeking righteousness and justice went down to the wilderness to live there, they, their sons, their wives, their livestock, because troubles pressed heavily upon them.” For the Qumran movement, therefore, the wilderness was not the goal in and of itself, but as Talmon notes, the passage to the goal—the eventual re-entry into the land beginning with the “wilderness of Jerusalem.”

5.4 Trumpets in the Qumran War Texts

The importance of the wilderness motif in the eschatological imagination of the Qumran movement, and more specifically in the Qumran war tradition, is similarly seen in the use of trumpets and standards, features which connect the tradition with the wilderness preparation narratives found in Num 1–10. In alluding to the use of trumpets and standards, the eschatological battle is conceptually linked to the preparations of the first wilderness generation while at the same time envisaging a re-entry of the land. In this section, we will explore the use

³³ Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 5.

³⁴ Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 55.

and function of trumpets in the Qumran war tradition before turning our attention in the next section to the use of standards in the *War Scroll*.

5.4.1 Trumpets in Greco-Roman and Maccabean Warfare

References to the use of trumpets in both Greco-Roman and Jewish military contexts is well attested in the Second Temple period.³⁵ Beginning with Alexander onward, the use of trumpets in warfare contexts was commonplace, predominantly being used for the signaling of formation for battle and to transmit orders within the battle itself.³⁶ First and Second Maccabees both attest to the use of trumpets by enemy forces, noting that the phalanx of Bacchides' army and the men with Judas both advanced to the sound of trumpets (1 Macc 9:12) and that Nicanor and his men advanced into battle with trumpets and battle songs (2 Macc 15:25). Josephus describes in detail the orchestrated procedure by which the Roman army break camp and march out to the sound of three trumpet signals (*J.W.* 3.89–92).³⁷ In an account similar to what we find in 1QM, Josephus relays that during Vespasian's siege of Jotapata at the sounding of trumpets "the troops raised a terrific shout, and at a given signal arrows poured from all quarters, intercepting the light" (*J.W.* 3.265 [Thackeray, LCL]).³⁸ Josephus also describes how he organized his army according to the

³⁵ For an extensive discussion of the military use of trumpets in the Second Temple period, see Batsch, *La guerre et les rites de guerre*, 210–15.

³⁶ Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989), 394. See also, Xenophon, *Anab.* 6.5.25–27; Aeneas, *On the Defense of Fortified Positions*, 22 [Guards]; 26 [Patrols]; and 29 [Importation of Arms by Stealth]; Asclepiodotus, *Tactics*, 2.9; 6.3; 12.10.

³⁷ Josephus highlights the tenor of this orchestrated procedure by noting the response of the soldiers after being asked if they are prepared to go to war or not. "Three times they loudly and lustily shout in reply, 'We are ready.' Some even anticipating the question; and worked up to a kind of martial fury, they along with the shout raise their right arms in the air" (*J.W.* 3.92 [Thackeray, LCL]).

³⁸ Regarding trumpets instilling fear in the enemy, Onasander notes, "a hostile trumpet heard at night from the walls brings great terror to the besieged, as if they had already been overcome by force, so that abandoning the gates and fortifications they flee" (Onasander 42.17 [Oldfather, LCL]).

manner of the Roman army specifically noting that he taught them to signal orders to one another including the use of trumpets to send and recall soldiers (*J.W.* 2.579).³⁹

The use of trumpets is also ascribed to the Judean forces during the Maccabean wars. In the battle against Gorgias, after the congregation cries out for God’s help, the Judean forces “sounded the trumpets and gave a loud shout (ἐβόησαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ)” after which Judas appoints the leaders of the people for battle (1 Macc 3:54).⁴⁰ Similarly, after Judas’ pre-battle petition for divine assistance, the men with Judas sound the trumpets and engage the enemy in battle (1 Macc 4:12–14). At the conclusion of the battle with Lysias and upon seeing the desecrated Temple, Judas and his brothers collectively mourn and “when the signal was given with the trumpets” (ἐσάλπισαν ταῖς σάλπιγξιν τῶν σημασιῶν) they cried out to heaven (1 Macc 4:40).⁴¹ When under attack by the forces of Timothy, the stronghold of Dathema engages the battle with a cry to heaven with trumpets and a loud shout (1 Macc 5:31) and as the forces of Judas join in the defense they likewise “sounded the trumpets and cried aloud in prayer” (1 Macc 5:33). Finally, in 1 Macc 7:45 we are told that the Judean forces continually blew trumpets as they pursued the army of Nicanor (cf. John Hyrcanus and the army of Cendebeus in 1 Macc 16:8). What is important to notice regarding the use of trumpets in the Maccabean wars is their memorializing character. In other words, the sounding of trumpets by the Judean forces do not appear to have a tactical function as much as serve as a memorial before God so that the army

³⁹ On the use of trumpets by the Roman army as described by Josephus and other Roman literature, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 110–13.

⁴⁰ A similar combination of trumpet blasts and a war cry (תְּרוּעָה) is seen in Josh 6:5, 20; Amos 2:2; Zeph 1:16; and Job 39:25.

⁴¹ All translations of 1 Maccabees taken from Lawrence H. Schiffman, “1 Maccabees,” Pages 2769–831 in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2013).

might be remembered in battle and victory be secured. This memorial function, as we will see, similarly plays a central role within the Qumran war tradition.

5.4.2 Trumpets in the *War Scroll*

Against this backdrop of trumpet usage in the Second Temple period, it is hardly surprising that trumpets play an integral role in the Qumran war tradition. The ubiquity and distinctive nature of trumpets to the war tradition is marked by the frequency and concentration of the term חצוצרות within the war traditions. Of the sixty-nine preserved or partially reconstructed occurrences in the “non-biblical” texts the only occurrence outside of war-related texts is found in CD 11:22, where “the trumpets of assembly” (חצוצרות הקהל) are blown at the time of sacrifice.⁴² The term is fully preserved forty times in 1QM, with an additional five partial reconstructions, and preserved fully or partially in 4QM^a (4Q491), 4QM^c (4Q493), and 4QM^f (4Q496).⁴³

As has been noted previously by scholars, the use of trumpets in the Qumran war texts is directly influenced by Num 10:1–10 as well as Num 31:6 and 2 Chr 13:12–14, both of which refer to priests possessing “trumpets of alarm” (חצוצרות התרועה) in times of war.⁴⁴ The trumpet usage in the war tradition, however, clearly demonstrates a significant innovation over that seen in the biblical tradition or other Second Temple writings, specifically regarding the number of trumpets used, their distinct soundings and usages, and the inclusion of theologically-oriented

⁴² Counting fully reconstructed locations there are eighty-one total occurrences of the term חצוצרות in the Qumran corpus: fifty-one occurrences in 1QM, ten in 4QM^a (4Q491), eight each in 4QM^c (4Q493) and 4QM^f (4Q496), and one each in CD 11:22, 4QSefer Ha-Milhamah (4Q285) 3 2, 4QD^f (4Q271) 5 i 16 and 4QRP^c (4Q365) 31a–c 14, the latter two occurrences being fully reconstructed.

⁴³ The term is fully preserved in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 13, 17 and 4QM^c (4Q493) 2, 3, 7, 11 and partially reconstructed in 4QM^a (4Q491) 11 ii 21; 13 4, 6; 4QM^c (4Q493) 8, 10, 13; and in 4QM^f (4Q496) 8 5, 6; 9 2; 11 3; 12 3; 17 2; and 58 5.

⁴⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 87.

inscriptions.⁴⁵ That said, any exploration of the topic of the trumpets, their number, and their usage is not without certain difficulty as there are distinct inconsistencies and a lack of coherence in their presentation, a reality acknowledged and well-articulated by van der Ploeg.⁴⁶ Our exploration here will not attempt to conclusively solve issues of inconsistency, but rather will focus on the rhetorical strategy the usage of trumpets plays within the war tradition beyond that of tactical orchestration.

Lists of the trumpets are preserved in several locations within 1QM. First, there is a lengthy description in 2:16–3:11, demarcated by full *vacat* lines in 2:15 and 3:12, which is comprised of both the names of various trumpets as well as the corresponding inscriptions written upon them.⁴⁷ Second, there is a brief listing of trumpets in 7:13 at the beginning of the instructions for how the priests should conduct the battle (7:9–9:9). The following table compares the lists in 2:16–3:11 with that of 7:13:

⁴⁵ For an early and extensive treatment on trumpets in 1QM, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 87–113.

⁴⁶ Van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 14–18. Various attempts have been made to address the inconsistencies. Assuming a single author of 1QM, Yadin sought to harmonize the disparate lists and usages of the trumpets into a singular coherent framework. Davies understood the disparate nature of the trumpets as signaling the presence of various sources and compositional stages of 1QM. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 29–32. More recently, Schultz has proposed the following basic sequence of trumpet use as “‘summoning’ (מקרא), ‘formation’ (סדר), ‘second alarm’ (תרועה שנית), ‘slain’ (חללים) together with the horns, ‘slain’ by themselves after the horns have ceased, and ‘return’ (משוב),” which Schultz refers to as a “battle cycle.” Schultz argued that this basic sequence reconciles all the battle sequences *assuming* the names of the trumpets can vary between battle narratives. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 305–12, especially 306–7.

⁴⁷ Yadin presents this lengthy description as two separate lists, one from the end of column 2 to 3:2a (List A) and a second from 3:2b–11 (List B), to which he adds a third listing in 7:13 (List C). See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 89. Here, I am in agreement with Schultz who combines Yadin’s List A and B into a singular listing. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 305. Schultz does not address the reasoning behind his decision. Here, I suggest that the presence of the two full *vacat* lines in 2:15 and 3:12 denote a section of text. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 147–48.

Table 5.1 – Trumpet Listings in the *War Scroll*⁴⁸

1QM 2:16–3:11	1QM 7:13
Trumpets for summoning the congregation (מקרא העדה) in 3:2	
Trumpets for summoning the commanders (מקרא הסשרים) in 3:3	
Trumpets of enrollment (מסורות) in 3:3	
Trumpets of the men of renown (אנשי השם) in 3:3–4	
Trumpets of the camps (מחנות) in 3:5	
Trumpets for breaking them (מסעיהם) in 3:5	
Trumpets of the battle formations (סדרי המלחמה) in 3:1, 6	
Trumpets for summoning (מקרא) the skirmishers in 3:1, 6	Trumpets of summoning (מקרא)
	Trumpets of memorial (זכרון)
Trumpets of the slain (תרועות החללים) in 3:1 and (חללים) in 3:8	Trumpets of alarm (תרועה)
Trumpets of ambush (מארב) in 3:2, 8	
Trumpets of pursuit (מרדף) in 3:2, 9	Trumpets of pursuit (מרדף)
Trumpets of withdrawal (מאסף) in 3:2 (משוב) in 3:10	Trumpets of withdrawal (מאסף)
Trumpets of the way of withdrawal (דרך המשוב) in 3:10	

As previously mentioned, the trumpet lists of 1QM are indebted to Num 10:1–10 where Moses is directed by God to make two silver trumpets to be used for summoning the people and for breaking the wilderness camp and is then subsequently given instructions for their use in summoning the congregation and the heads of tribes (10:3–4), the breaking of the wilderness camp and the marching out of the camps (10:5–8), as a memorial in time of war (10:9), and over the burnt offerings and sacrifices on their “days of rejoicing” and festival days as a memorial before God (10:10).

Significantly, the general sequence and structure of the trumpet instructions presented in Num 10:3–10 is similar to that seen within the trumpet lists in 1QM.⁴⁹ First, in both we see trumpets used within a context of summoning either the whole congregation or just the leadership (cf. CD 11:22 and the use of “trumpets of assembly”). In Numbers 10:3–4, this is

⁴⁸ For consistency, trumpet names and inscriptions will follow Duhaime’s translation in PTSDSSP 2.

⁴⁹ Yadin broadly categorized the trumpets in 1QM as those considered ceremonial trumpets and those battle trumpets. The former consists of those described in 3:2–5 (the first portion of Yadin’s List B) and parallel to those in Num 10:2–8, while the latter consist of those described from the end of column 2–3:2a (Yadin’s List A), 3:6–10 (the latter portion of Yadin’s List B), and in 7:13 (Yadin’s List C). See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 90–99.

differentiated by the number of trumpets used: when both trumpets are blown the whole congregation is summoned to the tent of meeting, while if only one is blown, only the heads of the tribes of Israel are to be assembled. Within 1QM, these are differentiated using two distinct trumpets: one for summoning the congregation (3:2) and one for summoning the commanders (3:3). Furthermore, 1QM adds an additional trumpet, the “trumpets of the men of renown,” further associated with the “chiefs of the congregation when they gather in the house of meeting” (3:3–4).

Furthermore, in both, we find trumpets used within the context of the breaking and mobilization of the camp. In the case of Num 10, specific instructions are given on the process of breaking the wilderness camp. When an alarm (תְּרוּעָה) is blown, the eastern camps are to set out; when a “second alarm” (תְּרוּעָה שְׁנִיית) is blown, the southern camps are to set out (10:5–7).⁵⁰ The emphasis on the sounding of a תְּרוּעָה for the breaking of camp suggests that what is in view is the transition from a peaceful encampment to one of battle formation as they moved through the wilderness.⁵¹ Similarly, within 1QM we once again find two distinct trumpets: one described generically as the trumpets of the camp, which, in light of the corresponding inscription, proclaims the “Peace of God in the camps of his holy ones” (3:4–5) and a second specifically for the breaking of the camp (3:5–6). Importantly, similar to the sounding of the תְּרוּעָה in Num 10, these latter trumpets signaled a transition from a peaceful encampment to that of a war-like positioning, a connection made clear in the dual inscription on the trumpets of breaking in 3:5–6,

⁵⁰ The LXX adds a “third alarm” (σημασία) for setting out of the western camps and a “fourth alarm” for the northern camps.

⁵¹ Milgrom, *Numbers*, 74.

“Mighty deeds of God to scatter the enemy and put to flight all those who hate righteousness” and “Return of the mercies against those who hate God.”⁵²

Finally, both texts contain trumpets used within the context of battle. Notably, in Num 10:9, when the Israelites are to go to war against an oppressive adversary, they are to “sound an alarm with the trumpets” (וְהִרְעַתֶּם בְּחִצְצֹרוֹת). This signal serves as a memorial before God so that they might be saved from their enemies. It is here that within 1QM we encounter an expansive series of trumpets utilized for the tactical orchestration of the eschatological battle. These trumpets including the trumpets of the battle formations (סדרי המלחמה), the trumpets for summoning (מקרא), the trumpets of the alarm of the slain (תרועות החללים) or the trumpets of the slain (חללים), the trumpets of ambush (מארב), the trumpets of pursuit (מרדף), the trumpets of gathering (מאסף) or trumpets of return (משוב), and the trumpets of the way of return (דרך) (המשוב).⁵³ This series of trumpets reflects a significant innovation in 1QM over and against the singular war time alarm commencing warfare in Num 10:9. The influence of the narrative of the war between Abijah and Jeroboam in 2 Chr 13:3–21 on this series of trumpets should be noted as well.⁵⁴ Not only is the narrative of 2 Chr 13 the only location in the biblical tradition where priests are described as blowing trumpets in the midst of warfare, the text contains a significant cluster of linguistic connections with 1QM. In 2 Chr 13:12, God is referred to as being with the forces of Abijah at the head (בראש). The priests are said to possess “battle trumpets” (חִצְצֹרוֹת)

⁵² Yadin was the first to suggest a connection between this inscription and Num 10:35, “Arise, O LORD, let your enemies be scattered, and your foes flee before you.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 105 and 269. This suggestion has been followed by Carmignac, *Le Règle de la Guerre*, 49; Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 32; and Milgrom, *Numbers*, 73.

⁵³ The full description of these last trumpets is “the trumpets for the way of return (דרך המשוב) from battle with the enemy to come back to the congregation to Jerusalem” upon which they were to write the inscription, “Rejoicings of God in peaceful withdrawal” (3:10). This trumpet is differentiated from the trumpets of withdrawal (המשוב) in that the latter reflects a disengagement with the enemy while still on the battlefield, while the former reflects a subsequent return from the battlefield to Jerusalem. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 92–93.

⁵⁴ See Batsch, *La guerre et rites de guerre*, 219–20.

הַתְּרוּעָה in 13:12), the terms ambush (מֵאַרְב) and pursuit (רֹדֵף) are present in 13:13 and 13:19 respectively, and, finally, those gathered to Jeroboam are described as אֲנָשִׁים רָקִים בְּנֵי בְלִיעֵל (translated as “worthless scoundrels”) in 13:7.⁵⁵

The final trumpet mentioned in Num 10:10 is that which is blown over the burnt offerings and the sacrifices of well-being on “your days of rejoicing, at your appointed times, and at the beginnings of your months” (cf. Lev 23:24). This trumpet is unaccounted for within the text of 1QM. That said, 4QM^c (4Q493) 13 preserves a unique reference to “the trumpets of the Sabbaths” (הַשַּׁבָּתוֹת), a trumpet unattested in any other war manuscript. Following instructions for battle in lines 1–12, this reference belongs to a listing of trumpets which included inscriptions, as seen with the phrase “on the trumpets of the Sabbaths” (עַל חֲצוּצְרוֹת הַשַּׁבָּתוֹת) in line 13 and the preserved text of line 14, which reads, “[...] the daily offering and for the burnt offering it is written *tbw*[...]” Joseph Baumgarten has argued persuasively that these “Sabbath trumpets” correspond to this final category of trumpet in Num 10:10, that which is blown over the burnt offering and sacrifices of well-being.⁵⁶ Baumgarten summarized thus,

What can be posited with a high degree of probability is that the Sabbath trumpets in the Cave 4 version of the *War Scroll* were intended as a complement of the sacrifices, thus filling in what had until now been a lacuna in the elaboration of the biblical uses of the trumpets in 1QM.⁵⁷

This suggestion further strengthens, in my opinion, the connection between the trumpet instructions in Num 10 and the presence and usage of trumpets in the Qumran war tradition and

⁵⁵ The phrase בני בליעל or בן בליעל is fully or partially preserved four times in the Qumran corpus: 4QFlor (4Q174) 1–2 i 8; 4QBer^a (4Q286) 7 ii 6; 4QpsEzek^b (4Q386) 1 ii 3; and 11QapocPs (11Q11) 6:3. The phrase has also been reconstructed in 4QBeat (4Q525) 25 2. On the role of Belial in the Qumran corpus, see Michael Mach, “Demons,” *EDSS* 1:189–92.

⁵⁶ It should be noted that CD 11:22 also contains a reference to “the trumpets of assembly” (חֲצוּצְרוֹת הַקְּהָל), which are blown in connection with times of sacrifice.

⁵⁷ Baumgarten, “The Sabbath Trumpets,” 559.

can be construed as evidence that the trumpet instruction and their structure in Num 10:1–10 had a pivotal influence in the earliest literary stratum of the war tradition.

A brief word concerning the trumpet inscriptions is in order as they constitute an innovative feature in the war tradition and are instructive for understanding the eschatological worldview of the movement. The preponderance of the term אל for God in the trumpet inscriptions coupled with the references to “fixed times of God” (3:4) and “the appointed time of God” (3:7) imply that every aspect of the military campaign is not only conducted under the auspices of God, but also within a pre-determined temporal framework. Victory has been decreed and is assured. Just as God has been faithful to secure victory in the past, so too the “mighty deeds of God” (3:5) and “mighty hand of God” (3:8) on behalf of the movement in the present and future will result in anticipated victory.⁵⁸ The trumpet inscriptions also express the ethical and dualistic nature of the eschatological war.⁵⁹ Of particular note are the use of such phrases as “holy counsel” regarding the meeting of the men of renown (3:4) as well as the reference to “the camp of his holy ones” (3:5) which are juxtaposed with references to the enemy as “those who hate righteousness” (3:5–6), “those who hate God” (3:6), “the sons of darkness” (3:6, 9), “the slain of the unfaithfulness” (מעל in 3:8), and metonymically as “wickedness” (רשעה in 3:9). The trumpet inscriptions, therefore, envisage the community as the faithful and holy remnant of God to whom victory is assured, whereas the enemy is the antithesis: those who hate

⁵⁸ On the use of the “sacred past” in the war traditions, see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Eschatology and the Sacred Past in Serekh ha-Milhamah,” in *The Religious Worldviews Reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 28–30 May 2013*, eds. Ruth A. Clements, Menahem Kister, and Michael Segal, STDJ 127 (Brill: Leiden, 2018), 245–63.

⁵⁹ Davies understood this feature as signaling literary development within the trumpet inscriptions themselves. See Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 31–32.

righteousness and are unfaithful to God, ruled by darkness and wickedness, and the objects of God's vengeance and unceasing wrath "until they are destroyed" (3:9).

5.4.3 The Trumpets of Memorial

Thus far, there is one trumpet we have left unaddressed, namely, the trumpets of memorial. References to the trumpets of memorial (זכרון) are preserved in the trumpet list in 7:13, as well as within the battle-related instructions found in 16:3–4; 18:3–5a; and 4QM^c (4Q493) 2. Given the fact that the trumpets of memorial are preserved in only one of the two trumpet lists and in only one of the two battle-related instructions in 1QM, the identification of these trumpets has been a matter of some debate. Early commentators offered several different proposals regarding the identification of these trumpets.

Following from his assumption of a single author and attempting to provide a coherent framework to the trumpets, Yadin proposed that the trumpets of memorial should be equated with the trumpets of the battle formations (סדרי המלחמה in 3:1, 6).⁶⁰ Important, however, is 4QM^c (4Q493), a fragment that contains a reference to the trumpets of memorial (line 2) and to the trumpets of battle (המלחמה, line 3). This latter trumpet signals an advancement on the battle line of the enemy, a function similar to that which Yadin ascribed to the trumpets of battle formation.⁶¹ This suggests that, at least within the earliest literary stratum of the war tradition,

⁶⁰ This identification creates an inversion of sequence in 7:13, which lists the trumpets of memorial *after* the trumpets of summoning, whereas the trumpets of the battle formation in column 3 are listed *before* the trumpets of summoning. Yadin addresses this by theorizing that the trumpets of battle formations were blown both *before* and *after* the trumpet of summoning, the former to "array" the combatants and the latter to deploy them toward the enemy. Therefore, for Yadin, the listing in 7:13 is focused on sequence after the first sounding of the trumpets of the battle formations. Yadin notes that this identification is not without problems. First, it does not account for the memorial usage of trumpets in Num 10:9–10. Second, the usages of the trumpet of memorial in 16:2–4 and 18:3–4 are "vague." See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 97–99.

⁶¹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 96.

the trumpets of the battle formations (3:1, 6) are better equated with the trumpets of battle (4QM^c [4Q493] 3) and furthermore are distinct from the trumpets of memorial.⁶²

Bastiaan Jongeling, followed later by Brian Schultz, suggested that the trumpets of memorial should be equated with the trumpets of summoning.⁶³ For Jongeling, this correlation is supported by the inscription found on the trumpet of summoning, “Memorial of vengeance (זכרון נקם) at the appointed time of God” (3:7–8). Problematic for this suggestion, however, is the explicit reference to both the trumpet of memorial and the trumpet of summoning in the trumpet list of 7:13 and in the battle-related instructions in 16:3–4 and 12 (cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 11 ii 10). This implies that these trumpets should be seen as distinctly different from one another.⁶⁴

At the heart of these identifications is an attempt to correlate the trumpets of memorial with another named tactical trumpet within 1QM. This assumes some degree of coherence between the trumpet lists and their usage, a coherence which, as has been demonstrated convincingly by van der Ploeg, is difficult to substantiate.⁶⁵ It would therefore seem more fruitful in my estimation to conceive of the trumpets of memorial as separate and distinct. Subsequently, rather than functioning as a tactical trumpet, the trumpets of memorial should be conceptually understood as reflective of those blown in Num 10:9 as a memorial before God at the

⁶² Schultz likewise correlates the “trumpets of battle” in 4QM^c (4Q493) 3 with the “trumpets of the battle formation” in 1QM 3:1, 6. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 308.

⁶³ Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 338. Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 308. Milgrom likewise assumes the trumpets of memorial to be the same as the trumpets of summoning. See Milgrom, *Numbers*, 75.

⁶⁴ Concerning 7:13, Jongeling and Schultz suggest the solution lies in either some form of authorial confusion or error by the author or subsequent copyist, respectively. See Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 338. Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 308. While the proposal of an error or intervention in 7:13 is plausible, the same proposal seems less so concerning the explicit mention of the trumpets of memorial in 16:4 and the trumpets of summoning in 16:12 (cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 11 ii 10). It is difficult to envisage a situation in which a scribe would introduce the trumpets of memorial in 16:4, and not make the same alteration in 16:12. It seems more plausible, in my estimation, to suggest that the trumpets are to be understood as distinctly different in column 16.

⁶⁵ Van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 14–18.

commencement of warfare. This understanding of the trumpets of memorial more accurately reflects with their usage in 16:3–4 and 4QM^c (4Q493) 2.

After the chief priest recites the prayer for the appointed time of war from the “book of the rule of that time” (15:4–16:1) and following the full *vacat* line in line 2, we find instructions for the battle engagement with the Kittim:

³They shall act according to this entire rule [...] where they stand, in front of the camps of the Kittim. Then the priests shall blow (יתקעו) for them on the trumpets of ⁴memorial, the gates of the ba[ttle] shall open, and the skirmishers shall [m]arch out and take position in the columns between the lines. The priests shall blow for them ⁵the alarm of formation (תרועה סדר). The columns [...]ym at the sound of the trumpets until each man is stationed at his own position. The priests shall blow for them ⁶a second alarm (תרועה שנית) [...to en]gage, and when they stand near the line of the Kittim, within throwing range, each man shall raise his hand with ⁷his weapon. (16:3–7)⁶⁶

4QM^c (4Q493) preserves a similar text and reads:

The priests, the sons of Aaron, shall take up position in front of [the] lines ²and sound the trumpets of memorial. Afterward they shall open the g[at]es for the ³skirmishers. The priests shall blow the trumpets of battle (המלחמה) [...] hand against the line of ⁴the nations. (4Q493 1–4a)⁶⁷

Both 1QM 16:3–4 and 4QM^c (4Q493) 2 instruct that the trumpets of memorial should be sounded at the commencement of the battle, a usage similar to that of Num 10:9. The connection between these instructions in the war tradition and Num 10 is strengthened in that Num 10:9 and 4QM^c (4Q493) 2 share a similar linguistic cluster (והרעתם בחצצרות ונזכרתם in Num 10:9 and והריעו בחצצרות הזכרון in 4Q493 2). This similar linguistic cluster suggests that in the earliest stratum of tradition, the trumpets of memorial were not seen as tactical in nature but rather envisaged as fulfilling a similar function to that of Num 10:9, namely as trumpets sounded before the commencement of the battle as a memorial before God in order secure deliverance from their

⁶⁶ Translation taken from Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:129–30.

⁶⁷ Translation my own.

enemies. The residue of this function of the trumpets of memorial is still in view in the later textual tradition of 1QM 16:3–4.⁶⁸ What is significant, to my mind, is that the blowing of the trumpets of memorial, particularly in 4QM^c (4Q493), appears to function more on a ceremonial level for the commencement of engagement, rather than as a tactical signaling for the opening of the battle gates as has been suggested.⁶⁹

Furthermore, I would suggest that a similar ceremonial function for the trumpets of memorial appears in 18:3–4 where the trumpets are blown before the climactic moment of the war, the *herem* of the enemy.

¹[...] When the great hand of God is [rai]sed against Belial and against all [...] of his dominion in an everlasting slaughter ²[...] and the alarm of the holy ones when they pursue Asshur; the sons of Japhet will be falling down without recovery; the Kittim shall be crushed without ³[...] the upraising of the hand of the God of Israel against all the multitude of Belial. At that time, the priests shall blow (יריעו) ⁴[... the trum]pets of memorial; all the battle lines shall gather together towards them and they shall divide against all *m*[...of the K]ittim ⁵to annihilate them (להחרימם) [...] (18:1–5a).

While linked conceptually with the memorializing trumpets in Num 10:9, the usage of the trumpets of memorial here marks an innovation upon that tradition. Rather than sounded solely at the commencement of the battle, the trumpets of memorial are sounded here at the battle's climactic moment, the *herem* of the enemy, as a memorial before God. For the writer(s), the

⁶⁸ Davies was the first to propose that the trumpets of memorial belonged to the earliest stratum of 1QM. This suggestion seems to find support in 4Q493. See Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 75 and 94. Schultz sees 4Q493 as demonstrating a much less elaborate cycle of trumpet usage as compared to that of 1QM describing 4Q493 as “the most primitive extant account about how the priesthood is to lead the army with trumpet sounds.” See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 310. An important difference between 4Q493 2 and 1QM 16:3–4 should be highlighted, however. In 4Q493, the trumpets of memorial are utilized only at the commencement of warfare. After the gates have been opened, secondary and distinctly different trumpets, the trumpets of battle, are blown to signal, what can only be assumed, the deployment and engagement with the enemy. In 1QM 16:3–4, however, the deployment and engagement come after the alarm of formation and the second alarm, both of which are given on unspecified trumpets—and quite possibly on still on the trumpets of memorial although we cannot be certain.

⁶⁹ 4Q493 2 introduces the complex preposition אחריו כן (“afterward”) before יפתחו (“they shall open”) which does not appear in 1QM 16:4. This complex preposition functions adverbially and suggests a sense of sequential temporality, rather than signaling causality as is often taken to be the case with the construction in 1QM 16:3–4. See Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 221. Also, Bill T. Arnold and John H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 2d ed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 111.

calling for remembrance before God was not merely a necessity before engaging the enemy, but also as the army approached the final and climactic moment—the *herem* of the enemy.

In sum, given the prominent and distinctive use of the trumpets of memorial in the early tradition of 4QM^c (4Q493), coupled with their use at climactic moments in the battle in 1QM 16:3–4 and 18:3–5a, I suggest that it is better to situate their understanding with Num 10:9 in view. In this regard, the trumpets of memorial in the war tradition serve primarily a ceremonial function “to attract the attention of God,” as van der Ploeg correctly suggested, in the most critical and decisive moments of battle.⁷⁰ In other words, rather than fulfilling a tactical function, the trumpets of memorial were used to call upon God to remember the combatants not only at the moment of initial engagement with the enemy, but also at the climactic moment of their *herem*.

5.4.4 Trumpets and Memorialization in the War Tradition

As we have seen, the description and use of trumpets in the war traditions demonstrate a distinct reliance upon Num 10:1–10 and 2 Chr 13:12–14. In these texts, trumpets are utilized ceremonially as a means of remembrance before God before the initial engagement with the enemy (Num 10:9) or at a decisive moment within the battle (2 Chr 13:12–14) to attract the attention of God and so be saved from the enemy.⁷¹ A similar function of trumpets is seen in the Maccabean tradition (cf. 1 Macc 3:54; 4:12–14) as we have seen.

The presence and usage of trumpets in the earliest stratum of the Qumran war tradition, I would suggest, function within a similar framework. That this is in view of the writer(s) of 1QM

⁷⁰ Van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 118.

⁷¹ Bezalel Bar-Kochva similarly described the pre-battle blowing of the trumpets in Num 10:9 as serving to “stir the Deity into providing help.” See Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus*, 255. Cf. m. Ta’an. 3:7.

is evidenced by the direct quotation of Num 10:9 in in 1QM 10:6–8.⁷² The presence of this quotation in connection with the mustering and strengthening of the army for war is highly suggestive that the overarching framework of memorial is central in the mind of the writer(s). This seems to indicate that in the earliest stratum of the tradition preserved in 4QM^c (4Q493), we see the trumpets of memorial functioning in harmony with what we find in Num 10:9. The distinct expansion of the tactical signals in the war tradition suggests a secondary growth in the tradition, as we have seen, potentially influenced by the battle account of 2 Chr 13 and plausibly by the knowledge of similar tactical signaling within Greco-Roman military tradition.⁷³

The reader or audience encountering this text would undoubtedly have been reminded of the trumpet instructions of Num 10:1–10. Moreover, they would have been reminded of Israel’s past battles, such as Num 31, Josh 6, and 2 Chr 13, where the presence and usage of trumpets by the priesthood played a memorializing role in securing divine assistance and victory over their enemies. Just as God remembered and was faithful to those in the past, so too God would remember the faithful remnant in the present. Finally, through the mimicry of tactical signaling of the Greco-Roman military tradition they would have felt prepared and equipped to bring about the defeat of the forces of Belial.

Given the most probable date for the composition of 1 Maccabees as the last decade of the second century BCE to the first decades of the first century BCE,⁷⁴ thus making 1 Maccabees

⁷² The quotation of Num 10:9 in 1QM 10:6–8 has affinities with the MT with minor variants but demonstrates the presence of plenary spelling and long endings often evidenced in writings in the Qumran corpus. Of note, however, is the absence of the tetragrammaton at the end of line 7. This is typical of 1QM, which avoids using the tetragrammaton and, outside of quotation, prefers the term לַאֱלֹהִים for God.

⁷³ On the connection between the 1QM and Greco-Roman tactical treaties, see Jean Duhaime, “The *War Scroll* from Qumran,” 133–51.

⁷⁴ Daniel R. Schwartz, *1 Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 41B (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2022), 8. Jonathan Goldstein suggests the date of composition as during the early reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE), no later than 90 BCE. See Jonathan A. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees: A New Translation, with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 41 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 62–64.

roughly contemporary with 4QM^c (4Q493), the tradition of the use of trumpets as a memorial before God in times of war appears to still be a vibrant component within military tradition at that time. Moreover, it can be argued that the Jewish tradition underwent a certain degree of expansion in the latter second century or early first century BCE, potentially in connection with the knowledge of the tactical use of trumpets within Greco-Roman military practice as preserved in ancient sources such as Xenophon, Aeneas, Asclepiodotus, Onasander, and Josephus.⁷⁵ While the Maccabees tradition demonstrates only slight innovation over that seen in Num 10 and 2 Chr 13, the Qumran war tradition evidences a significant innovation while maintaining the core ceremonial framework.

5.5 The Rule of the Standards in the War Tradition

The use of standards within a distinctly martial context is unknown in the biblical tradition. Their use is, however, explicitly found within the wilderness narrative of Num 1–10 regarding the organizational structure of the people of God as they travel through the wilderness. The presence of the description of the standards in the Qumran war tradition is significant as it demonstrates the adaptation and redeployment of the wilderness motif within the setting of the eschatological battle. On the one hand, in adapting this tradition the writer envisages the organization and preparation in the wilderness as a sort of military campaign. On the other, the redeployment of the tradition sees the war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness through the lens of the wilderness generation traveling toward the goal of conquest of the Promised Land. This is not to say that the writer was not knowledgeable about the use of standards within a wider military context such as the Roman use of military standards, a topic to which we will return later in the

⁷⁵ See section 6.4.1.

discussion. As we will suggest, however, the use of standards in the Qumran war tradition is principally influenced by the wilderness biblical tradition and only secondarily by the potential knowledge of Greco-Roman military practices.

5.5.1 The Rule of the Standards in the *War Scroll* (1QM 2:16–3:11)

Following a similar sequence of sub-sections as in Num 10, immediately following the section addressing the usage of trumpets in 1QM 2:16–3:11 comes a lengthy description of standards extending from 3:13 to the end of column 4.⁷⁶ Following the *vacat* in line 12, this section is introduced with a heading, “The rule of the standards of the whole congregation according to their enrollment” (סרך אותות כול העדה למסורות).⁷⁷ The subsequent material consists of five sections including: 1) a description of the standards of the congregation, including their division into subgroups and their respective inscriptions (3:13–end); 2) a description of the standards of the tribes of Levi (end 3–4:5), of which only the tribe of Merari is preserved; 3) a listing of the inscriptions upon the standards for three phases of war on four distinct standards (4:6–8); 4) a listing of the inscriptions upon eight distinct standards for the same three phases of war (4:9–14); and 5) an accounting of the length of the standards of the whole congregation (4:15–end). The

⁷⁶ The most robust engagement with the rule of the standards continues to be Yadin’s chapter on “The Banners of the Congregation and its Organization” in *The Scroll of the War*, 38–64. See also, van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 81–86; Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 33–35; and Batsch, *La guerre et rites de guerre*, 224–35.

⁷⁷ The term מסורות occurs only here 3:13 and in the trumpet listing in 3:3. Most commentators (such as Yadin, van der Ploeg, Jongeling, Davies, and Duhaime) render this term in both locations as “formations” (or “enrollment” as is the case for Duhaime in PTSDDSP 2) in reference to military units or subgroups. Carmignac renders this term in 1QM 3:3 as “les trompettes des (hommes des) recitations” and in 3:13 as “pour leurs citations.” See Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 46 and 54. Dupont-Sommer, later followed by Batsch, however, renders this term in both locations as “transmission” thus highlighting a communicative function for both the trumpets and the standards. See Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, 174 and Batsch, *La guerre et les rites de guerre*, 232–33. Given the lack of use of the standards in battle descriptions and the term used here as an introduction of hierarchical divisions, the former rendering seems much more plausible to my mind.

lists are demarcated by *vacats* preserved at the end of lines 5, 8, and 14 in column 4 and by sectional headers in 4:9 and 15.

The first two sections address the standards of the whole congregation and those of the tribes of Levi and are influenced by several locations in the Israelite wilderness tradition, most notably Exod 28:9–10 and Num 2.⁷⁸ Upon the great standard, over the entire congregation, is written “People of God” along with the names of Israel and Aaron and the twelve tribes according to their birth order (cf. Exod 28:9–10). The twelve tribes are then divided into four camps consisting of three tribes each with the Levites encamped separately (cf. Num 2:32–33). The whole congregation is divided into eight subgroups: the whole congregation, the camp of three tribes, the tribe, the myriad, the thousands, the hundreds, the fifties, and the tens. The Levitical clans are divided into subgroups according to clan, including the Kohathites, the Gershonites, the Merarites, and a fourth subgroup, which Yadin has convincingly demonstrated as being the sons of Aaron, arguing that the entire arrangement of the whole congregation and the Levitical clans set forth here mirrors the wilderness camp surrounding the tabernacle in Num 3.⁷⁹ The standard of Merari, inscribed with “Offering of God,” is the only preserved description (4:1), while the other three are presumably described at the end of column 3, each of which most likely contained a distinct standard inscription.⁸⁰ Each of the Levitical clans are then subdivided into thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens with the standard of each subsection in each of the clans containing the same inscription (4:1–5).

The third section (4:6–8) contains a description of three sets of four inscriptions, one set for a different phase of the battle: “when they go to battle” (4:6), “when they draw near for

⁷⁸ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 44–45.

⁷⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 53–57. Cf. Num 3:23, 29, 35, and 38.

⁸⁰ Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 33.

battle” (4:7), and “when they withdraw from battle” (4:8). The question as to which standards these apply has been a matter of debate. André Dupont-Sommer suggested that these apply to the subdivisions of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens as these would represent tactical divisions in battle.⁸¹ Yadin, however, understood these inscriptions as applying to the standards of the four Levitical clan divisions since the subsequent section applies explicitly to the eight divisions of the standards of the congregation.⁸² Davies proposed that these sets of four inscriptions and the subsequent list of eight inscriptions represent two variant traditions regarding the number of lay standards, the first of which was altered by the compiler to refer to the four Levitical clans to avoid confusion and “to balance levitical and lay inscriptions.”⁸³ Given that the eight inscriptions in 4:9–14 are explicitly described as belonging to the standards of the congregation, it seems best to see these as referring to the four Levitical clans, following Yadin. That said, Davies’ suggestion of variant traditions and textual development should not be dismissed.

5.5.2 The War Standards and Their Inscriptions

The focus of the rule of the standards is upon their inscriptions of which there are two distinct categories: those inscriptions which are fixed upon a particular standard and those which change depending on the phase of the battle. The basic fixed inscription seemingly consisted of three elements: 1) a two-word slogan indicating the character of the grouping, including the term אַל

⁸¹ Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings of Qumran*, 176. Dupont-Sommer additionally rejects the reading of מררי in 4:1 as referring to Merari. Rather, he reads this as referring to the myriad and thus bringing it in line with the descriptions of the thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. See Dupont-Sommer, “Règlement de la Guerre,” 41 and *The Essene Writings of Qumran*, 175. Yadin, however, has demonstrated that the family or clan should be envisaged as being equivalent with the myriad. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 49–53. The reading of “Merari” here should therefore be accepted.

⁸² Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 53–57. See also van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 84–85.

⁸³ Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 33–34.

for God and as *nomen rectum*,⁸⁴ of which only three are preserved in the text: עַם אֱלֹהִים (“People of God” in 3:13), נִס אֱלֹהִים (“Ensign of God” in 3:15), and תְּרוֹמַת אֱלֹהִים (“Offering of God” in 4:1); 2) the name of the leader of the particular division, whether a prince or commander; and 3) the name of the commanders of the subdivisions under the command of the leader.⁸⁵ The standards of the subdivisions of the thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens associated with the Levitical clans appear to have had an expanded, fixed inscription as well as the name of the commander of the specific subdivision and those of the commanders under his instruction (4:1–5).⁸⁶

According to the rule of the standards, a variable inscription is also included on the standards, which changed according to the phase of the battle: “when they go in battle,” “when they draw near for battle,” and “when they withdraw from battle.” As with the fixed inscriptions, these variable inscriptions are in the form of a two-word slogan including the term אֱלֹהִים, as well as some variation of “the whole list of their names.”

Yadin has noted a thematic element to the variable descriptions in each of their distinct phases, which correspond to the character of the phase.⁸⁷ The inscriptions associated with going to battle have two functions: inscriptions on the standards of the whole congregation indicate the divisions according to their tribal affinity (congregation, camps, tribes, families, etc.), thus keeping order according to military unit (4:9–11); inscriptions associated with the Levitical clans

⁸⁴ On compound phrases with אֱלֹהִים as *nomen rectum* in IQS and the significance, see Charlotte Hempel, “The Long Text of the *Serekh* as Crisis Literature,” *RevQ* 27 (2015): 3–23, esp. 12–16.

⁸⁵ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 54.

⁸⁶ These additional fixed inscriptions are as follows: “Wrath of God in outbursts toward Belial and against all the men of his lot without any remnant” on the standard of the thousands (4:1–2), “From God a hand of war against all flesh of deceit” on the standards of the hundreds (4:2–3), “They have ceased to stand, the wicked ones, [by] the might of God” on the standards of the fifties (4:3–4), and “Jubilations of God upon the ten-stringed harp” on the standards of the tens (4:4–5). Davies has argued that these expansions reflect glosses, whether ethical or dualistic in quality. See Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 34–35.

⁸⁷ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 57–59.

highlight the justification for the war (4:6).⁸⁸ Inscriptions linked with drawing near in battle are hortatory in nature, highlighting the war as belonging to God and that victory will come through the help of God (4:7, 11–13).⁸⁹ Finally, the inscriptions connected to the withdrawal from battle highlight the praise offered to God in joyful thanksgiving for God’s help in securing the victory (4:8, 13–14).⁹⁰ Taken in sum, the standard inscriptions offer a specific exhortation, namely that every facet of the battle belongs to God and that victory over the forces of Belial is pre-ordained and assured. God will be their helper and support and is worthy of all praise and adoration for the ensuing victory. The act of inscribing religious slogans upon both the trumpets and the standards warrants further investigation regarding the potential actualizing significance of the written word beyond that of mere inscription.⁹¹

5.5.3 Standards in the Wilderness Tradition

The rule of the standards in 1QM 3–4 outlined above is directly connected with the instructions for the mobilization of the tribes of Israel found in the wilderness tradition of Numbers, specifically Num 2 and 10. Several overarching observations deserve mention here.

First, there is a significantly similar constellation of linguistic terms between what we find in the biblical wilderness tradition and in 1QM 3–4. In describing the organization and mobilization of the Israelite wilderness camp in Num 2:2 we read, “The Israelites shall camp

⁸⁸ These latter inscriptions include: “Truth of God,” “Righteousness of God,” “Glory of God,” and “Judgment of God.”

⁸⁹ The inscriptions on the eight standards of the whole congregation read: “Battle of God,” “Vengeance of God,” “Strife of God,” “Requital of God,” “Power of God,” “Retribution of God,” “Might of God,” and “Destruction by God of every nation of vanity,” while on the standards of the four Levitical clans are: “Right hand of God,” “Appointed Time of God,” “Panic of God,” and “Slain of God.”

⁹⁰ These include “Deliverances of God,” “Victory of God,” “Help of God,” “Support of God,” “Joy of God,” “Thanksgiving to God,” “Praise to God,” and “Peace of God” on the eight standards of the whole congregation and “Exalt God,” “Magnify God,” “Praise of God,” and “Glory of God” on the standards of the four Levitical clans.

⁹¹ See Jack Goody, *The Power of the Written Tradition*, SSEI (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000).

each in their respective regiments (לַגִּדִּי), under the ensigns (תֹּזֶה) by their ancestral houses; they shall camp facing the tent of meeting on every side.” The passage goes on to describe the organizational structure and mobilization order of the tribes surrounding the tent of meeting.

The term לַגִּדִּי here denotes a battalion or a company of troops, as we see also in Num 1:52. This same term and usage is widely used in 1QM to designate military divisions or a battalion or company of troops.⁹² The term תֹּזֶה, rendered “ensign” in Num 2:2, is normally rendered as a “sign” more broadly in the Hebrew Bible.⁹³ There, an תֹּזֶה typically serves as a reminder or memorial to the Israelites (cf. Gen 9:12, 13, 17; 17:11; Exod 13:9, 16; 31:13, 17; Num 17:3; Josh 4:6; Ezek 10:12, 20, Isa 19:20; 55:13), as a token or proof to the Israelites (cf. Exod 3:12; Deut 13:2, 3; 28:46; Josh 2:12; Judg 6:17; 1 Sam 2:34; 10:7, 9; 14:10; Isa 7:11, 14; 8:18; Jer 44:29), or as a portent concerning the future (cf. 2 Kgs 19:29 // Isa 37:30; 2 Kgs 20:8 // Isa 38:22; 20:9 // Isa 38:7; Isa 20:3). The term also can refer to a miraculous event, one which arises from some form of divine action (cf. Exod 4:8–9, 17, 28; 4:30; 7:3; 8:19; 10:1–2; Num 14:11, 22; Deut 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 11:3; 26:8; 29:2; 34:11; Josh 24:17; Jer 32:20–21). An תֹּזֶה is also used to refer to a marker of seasons (cf. Gen 1:14). Central to these occurrences of תֹּזֶה is the idea of a natural phenomenon or event, which serves as a “sign” to the people regarding a certain promise of God, a future reality, or a marker of time or season. It is this latter sense that we see conveyed in 1QS 10:4; 4QPrQuot (4Q503) 51:14; 64:4; 1QH 12:8; 4QJub^b (4Q217) 6:7; and in 4QOtot (4Q319) 1:11–12; 2:5; 3:8.

⁹² “לַגִּדִּי,” *DCH* 2:415. Cf. 1QM 1:14; 3:6; 4:10; 5:3; 6:1, 4, 5; 8:4, 14; 9:4, 10; 17:10. לַגִּדִּי is, however, used in the sense of a banner in Ps 20:6 and Song 2:4.

⁹³ For a discussion of the term תֹּזֶה, see “תֹּזֶה,” *DCH* 1:165–67.

Significantly, however, there are two occurrences of the term in the Hebrew Bible both of which are rendered as “standard” or “ensign” (Num 2:2; Ps 74:4).⁹⁴ In Num 2:2, as we have seen, the term refers to the standards or banners that are associated with specific groupings of the tribes of Israel. In Ps 74:4, the term is associated with an enemy military force: “Your foes have roared within your holy place; they have set up their emblems (אֹתֹתָם) there” [cf. 1QpHab 6:4, “they [the Kittim] sacrifice to their standards (לְאוֹתוֹתָם)]. It is this usage of אֹת that we find in the Qumran war tradition, with the term partially or fully preserved twenty-six times within 1QM 3–4.⁹⁵

Following the trumpet instructions in verses 1–10, Num 10:11–28 describes the mobilization of the Israelite tribes from the wilderness of Sinai to the wilderness of Paran according to the instructions given in Num 2. The same formula occurs with each mobilization: “The standard (דָגֶל) of the camp of X” sets out “company by company (צָבָא),” each company (צָבָא) under the leadership of a specific individual. Here, the term דָגֶל can plausibly be rendered as “standard.”⁹⁶ It is noteworthy that each of the camps in Num 10:11–28 is referred to as a צָבָא, or company—the same term employed in 1QM to describe the military units. The use of the terms דָגֶל, אֹת, and צָבָא in the wilderness tradition of Num 2 and 10 thus portray the Israelites as moving through the wilderness as a military force. This same concentration of terms is also found in 1QM fostering a strong allusive connection between the Qumran war tradition and the wilderness tradition of Numbers.

⁹⁴ “אֹת,” *DCH* 1:166.

⁹⁵ Cf. 1QM 3:13, 14, 15, 17; 4:1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, and 17. The term can potentially be reconstructed in 4QM^a i 2.

⁹⁶ See “דָגֶל,” *DCH* 2:415.

Second, there are significant structural similarities between Num 10 and 1QM. Numbers 10 begins with instructions on the use of trumpets (vv. 1–10) and is then followed by the mobilization of the tribes of Israel from the wilderness of Sinai to the wilderness of Paran (vv. 11–28) in which standards play a central role. A similar sequence of subsections can be seen in 1QM with the instructions on the trumpets (2:16–3:11) followed by the rule of standards (3:13 to the end of column 4). This structural similarity as well as the similar constellation of linguistic terms is highly suggestive that Num 2 and 10 lies behind the trumpet instructions and the rule of the standards in columns 2–4 and thus framed the war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness within the wider framework of the wilderness preparation narratives of Num 1–10.

5.5.4 The Mimetic Function of the Qumran War Standards

As previously noted, outside of the reference to standards in Num 2:2 there is no mention in the Hebrew Bible of the use of standards for organizational or military purposes. That said, the widespread use of standards on the battlefield in antiquity has been documented. Both Herodotus and Xenophon reference the use of standards on the battlefield by the Persians.⁹⁷ The degree to which the use of military standards in the Qumran war tradition is indebted to the Roman use of military standards remains an open question.

The use of military standards by the Roman army is well documented.⁹⁸ *Signa* were used for the organization of military units as well as to provide a physical expression of corporate identity and unit cohesion. Tacitus noted that during the military revolt in 14 CE, a show of unity

⁹⁷ See *Hist.* 9.52.2 and *Anab.* 1.10.12–13, respectively.

⁹⁸ On the Roman army use of military standards, see Goldsworthy, *The Roman Army at War*, 252–56; Brian Campbell, *Warfare and Society in Imperial Rome: 31 BC–AD 284* (London: Routledge, 2002), 36–38 and 45; and Catherine M. Gilliver, “Chapter 4: Battle,” in *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, Volume II: Rome from the Late Republic to the Late Empire*, eds. Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees, and Michael Whitby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 137–38.

was expressed by “planting the three eagles and the standards of the cohorts side-by-side” (*Ann.* 1.18). Standards also provided a focal point of courage for the Roman troops as they went into battle and as an omen to the enemy. In describing the organization of the Roman army advancing into Galilee under Vespasian, Josephus noted:

Next, the ensigns surrounding the eagle, which in the Roman army precedes every legion, because it is the king and bravest of all the birds: it is regarded by them as the symbol of empire, and, whoever may be their adversaries, an omen of victory. These sacred emblems were followed by the trumpeters, and behind them came the solid column, marching six abreast (*J.W.* 3:123–124 [Thackeray, LCL]).⁹⁹

Standards were used as a means of encouragement for the Roman army. To lose a standard to the enemy in battle was considered a great disgrace, while the capture of enemy standards was considered a sign of military success.¹⁰⁰ In Cerialis’ charge to the legions under his command before engaging the Germanic troops in battle told the Second Legion that they “would dedicate their new standards, and their new eagle” (*Hist.* 5.16 [Moore, LCL]). Josephus records how Titus at the triumph after the destruction of Jerusalem lauded those who acted with valor on the battlefield, lavishing them with golden crowns, neck-chains, spears, and “standards made of silver” (*J.W.* 7.13–14 [Thackeray, LCL]).

Significantly, military standards were imbued with a religious quality, even considered divine and the object of worship.¹⁰¹ Josephus mentioned how at the fall of Jerusalem the Roman troops “carried their standards into the temple court and, setting them up opposite the eastern gate, there sacrificed to them, and with rousing acclamations hailed Titus as imperator” (*J.W.* 6.316 [Thackeray, LCL]). Tertullian, writing near the end of the 2nd century CE, commented, “Among the Romans, the whole of the soldier’s religion is to venerate the standards, swear by

⁹⁹ Josephus offers a similar description of the Roman army advancing into Judea under Titus in *J.W.* 5.48.

¹⁰⁰ See Campbell, *Warfare and Society*, 38 and Goldsworthy, *The Roman Army at War*, 253.

¹⁰¹ On military standards as religious objects, see Jonathan P. Roth, *Roman Warfare*, CIRC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 66 and 183.

the standards, and set the standards before all the gods” (*Apol.* 16.8 [Glover, LCL]). The worship of military standards is likewise mentioned in *Pesher Habakkuk*, a text dated roughly contemporaneous with 1QM, where in a *pesher* of Hab 1:16 we read, “Its interpretation is that they [the Kittim] sacrifice to their standards (לאותותם), and the weapons of their wars are the object of their reverence” (1QpHab 6:3–5).¹⁰² This reference seems to not only corroborate Josephus’ account, but also suggests that those in the Qumran movement had some tacit knowledge of Roman usage of military standards and their religious veneration.

As Yadin first suggested, the use of standards in the Qumran war tradition differs from that of the Roman army.¹⁰³ This is not to say that there are no parallels, however. Both attach an organizational element to the use of standards. Both can be understood as having a motivational affect upon military combatants. Finally, both have a distinctly religious quality to them, albeit with differing expressions. For the Romans, their standards were incorporated within the context of worship in thanksgiving for military victory and seemingly became the focus of the religious veneration. In 1QM, the standards themselves are never the object of religious veneration, but rather the religious nature is captured in the theologically oriented inscriptions. What seemed foremost in the mind of the transmitters of the Qumran war tradition is the redeployment of standards within the wilderness preparation motif. That said, the notion of some mimicry of the Roman military usage of standards should not be dismissed. While the use of the standards in the *War Scroll* is more closely allied to the wilderness narrative of Num 1–10, as we have

¹⁰² Translation from Lim. *The Earliest Commentary*, 84.

¹⁰³ Yadin suggested the following, “It appears that the development of the use of banners in Israel and in Rome went along different and opposite lines: in the Roman army the use of banners at the outset was mainly for military and tactical purposes and in the end it changed to an object of worship and religious adoration, while in Israel (and similarly in several other eastern nations) the process was probably reversed.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 63.

demonstrated, this does not preclude some mimetic appropriation of power or prestige in the *War Scroll*.¹⁰⁴

5.5.5 The Division of the Standards and the Wilderness Motif

One final aspect of the standards requires brief comment: the division of the standards into thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (1QM 4:1–5). This division is connected to the wilderness organization in Exod 18:17–26 attributed to Jethro for the administration of justice for the people, a tradition that reappears in a number of locations within the Hebrew Bible for both administration and military organization.¹⁰⁵ The division of a military force into thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens is likewise ascribed to the forces of Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 3:55; cf. *Ant.* 12.301) and is implied in Josephus' description of the organization of his own army (*J.W.* 2.578).¹⁰⁶ The same hierarchical schema for military organization is also preserved within other texts in the Qumran corpus: for the conscription of the troops on the day the king is crowned in 11QT^a 57:4–5, the organization of the army in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 10, and in 4QM^f (4Q496) 16 5, a parallel reading of 1QM 4:1–5.¹⁰⁷

Significantly, a similar organizing principle is reflected in the organization of the Qumran movement more broadly. The *Damascus Document* prescribes that those who live in camps “in the time of wickedness until the Messiah of Aaron and Israel arises (shall form groups) of at least

¹⁰⁴ On mimicry of dominant cultural practices as appropriation, see Cynthia Baker, “When Jews were Women,” *HR* 45 (2005): 114–34. For a discussion of the significance of the Roman conquest on the Qumran movement, see Nadav Sharon, “The *Kittim* and the Significance of the Roman Conquest for the Qumran Community,” in *Judea Under Roman Domination: The First Generation of Statelessness and Its Legacy*, EJM 46 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 171–207, esp. 197–207.

¹⁰⁵ See Deut 1:15 and shortened versions of “thousands” and “hundreds” in Num 31:14, 48, 52, 54; 1 Sam 22:7; 2 Sam 18:1, 4; 1 Chr 13:1; 26:26; 27:1; 28:1; 29:6; 2 Chr 1:2; 25:5 and “thousands” and “fifties” in 1 Sam 8:12. Cf. 1 Sam 29:2 where the Philistines are described as passing by in divisions of “hundreds” and “thousands.”

¹⁰⁶ It is worth noting that Josephus does not explicitly mention a “commander of fifties” in his description, but based upon the commanders of tens, hundreds, and thousands Josephus could have this four-part schema in mind.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. 11QT^a 21:0; 22:2; 42:15 for administrative organization.

ten men by thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens” (CD 12:23–13:2).¹⁰⁸ Similarly, 1QS 2:21–23 prescribes that during the annual procession all the people should organize themselves “according to their thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens so that every Israelite may know his own position in the community of God according to the eternal scheme.”¹⁰⁹

The above descriptions, closely resembling the description of the divisions of the standards, suggest that such an organizing principle potentially played a larger and more central role in the construction of the identity and its self-presentation within the Qumran movement.¹¹⁰ Modeled after the division of the Israelites in the wilderness, as we have seen, this organizational schema fosters a connection between the Qumran movement and the wilderness motif preserved in the priestly tradition. As with the Israelites who experienced the revelation of God at Sinai, the Qumran movement envisaged themselves as the recipients and transmitters of divine revelation in the wilderness in the tradition of Moses. The wilderness, therefore, becomes an embodiment of idyllic and utopian perfection. Returning to the wilderness represented a re-living of Sinai and a potential redemption of the disobedience of the first wilderness generation (cf. 1QS 8:8–10; 4QS^d [4Q258] 6; 4QS^e [4Q259] 2).¹¹¹

In identifying themselves with the wilderness generation, the writer(s) presented the original wilderness generation, in spite of their disobedience, as a prototype and envisaged their re-entry into the wilderness as a means of fulfilling the original covenantal relationship between God and the chosen people.¹¹² In this light, the hierarchical scheme of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens as a literary phenomenon invites the reader or audience to see themselves as the

¹⁰⁸ Translation from Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 107.

¹⁰⁹ Translation from Hempel in *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 72.

¹¹⁰ On the social construction of identity within the Qumran movement, see Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*.

¹¹¹ See Schofield, “The Wilderness Motif;” Schofield “Wilderness,” EDEJ, 1337–38. Also, Hindy Najman who suggests the wilderness envisaged as a place of revelation in ancient Judaism. See “Towards a Study.”

¹¹² Schofield, “The Wilderness Motif,” 50–53.

continuance of the wilderness generation as they strive to live in obedience to their divinely revealed interpretation of the Torah under the leadership of a Moses-like figure, the Teacher of Righteousness. As a reconstituted wilderness generation, the Qumran movement would play a central role in the return of God's glory to Israel as their study of Torah was a means of "preparing the way of the LORD" in the wilderness (cf. Isa 40:3; 1QS 8:13–16; 9:19b–21).¹¹³ Just as Isa 40:3 describes the triumphal return of the Babylonian exiles with their God through the desert to Jerusalem, so too the Qumran movement saw themselves as a part of a triumphal return of God to Jerusalem. This same self-understanding is likewise present in the war traditions as seen in the description of the sons of light as we have seen in 1QM 1:2–3.

5.6 Conclusion: Wilderness and Warfare

We began this chapter with Talmon's suggestion that rather than embrace the wilderness motif as disobedience and punishment, central to the Qumran movement was the wilderness motif as *transition-and-preparation*. Subsequently, the wilderness was deemed a locus of purification and preparation for the achievement of a new goal, which Talmon described as "the future conquest of Jerusalem and of the Land of Israel, which still lies ahead of them."¹¹⁴ It has been our contention in this chapter is that this understanding of the wilderness motif plays a central role within the Qumran war tradition and accounts for the presence of elements fostering allusion to the wilderness preparation narratives of Numbers. For the transmitters of the Qumran war

¹¹³ See Dimant, "Not Exile in the Desert." Alison Schofield has described the wilderness as "the site where their imagined utopian space met lived space, an intersection best understood as a heterotopia." See Alison Schofield, "Re-Placing Priestly Space: The Wilderness as Heterotopia in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, eds. Eric Mason et al., JSJSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012) 1:490.

¹¹⁴ Talmon, "The 'Desert Motif,'" 247.

tradition, the final battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness was a re-entry into the land from exile in the wilderness.

The aim of this chapter was to examine elements of the Qumran war tradition that demonstrate a marked connection with the wilderness preparation narratives. First, we observed that in the first lines of 1QM the sons of light are envisaged as returning from a time of purification and preparation in the “wilderness of the nations” to the “wilderness of Jerusalem” to wage war against the sons of darkness and the forces of Belial. Here, this first phase of the war, according to 1QM 1–2, includes the re-entry into and re-occupation of Jerusalem and the re-institution of properly conducted Temple service (cf. 2:1–6). As we saw in the last chapter, this re-institution has cosmological significance as it constitutes the first step in setting aright the cosmos. Second, we considered the usage of trumpets in the Qumran war tradition, concluding that the rule of the trumpets is predominantly indebted to the wilderness preparation narrative of Num 10:1–10. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that in its earliest stratum, the war tradition shows the usage of trumpets as reflecting the ceremonial function of remembrance as denoted in Num 10:10, revealing a deep connection with the wilderness preparation narrative early in the tradition. It was additionally argued that the later war tradition evidences a significant innovation regarding the tactical usage of trumpets while still maintaining the core ceremonial framework. Third, the use of standards in the *War Scroll*, including their inscriptions, was argued as deriving from the preparation narratives of Num 2 and 10. Moreover, we suggested that the inscriptions serve a similar function to that of the trumpet inscriptions, namely, as theologically oriented slogans meant to convey remembrance before God as well as an exhortation to the combatants as they engaged the enemy. This represents a distinct innovation in the Qumran war tradition.

As Talmon aptly noted, for the Qumran movement the wilderness was not envisaged as the goal itself, but rather as a means of passage towards the goal: a triumphal return to Jerusalem. The redeployment of the wilderness *transition-and-preparation* motif within the Qumran war tradition, more specifically, frames the battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness as a type of re-entry into the land. Just as the previous wilderness generation experienced the desert as a place of preparation before entry into the land, so too the Qumran movement saw itself as living as “exiles in the wilderness” in preparation for their triumphal re-entry into the land. In the next chapter we will suggest that for the writers and transmitters of the Qumran war tradition the re-entry into Jerusalem from the wilderness was just the beginning of the final conflict between the sons of light and the sons of darkness. The eventual goal was the purification of the land from the defilement of the sons of darkness and the forces of Belial. Here, as we will see, the Qumran war tradition is indebted to the Joshua tradition, a tradition that we know held great interest for the Qumran movement. However, whereas the conquest narratives of Joshua are concerned with the purification of the land from the defilement of the Canaanites on an earthly scale, the Qumran war tradition is concerned with the purification of the land from the pollution of the wicked on a more cosmological scale. For the collectors and transmitters of the Qumran tradition, the cosmological purification of the land from the defilement of the works of the sons of darkness and the forces of Belial would be the final act in the ushering in the eschaton.

CHAPTER 6 – THE USE OF JOSHUA IN THE WAR TRADITION

6.1 Introduction

The extensive reliance in the Qumran war tradition upon traditions and motifs contained in the Hebrew Bible, such as we saw in the last chapter regarding the wilderness motif, is without question. Specifically, the influence the books of Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Psalms have had on the Qumran war tradition has been well documented.¹ As Jean Duhaime has noted, those who shaped and transmitted the war tradition found in the texts of various scriptural traditions a wealth of imagery and motifs by which to frame their vision of the eschatological struggle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness.² The writers found within these texts instructions and regulations that would ensure the eschatological battle would be properly conducted. They drew upon the inherited traditions of holy war and God as holy warrior to present the assured victory of the sons of light as the work of God's mighty hand. Thus, the inherited scriptural traditions exerted a sizable influence upon the shaping of the Qumran war tradition.

¹ Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament," 234–60, 375–90; Dean O. Wenthe, "The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM," *DSD* 5 (1998): 290–319; Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, JAJSup 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 321–27. Specifically on the connection between Daniel and 1QM, see Alfred Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*, SBM 12 (Stuttgart: Echter, 1971), 78–83; 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): 596–612; G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in the Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John* (New York: University Press of America, 1984), 42–66; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 91–102; 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*, eds. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Martilla, BZAW 419 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 223–45.

² Jean Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2:88.

Interestingly, the influence of the book of Joshua, the quintessential “holy war” tradition, on the Qumran war tradition has often been left under-examined.³ This is surprising given the amount of potential thematic connection between the two traditions.⁴ The aim of this chapter is to explore the linguistic and allusive connections between the conquest narratives of the book of Joshua and the Qumran war tradition and their significance for understanding the framing of the battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness.⁵ First, we will examine the Joshua tradition within the Qumran literary tradition, both the “biblical” and the apocryphal manuscripts, to substantiate the importance of the Joshua tradition at Qumran. Second, we will specifically explore the linguistic and thematic connections between the Joshua tradition and the war tradition, including the concept of *herem* in both the biblical tradition and its redeployment in the *War Scroll* as well as the reuse of Joshua’s prayer in 10:12–14 in 1QM 18. It will be argued that, in further continuance of the wilderness preparation motif we examined in the last chapter, these elements provide a further framing of the battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness as a type of re-conquest and purification of the land. Finally, we will explore

³ Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold list only three quotations or allusions to the book of Joshua in the war tradition (1QM 7:14 // Josh 6:4, 6, 8, 13; 1QM 18:5 // Josh 10:13–14; 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 13 // Josh 8:19). See Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 321–27.

⁴ One possibility might be that the lack of connection between the Hasmonean wars of 1 and 2 Maccabees and the conquest narratives of Joshua, aptly demonstrated by Katell Berthelot, has been assumed upon the Qumran war tradition. See Katell Berthelot, “The Biblical Conquest of the Promised Land and the Hasmonean Wars according to 1 and 2 Maccabees,” in *The Books of Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9–11 June, 2005*, eds. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, JSJSup 118 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 45–60

⁵ By way of definition, I am following the work of Carmela Perri on allusions noting the crucial characteristic of that an allusion has at least a double referent and the requirement that “the alluding text directs our attention to one of more aspects of the source text necessary to comprehend the meaning of the allusion.” See Carmela Perri, “On Alluding,” *Poetics* 7 (1978): 295–96. On the application of Perri’s work to the Hodayot, see Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusion and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, STDJ 59 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), esp. 41–50. Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold define an allusion as “employments of anterior texts in which the anterior text in still linguistically recognizable in the posterior text but not morphologically identical with it.” They go on to define an *implicit* allusion as “any parallel of at least three words to another text” and an *explicit* allusion as “a reference to a given text or quotation formula in addition to which a given text is paraphrased or a keyword or theme of a given text are employed.” See Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 25–26.

the exegetical use of the conquest narratives in other Qumran texts, more specifically 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381), as a way of illuminating our conclusions.

6.2 Joshua in the Qumran Literary Tradition

Before examining the employment of the Joshua tradition within the Qumran war tradition, we need to briefly situate the Joshua tradition within the larger literary finds from Qumran. First, we will briefly discuss the two fragmentary manuscripts that reflect what would later comprise the “biblical” tradition. We will then turn our attention to the rewritten Joshua traditions, a more widely attested collection of writings associated with the Joshua tradition.

6.2.1 The Book of Joshua at Qumran

Before the discovery of the “biblical” manuscripts of Joshua at Qumran, the text of the book of Joshua was preserved in what is now considered two different editions: the MT and the LXX, the relationship of which is a matter of debate.⁶ At Qumran, two fragmentary manuscripts of the book of Joshua were discovered in Cave 4: 4Q47 and 4Q48, designated 4QJosh^a and 4QJosh^b respectively.⁷ Dating from 150–50 BCE and written in a Hasmonean hand, 4QJosh^a preserves Josh 5:2–7 (frgs. 1–20); 6:5–10 (frgs. 3–8); 7:12–17 (frgs. 9 i–12); 8:3–14, 18(?) (frgs 9 ii, 13–16), 34–35 (frgs. 1–2); 10:2–5, 8–11 (frgs. 17–22).⁸ The second fragment, 4QJosh^b, preserves Josh 2:11–12 (frg. 1); 3:15–4:3 (frgs. 2–3); 17:1–5 (frg. 4), 11–15 (frg. 5) and is written in a late

⁶ On the MT vs. the LXX traditions, see Thomas B. Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 6B (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 32–43; Nelson, *Joshua*, 22–24.

⁷ On the book of Joshua in the Qumran corpus, see Emanuel Tov, “Joshua, Book of,” *EDSS* 1:431–34; Michaël N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses*, VTSup 102 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 93–105. A potential third manuscript, designated XJoshua (Schøyen MS 2713) is unprovenanced and will not be discussed here. See James Charlesworth, “XJoshua,” *DJD* 38:231–39; Torleif Elgvin, Kipp Davis, and Michael Langlois, *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection*, LSTS 71 (London: T&T Clark, 2018), 159–68.

⁸ See Eugene Ulrich, “4QJosh^a,” *DJD* 14:143–52; *PAM* 43.060, 057; 42.273; 41.201; 41.199; 40.584, 602, 607.

Hasmonean or early Herodian hand and dates from ca. 50 BCE.⁹ Both manuscripts follow the MT in principle, with 4QJosh^b being closer to the MT, but also demonstrate readings that are either in agreement with the LXX or represent readings unique to the compositions.

The relationship between 4QJosh^a and the editions represented in the MT and LXX has been the focus of some debate. Central to the discussion is the insertion of Josh 8:34–35 before Josh 5:2–7 in 4QJosh^a 1–2. On the one hand, Eugene Ulrich has argued that 4QJosh^a is best understood as a third edition of the book of Joshua and represents the oldest of the three witnesses.¹⁰ On the other, Ariel Feldman has proposed that 4QJosh^a is an abbreviated scriptural text that incorporates an exegetical expansion in the same manner as other “rewritten scriptural” texts.¹¹ Independent of the exact nature of 4QJosh^a, the two fragmentary manuscripts demonstrate the textual fluidity characteristic of the “biblical” text at Qumran and, furthermore, that the authoritative status of a writing is not found in a stable and concrete text form, but rather in the broader literary tradition.¹² The presence and contemporary transmission of variant forms of the “biblical” tradition undergirds this position.

⁹ See Emanuel Tov, “4QJosh^b,” DJD 14:153–60; PAM 43.061; 42.274; 41.302.

¹⁰ Ulrich, DJD 14:145–46; Ulrich, “4QJoshua^a and Joshua’s First Altar in the Promised Land,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, eds. George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 15 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 89–104.

¹¹ Ariel Feldman, “4Q47 (4QJosh^a): An Abbreviated Text?” in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*, eds. Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioatâ, and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 152–63.

¹² See Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Florentino García Martínez, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Book of Joshua,” in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange, CBET 57 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 97–109.

6.2.2 The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls

That there was a great interest in the Joshua tradition within the Qumran movement has been aptly demonstrated by Feldman in his study on the “rewritten Joshua scrolls.”¹³ For his study, Feldman examines the additional five fragmentary manuscripts connected to the Joshua tradition discovered at Qumran: 4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a-b} (4Q378 and 4Q379), 4QProphecy of Joshua (4Q522), 4QParaphrase of Joshua (4Q123), and 5QWork of Place Names (5Q9), as well as one manuscript discovered at Masada, MasParaJosh (Mas 1039-211).¹⁴ Dated to the last two centuries BCE, these fragmentary manuscripts represent a growing interpretive tradition associated with the book of Joshua in the late Second Temple period.¹⁵

Regarding these rewritings of Joshua, Feldman offers several important conclusions. First, where others have argued for various textual overlap within the Qumran manuscripts, Feldman suggests that these rewritings are best treated as five separate compositions. Second, and more significant for our study, Feldman places these compositions within the larger exegetical context of the late Second Temple period, concluding:

¹³ See Ariel Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, BZAW 438 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014).

¹⁴ Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls*, 1–6. See also Carol Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Josh^{a-b},” DJD 22:237–88; Émile Puech, “4QProphétie de Josué (4QapocrJosué?),” DJD 25:39–74; Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, “4QpaleoParaJosh,” DJD 9:201–3; J. T. Milik, “Ouvrage avec toponymes,” DJD 3:179–80; Shemaryahu Talmon, “Hebrew Fragments from Masada: (b) Mas 1039-211, Joshua Apocryphon (MasapocrJosh),” in *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–65: Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), 105–16.

¹⁵ Within this interpretive tradition, Feldman includes Ben Sira’s “Praise of the Fathers” (44:1–50:24); Eupolemus’ *Concerning the Kings of Judaica*; 1 Macc 2:49–70; 2 Macc 12:13–16; Jdt 5:15–16, the Assumption of Moses; the works of Philo (*Moses* 1.216, 220–236; *Names* 121; *Virtues* 55–70); New Testament writings (Matt 1:5; Acts 7:45; Heb 4:8; 11:30; James 2:25); Josephus (Ant. 3.59; 4.165, 311, 324; 5.1–120; 6.84; 7.68, 294; 9.207, 280; 11.112), Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* (LAB 20–25); and 4 Ezra 7:107. See Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls*, 8–15. With regard to the non-biblical scrolls in the Qumran corpus, Feldman adds CD 4:20–5:6 // 4QD^d (4Q269) 3 2 // 6QD (6Q15) 1 1–3; 1QWords of Moses (1Q22) 1 11–12; 4QPseudo-Jubilees^b (4Q226) 4, 6; 4Qpap Chronologie biblique ar (4Q559) 4. Possibly 4QExodus/Conquest Tradition (4Q374) 2 ii 2–5; 4QNarrative C (4Q462) 1 6–7; 1QapGen 16–17, 21 15–19.

If this conclusion is correct, it implies that the Book of Joshua was a subject of an intense literary/exegetical activity in the last two centuries BCE. In fact, it may well be the most frequently rewritten book of the Former Prophets among the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁶

Feldman further proposed that while the expansions contained within the rewritten Joshua scrolls focus on the Levitical/priestly concerns, such as the sanctity of the Promised Land, proper Torah observance, and the fulfillment of divine oracles, the compositions demonstrate a lack of “sectarian” nomenclature and worldview and hence should be considered as reflective of some wider Levitical/priestly literary tradition.¹⁷ That these rewritings were given influential status can be seen in 4QTestimonia (4Q175), preserving a series of four quotations without comment that include Exod 20:18b (from the Samaritan tradition); Num 24:15–17; Deut 33:8–11 (both following a similar form to the MT with minor variants); and 4QapocJoshua^b 22 ii 7–15 (cf. 4QTest 21–30). That these four quotations follow the ordering of the biblical books and are connected with a similar introductory formula suggests that traditions contained within 4QapocJoshua^b played some influential role within the Qumran movement. Whether or not 4QapocJoshua^b attained an authoritative status on the level of the quotations from the Torah remains an open question.¹⁸

Feldman’s suggestion that the rewritten Joshua scrolls reflect an intense literary and exegetical enterprise in the last two centuries BCE is significant. Whether the five compositions

¹⁶ Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls*, 193.

¹⁷ Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls*, 199–200. Feldman suggests that a parallel between the events narrated in the book of Joshua and those of the contemporary Hasmonean rule could have potentially prompted the re-writing of the book of Joshua (p. 200).

¹⁸ Some scholars have argued for authoritative status of 4Q379 based upon the quotation in 4Q175. See P. W. Skehan, “Two Books on Qumran Studies,” *CBQ* 21 (1959): 71–78, esp. 73; Tigchelaar, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” *EDEJ*, 170; John J. Collins, “Canon, Canonization,” *EDEJ*, 462; García Martínez, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Book of Joshua,” 107. Others have argued for caution in this assessment, see Katell Berthelot, “4QTestimonia as a Polemic against the Prophetic Claims of John Hyrcanus,” in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy*, eds. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, With the Assistance of Lucas L. Schulte, *CBET* 52 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 99–116; Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls*, 125–27.

find their origin in the Qumran movement or not, their presence within the Qumran corpus suggests that traditions surrounding the book of Joshua were not only important to maintain and transmit but were also potentially an exegetical repository of images and ideas available to the movement for employment within other compositions and traditions. One such employment of the Joshua tradition, I would suggest, can be seen within the Qumran war tradition. If accepted, this would lend support to Feldman's suggestion that the Joshua tradition was an important one within Second Temple literature and for the Qumran movement more specifically.

6.3 Joshua and the Qumran War Tradition

The book of Joshua, particularly the conquest narratives of Josh 6 and 10, and the Qumran war tradition share several linguistic and thematic features, enough so that the question of the influence the Joshua tradition had upon the shapers and transmitters of the war tradition should be considered. Specifically, in this section we will consider the overarching constellation of linguistic terms and thematic clusters associated with Josh 6 and the war tradition, with a special focus on the conception of *herem* demonstrated in both, before finally exploring specific connections between Josh 10 and the Qumran war tradition.

6.3.1 Linguistic and Thematic Echoes of Joshua in the War Tradition

The complex textual development of Josh 6 has long been noted by commentators.¹⁹ Central to the narrative is the cultic context of the campaign as well as the highlighted theme that God is the one who brings about the victory not the military prowess of the Israelites.²⁰ Significantly, both

¹⁹ On the textual development of Josh 6, see Nelson, *Joshua*, 87–93; Hartmut N. Rösel, *Joshua*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 94–97; Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 320–25.

²⁰ Rösel, *Joshua*, 93.

elements likewise play a central role in the *War Scroll* as we will see below, thus providing a strong thematic connection between the two texts. Several features of Josh 6 deserve attention. The preponderance and concentration of the number seven in Josh 6 is significant (6:4 [4], 6 [2], 8 [2], 13 [2], 15 [3], 16)²¹ as well as the role of the priesthood in the procession around Jericho, both of which provide a distinctly cultic character to the narrative.²² Likewise, the number seven is prominent in the *War Scroll*, preserved nineteen times (1:14; 2:12; 4:10; 5:3, 7, 16; 6:1, 2, 4, 8 [2], 9; 7:9, 14 [2]; 8:1, 13; 9:4; 11:8) and plausibly reconstructed an additional two times (4:17; 18:1). Moreover, just as in Josh 6, the priesthood plays a prevalent role in the war tradition as military leaders and sacerdotal combatants, as discussed in Chapter 3.

God instructs Joshua that he and all the warriors are to march around the city for six days with “seven priests bearing seven trumpets of ram’s horns (שִׁבְעָה שׁוֹפְרוֹת הַיּוֹבְלִים)” before the ark (6:3–4; cf. Josh 6: 4, 6, 8, 13 for the term שׁוֹפְרוֹת הַיּוֹבְלִים). On the seventh day, they are to process around the city seven times with the priests blowing the trumpets (שׁוֹפְרָא in Josh 6:4, 5, 9, 13, 16, 20).²³ When the priests sound a long blast on the ram’s horn (בְּקֶרֶן הַיּוֹבֵל), the people are to “shout with a great shout (תִּירוּעָה גְדוֹלָה)” resulting in the collapse of the wall allowing the people to charge ahead into the city (6:4–5). The instruction to “shout” (רִוַע) in 6:5 and 10 can

²¹ The number seven also appears in the narratives regarding the disbursement of the land (Josh 18:2, 5, 6, 9; 19:40).

²² On the wider use of the number seven in the book of Joshua, see E. Noort, “De val van de grote stad Jericho: Kanttekeningen bi synchronische en diachronische benaderingen,” *NedTT* 50 (1996): 265–79; Michaël N. van der Meer, “Sound the Trumpet!” Redaction and Reception of Joshua 6:2–25,” in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort*, eds. Jacques van Ruiten and J. Cornelius de Vos, VTSup 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 19–43, esp. 30.

²³ Hartmut Rösel has argued that the term “shofar” is the original term to the narrative, whereas “trumpets of ram’s horns” is a fusion of the other two expressions. See Rösel, *Joshua*, 96–97. Dozeman highlights the use of the Hebrew term יוֹבֵל, noting the term can mean “ram’s horn” (Exod 19:13; Josh 6:5), but more often signifies the Jubilee Year of Release (e.g., Lev 25:13, 28, 40; 27:18, 21). For Dozeman the use of this term, along with the pattern of seven days, could conceptually link Josh 6 intertextually with the priestly teaching on the Jubilee in Lev 25, as well as the theophany to Israel at Mount Sinai (Exod 19:13). Dozeman additionally suggests that the use of שׁוֹפְרוֹת הַיּוֹבֵל was “a literary creation to reinforce the interpretation of the collapse of Jericho’s walls as the enactment of the Jubilee law.” See Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 308, 331–32. Also, L. Daniel Hawk, *Joshua*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 94.

refer to a war shout (cf. Judg 7:21; 15:14; 1 Sam 4:5; 17:20, 52; Hos 5:8) or as cultic praise (cf. Ps 41:2; 66:1), all of which adds to the cultic character of the narrative and could reflect not only a “war cry” but also a shout of praise to God for the victory.²⁴

The use of trumpets, and more specifically the terminology for the trumpets used, offers a significant connection between Josh 6 and the war tradition. First, in both traditions we find reference to seven priests carrying “seven trumpets of rams’ horns (שבעת שופרות היובל)” (Josh 6: 4, 6, 8, 13; 1QM 7:14). This is quite striking as this Hebrew phrase only appears in Josh 6 and in the 1QM 7:14, strongly suggesting that the tradition of Josh 6 lies behind the usage in the war tradition. Additionally, while the preferred term for trumpets in the war tradition is חצוצרות, preserved forty-six times in the tradition, the term שופרות appears within the tradition in specific reference to “rams’ horns” blown by the Levites and “the people with them” (1QM 8:9–11; 16:7–8; 17:13; 4QM^a [4Q491] 11 ii 22) creating a distinction with the trumpets used in general.²⁵ 1QM 8:9–11 reads as follows:

... the Levites and all the people with rams’ horns (שפרות) shall blow ¹⁰together a great battle alarm (תרועת מלחמה גדולה) together to melt the heart of the enemy. With the sound of the alarm (קול התרועה), ¹¹the battle darts shall go out to bring down the slain.

It is worth noting that these trumpets are blown by the Levites in the war tradition as opposed to the priests in Josh 6. This provides another instance of the elevation of the Levites as seen within other texts found at Qumran, previously discussed in Chapter 3. The instruction for the Israelites to “shout with a great shout (תְּרוּעָה גְדוֹלָה)” after the priests blow the trumpets in Josh 6:5, 20 is echoed within 1QM 8:9–11. While in Joshua the people raise “a great shout” resulting in the collapse of the walls, in 1QM 8 the trumpets are said to blow “a great battle alarm.” The

²⁴ Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 333.

²⁵ Additionally, the term שופרות is reconstructed in 1QM 8:15; 4QM^a (4Q491) 11 ii 6, 13 6 as well.

reference to “all the people” blowing the שופרות alongside the Levites in the war tradition may represent the way in which the shapers of the war tradition incorporated the role of the people in Josh 6 into the commence of the eschatological battle. That said, however, it should be noted that the great sound, whether delivered by the people or שופרות, functions in both locations to commence engagement with the enemy.

Finally, the verb נפל (“to fall”) is utilized four times in the Joshua conquest narratives (6:5, 20; 8:24, 25) to describe the destruction of the enemy. The term is frequently employed within the Qumran war tradition regarding the enemy (1:6, 9; 3:8; 6:3, 5; 8:11; 9:1, 7; 11:8, 11; 13:9; 14:3; 16:8, 11; 17:14, 16; 18:2; 19:11; 4QM^a [4Q491] 10 ii 11; 11 ii 7, 9; 23 3; 4QM^b [4Q492] 1 9, 10).²⁶ While the term is used within the Hebrew Bible regarding the destruction of the enemy,²⁷ its ubiquitous use within the war tradition points to the suggestion that it is the preferred terminology. Whether or not the use of נפל constitutes an allusion to the Joshua conquest narratives is unclear.

In sum, the sevenfold pattern, the centrality of the priesthood, and the use of trumpets and the terminology employed all demonstrate a strong allusive connection between Josh 6 and the Qumran war tradition. This seems to suggest that the transmitters of the war tradition were not only similarly familiar with priestly tradition, but implicitly framed the war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness within the Joshua tradition as well. This is understandable given the influence of the wilderness motif upon the war tradition. Read together, the writers of the war tradition conceived of the final battle with the forces of darkness as a re-entry into the land and the extermination of enemy akin to the conquest narratives found in the book of Joshua. That this

²⁶ The verbal form is also reconstructed in 1QM 9:18; 19:10; 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 13; 8–10 i 8; 10 ii 9; 11 ii 23; 18 4; and 4QM^c (4Q495) 2 1.

²⁷ For the full semantical range of the term and its use in war narratives, see “נפל,” *DCH* 5:715–23.

theme is present in the Qumran war tradition is further seen in the utilization of the *herem* tradition in 1QM.

6.3.2 The Concept of *Herem* and the War Tradition

The nature and development of the concept of חרם (*herem*) has been a matter of some debate since C. H. W. Brekelmans' landmark 1959 monograph on the subject.²⁸ Prior to Brekelmans' publication, *herem* was exclusively understood to be a constitutive feature of "holy war." This position is typified in the work of Gerhard von Rad, who envisaged *herem* as the highpoint and culminative act within of his typology of "holy war," denoted the act as consecrating the spoils of warfare to God whereby "human beings and animals are slaughtered, gold and silver and the like go as קָדָשׁ into Yahweh's treasury (Josh 6:18–19)."²⁹ This position has persisted within certain scholarly circles.³⁰ Brekelmans, however, suggested that *herem* is best understood as a *nomen qualitatis*, a quality or attribute analogous to קָדָשׁ.³¹ While his work on the subject is not widely cited, his suggestion opened a door for a broader and more nuanced understanding of the concept of *herem*.

²⁸ C. H. W. Brekelmans, *De herem in het Oude Testament* (Nijmegen: Central Drukkerij, 1959). See also, Brekelmans, "Le *herem* chez les prophètes du royaume du Nord et dans le Deutéronome," in *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*, eds. J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and É. Massaux, BETL 12 (Gembloux: Duculot, 1959), 1:377–83.

²⁹ Von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel*, 49; See also de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Volume 1: Social Institutions*, 260–61. For an overview of scholarship regarding the concept of "holy war," see Karl William Weyde, "Holy War, Divine War, and YHWH War—and Ethics: On Central Issue in Recent Research in the Hebrew Bible," in *Encountering Violence in the Bible*, eds. Markus Zehnder and Hallvard Hagelia, BMW 55 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), 235–52.

³⁰ On *herem* as exclusively an element of warfare, a battlefield act indispensably associated with the concept of "holy war," see Miller, *The Divine Warrior*, 157; Peter C. Craigie, *The Problem of War in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978); Millard C. Lind, *Yahweh is a Warrior: The Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1980), 81; Jacques Cazeaux, *Le refus de la guerre sainte: Josué, Juges, et Ruth*, LD 174 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1998); Nils Lohfink, "Der „heilige Krieg“ und der „Bann“ in der Bibel," *IKZ* 89 (1989): 104–12; Avalos, *The Reality of Religious Violence*, 167.

³¹ Brekelmans, *De herem in het Oude Testament*, 42–53.

The root חרם occurs eighty-one times in the MT in all its cognate forms.³² Of these occurrences, the root occurs fifty-one times in the verbal form, predominantly in the *hiphil* with only three references occurring in the *hophal* (Exod 22:20 [22:19], Lev 27:29, and Ezra 10:8). The remaining thirty occurrences of the root are in the nominal form which exclusively occur in the singular.³³ The greatest number of references occur within the so-called Deuteronomistic History (DtrH), a total of fifty-one occurrences, with the highest concentration found within the books of Joshua and Deuteronomy, twenty-seven and eleven occurrences respectively. Of the eighty-one occurrences of the root חרם in the MT, the LXX contains equivalents for seventy-seven.³⁴ The LXX employs the terms ἀνάθεμα (along with the alternative spelling ἀνάθημα) exclusively to render the nominal form of the root, *herem* or the proper noun *Hormah* (cf. Num 21:3). The same applies to the term ἀναθεματίζω, a neologism created by the LXX translators, which is exclusively used to render *hiphil* verbal form.³⁵ That said, it should be noted that the LXX employs a variety of additional terms to render nominal and verbal forms of חרם, predominantly, but not exclusively, ἐξολεθρεύω (“to destroy utterly”). Regarding the varied use of terms in the LXX, Katell Berthelot has suggested this is due to the LXX translators’

³² For a detailed lexical examination of the root חרם, see Norbert Lohfink, “hāram, hērem,” *TDOT* 5:180–99.

³³ See Appendix 1 for the full distribution of the root in all its cognate forms in the MT, as well as the context in which they occur.

³⁴ See Appendix 2 where the LXX equivalents for the MT occurrences of the root are summarized including the LXX equivalent and frequency, a translation of the Greek term, and the location in which that specific equivalent is utilized. There is no equivalent for the nominal usage in Lev 27:29 where the LXX reads καὶ παν in place of בל-חרם. Additionally, where Josh 7:15 reads והיה הנלכד בחרם (“the one who is selected with the devoted thing”), the LXX lacks reference to the devoted thing. 4QJosh^a 9i–12 6 reads והיה הנלכד בהם (“the one who is selected *with them*”) in this location. Finally, Josh 8:26 is lacking from the LXX. Richard Nelson suggests this is due to homoioteleuton from “all the people of Ai” at the end of 8:25 to “all the inhabitants of Ai” at the end of 8:26. See Nelson, *Joshua*, 110.

³⁵ On ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα and ἀναθεματίζω, see Katell Berthelot, “ἀνάθημα, ἀνάθεμα, ἀναθεματίζω,” in *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint, Volume I: Alpha – Gamma*, ed. Eberhard Bons (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 478–87; Katell Berthelot, “The Notion of *Anathema* in Ancient Jewish Literature Written in Greek,” in *The Reception of Septuagint Words in Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian Literature*, eds. Eberhard Bons, Ralph Brucker, and Jan Joosten, WUNT II/367 (Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 39–52.

understanding of the term *herem* in such a way that they chose to differentiate the concept in some cases preferring to use a term other than ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα or ἀναθεματίζω.³⁶

6.3.2.1 *Herem* in the Priestly and Deuteronomistic Traditions

The most widely accepted definition of the root in the *hiphil* is best expressed in the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* as to “devote to ban of destruction, destroy; also dedicate to YHWH” and the nominal form as a “devoted object, that which is banned.”³⁷ A more broad definition, however, was proposed by Moshe Greenberg, “the status of that which is separated from common use or contact either because it is proscribed as an abomination to God or because it is consecrated to Him.”³⁸ Following closely the work of Brekelmans, Richard Nelson has convincingly argued that *herem* should be understood within the larger framework of categories in Israel’s cultural classification system akin to term such as “holy” and “unclean.”³⁹ Subsequently, it is best to view *herem* not primarily through the lens of destruction or conquest, but rather as an intangible quality taken up either by living beings or physical objects.⁴⁰ Therefore, when a person or object is deemed as being in the state of *herem*, it is considered as belonging in the divine sphere, a possession of God, and not to be used by humans.⁴¹ The living

³⁶ Berthelot, “The Notion of *Anathema*,” 42.

³⁷ “חרם,” *DCH* 3:317–19. For a discussion on the broad semantic range of the root חרם, see M. Malul, “Taboo,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, eds. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999): 824–27.

³⁸ Moshe Greenberg, “*HEREM*,” *EncJud* 9:10. Along similar lines, Norbert Lohfink defines the *hiphil* usage of חרם as “consecrate something or someone as a permanent and definitive offering for the sanctuary; in war, consecrate a city and its inhabitants to destruction; carry out this destruction; totally annihilate a population in war; kill;” the *hophal* usage as “be condemned to capital punishment with certain additional conditions; the execution of this punishment; confiscation (of property) (?);” and the nominal usage as “the object or person consecrated...the act of consecration or of extermination or killing.” See Lohfink, *TDOT* 5:188.

³⁹ See Nelson, *Joshua*, 19; Richard D. Nelson, “*Herem* and the Deuteronomistic Social Conscience,” in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature: Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans*, eds. Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust, *BETL* 133 (Leuven: Leuven University Press; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997), 45–47; Nelson, *Raising Up a Faithful Priest*, 17–18.

⁴⁰ See Nelson, “*Herem*,” 41–45.

⁴¹ Nelson, “*Herem*,” 44–45.

being or physical object which is deemed as falling in the category of *herem* is therefore to be excluded from utilization or existence within the profane realm. The *hiphil* form of the root can thus be understood to signify the transfer of the person or object into the state of *herem* or “to deal with an entity required by its *herem* state.”⁴² This can be accomplished by several means, including the killing or destroying of the entity or the consecration of it into the cultic sphere.

A similar sense of *herem* can be seen within the Mesha Inscription. Dated to the late ninth century BCE, the inscription preserves an important reference to *herem*. Containing thirty-four lines of inscription, the stele was erected by Mesha, King of Moab, as a tribute to his god, Kemosh, who delivered him from the kings of Israel, prevailing over his enemies (ll. 3–4). The inscription recounts the oppression of the Moabites at the hands of Omri, King of Israel, as punishment due to the anger of Kemosh toward the people of Moab. Deliverance comes with the destruction of the cities of Ataroth, Nebo, and Horonaim by Mesha, thus recapturing these areas for Moab. Presented as a first-hand account, the inscription describes the following:

¹⁴Now Kemosh said to me, “Go seize Nebo from Israel.” So I ¹⁵went at night and fought against it from the break of dawn until noon. I ¹⁶seized it and killed everyone of [it]—seven thousand native men, foreign men, native women, for[eign] ¹⁷women, and concubines—for I devoted it to ‘Ashtar-Kemosh (כַּמֶּשׁ הַחֶרְמַתָּה). I took from there th[e ves] ¹⁸sels of Yahweh and dragged them before Kemosh. (ll. 14–18)⁴³

The lines begin with the command of Kemosh to King Mesha to attack Nebo, who obeys killing everyone in the city, seven thousand in total. Mesha describes this as an act of *herem*, devoting the city to Kemosh. Mesha then takes the “vessels of Yahweh,” a reference implying the presence of a shrine to Yahweh at Nebo in Moab, bringing them before his god Kemosh as an act of consecration. The inscription provides important evidence of the concept of *herem* as the

⁴² Nelson, “*Herem*,” 45.

⁴³ Translation by Kent P. Jackson, “The Language of the Mesha Inscription,” in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*, ed. Andrew Dearman, ABS 2 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 98. For a detail treatment of the Mesha Inscription, see *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab* in its entirety.

devotion of something to a deity through destruction and the consecration of objects to the deity as existing outside of Israelite conception.⁴⁴ Philip Stern has argued that the act of *herem* recounted in the Mesha Inscription should be understood as a moral-religious act, even a cosmic act, reasserting the rule of the god(s) over the forces of chaos and re-establishing moral order to the universe. *Herem*, therefore, “involved the re-establishment of the land as a ‘sacred space’ where the Moabite world order could rise again from the ashes.”⁴⁵ This understanding of *herem* offers noteworthy insight into the usage within the biblical tradition, especially, as we will see, the narrative of the destruction of Jericho in Josh 6.

Regarding the biblical tradition, Stern has importantly noted the interpretation of *herem* differs between Deuteronomistic and priestly literature.⁴⁶ Within the priestly conception, *herem* is more closely linked with the consecration of a dedicated gift to God.⁴⁷ This vowed gift could consist of a human being, an animal, or property, such as land, as a means by which these items were marked as the exclusive property of God (Num 18:14) and thus were removed from the dedicant and from profane use.⁴⁸ With regards to the dedication of a patrimonial field, Lev 27:21 explicitly states that *herem* dedication was distributed to the priests, “But when the field is

⁴⁴ On warfare and the use of *herem* in the Mesha Inscription, see Gerald L. Mattingly, “Moabite Religion and the Mesha Inscription,” in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*, ed. Andrew Dearman, ABS 2 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 233–37. For a detailed treatment on the importance of the Mesha Inscription for the concept of *herem* in the biblical tradition, see Philip D. Stern, *The Biblical Herem: A Window on Israel’s Religious Experience*, BJS 211 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 19–56.

⁴⁵ Stern, *The Biblical Herem*, 50.

⁴⁶ Stern, *The Biblical Herem*, 125–35.

⁴⁷ On the nexus between ritual sacrifice, violence, and the divine, see René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*, trans. Patrick Gregory (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979).

⁴⁸ On the issue of *herem* as divine ownership in the Hebrew Bible and in the wider ancient Near East, see Ada Taggar-Cohen, “Between *Herem*, Ownership, and Ritual: Biblical and Hittite Perspectives,” in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*, eds. Roy E. Gagne and Ada Taggar-Cohen, RBS 82 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 419–34. Echoing our earlier argument to understand *herem* within a cultic framework, Taggar-Cohen begins her study by noting, “Behind the term *herem* in the Hebrew Bible lies an act involving property or life in a time of war and peace. Although the word is more commonly used in a war situation, both kinds of contexts involve relations between deities and their worshippers, thereby placing these usages within the framework of cult” (p. 419).

released in the jubilee, it shall be holy to the LORD as a devoted field (בְּשִׂדֵּה הַחֶרֶם); it becomes the priest’s holding” (NRSV, cf. Lev 27:26, 28–29; Num 18:14; Ezek 44:29).⁴⁹ While firstborn human beings and unclean animals can be redeemed, the firstborn of clean animals cannot be redeemed as they are considered holy with their sacrificial flesh going to the priesthood (Num 18:15–18). Leviticus 27:28–29, however, contains a stricter form of the *herem* vow prohibiting anything that has been “devoted to destruction for the LORD (אֲדָבֶר־בְּלִיַחֲרָם אֲשֶׁר יַחֲרַם אִישׁ לַיהוָה)” from being sold or redeemed. The reason given for this injunction is that “every devoted thing is most holy (קֹדֶשׁ־קְדוֹשִׁים) to the LORD.” It is notable that the connection between the concepts of *herem* and קֹדֶשׁ is made explicit here.⁵⁰ Important also is the phrase לַיהוָה. Within the priestly tradition on *herem*, this phrase indicates the cultic context of the vow and represents a transfer of persons and objects from the profane realm to that of God.⁵¹ While this phrase does not occur within the warfare context of *herem* in the book of Deuteronomy, significantly the phrase does appear in Josh 6, a subject to which we will return below. The *herem* instruction in Lev 27:28–29 concludes with a regulation regarding persons who have been dedicated as *herem*, noting “No human beings who have been devoted to destruction (בְּלִיַחֲרָם אֲשֶׁר יַחֲרַם מִזֵּה־אָדָם) can be ransomed; they shall be put to death.”⁵²

In Deuteronomistic literature, the concept of *herem* is grounded within the context of warfare. In Deuteronomy, the verbal form specifically denotes a total destruction of the enemy, as seen in Deut 7:2, “When the LORD your God gives them [the peoples of the land] over to you

⁴⁹ On the biblical instruction regarding the voluntary *herem* dedication of a patrimonial field and its later interpretation, See Benjamin D. Gordon, *Land and Temple: Field Sacralization and the Agrarian Priesthood of Second Temple Judaism*, SJ 87 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021), 73–78.

⁵⁰ See David P. Wright, “Holiness (OT),” *ABD* 3:237.

⁵¹ Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 58.

⁵² Benjamin Gordon has suggested Lev 27:29 refers to a sentence of a juridical proceeding and that individuals who have been dedicated to God (27:28) were enlisted into the service of the priest’s household rather than face execution. See Gordon, *Land and Temple*, 78.

and you defeat them, then you must utterly destroy (הַחֲרִים תַּחֲרִים) them. Make no covenant with them and show them no mercy.” The reason given for the total destruction of the enemy in Deut 7 centers on the maintaining of Israelite religious fidelity, noting that intermixing with the peoples of the land “would turn away your children from following me, to serve other gods” (Deut 7:4). The nominal form refers specifically to devoted objects as spoils of war, which are considered abhorrent, “Do not bring an abhorrent thing (תּוֹעֵבָה) into your house, or you will be set apart for destruction (וְהָיִיתָ חָרָם) like it. You must utterly detest and abhor it, for it is set apart for destruction (חָרָם)” (Deut 7:26). Deuteronomy 13:18 likewise cautions to not let anything devoted to destruction “stick to your hand (אִדְבֶּק בְּיָדְךָ).” Central to these injunctions is the dangerous and contagious nature of the devoted object. Much like holiness and impurity, devoted items required circumspect handling and the possession of such items was cause for severe consequence. The nature of the contagion here is more than the touching of an object but lies rather in the desire and attempt to personally possess that which has been divinely designated as *herem*.⁵³

Ultimately, the ban as described in Deuteronomistic ideology focuses centrally on the threat of danger and contagion arising from the social and religious contact with the peoples of the land. In other words, the main concern regarding the ban falls well within the overall Deuteronomistic warnings against idolatry and concern for Israel’s religious fidelity to God.⁵⁴ As Nelson observed:

⁵³ See Nelson, “Herem,” 46; Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 56–57.

⁵⁴ See Markus Zehnder, “The Annihilation of the Canaanites: Reassessing the Brutality of the Biblical Witness,” in *Encountering Violence in the Bible*, eds. Markus Zehnder and Hallvard Hagelia, BMW 55 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), 289. Noting that the concept of חָרָם is embedded in a cultic context, Zehnder concludes, “The חָרָם primarily serves to protect the Israelites from being ensnared by the Canaanite cult and losing their independence; in addition, it also serves as to exact punishment upon the Canaanites for their abominations” (p. 289).

Deuteronomy's directive for total *herem* was not an end in itself, but a means to an end, part of the larger program of inspiring loyalty and fidelity to Yahweh. *herem* in warfare and as a domestic policy would keep Yahweh's holy people free from syncretism and idolatry.⁵⁵

Separation, therefore, is an essential component of *herem* instruction in Deuteronomy. The Israelites are explicitly instructed to separate themselves from persons and objects falling under the category of *herem*, as they are deemed "abhorrent," even detestable, and carry with it a degree of contagion. Whereas the priestly tradition sees separation as occurring through the transfer of persons or objects from the human sphere into the divine, the Deuteronomistic conception conceives of separation as strict social exclusion and the destruction of persons or objects, including foreign cultic objects.⁵⁶ Precisely how and to what degree the invocation of *herem* was to be carried out in warfare contexts differs according to various biblical texts. The most expansive application of *herem* is described in the destruction of Jericho in Josh 6 where all living things and objects were considered *herem*.

6.3.2.2 *Herem* in the Joshua Tradition

The majority of occurrences of the root חרם occur in the book of Joshua, twenty-seven times, where it is used in both the verbal and nominal forms. Decidedly concentrated within the conquest narratives, it is significant that the concept of *herem* in the book of Joshua reflects both the Deuteronomistic and priestly *herem* traditions. The book of Joshua follows Deuteronomy in that it conceives of *herem* as being carried out within the context of war on "everything that has

⁵⁵ Nelson, "Herem," 54. See also, Stern, *The Biblical Herem*, 104–16 and Christa Schäfer-Lichtenberger, "Bedeutung und Funktion von *Herem* in biblisch-hebräischen Texten," *BZ* 38 (1994): 270–75.

⁵⁶ On social exclusion and *herem*, see Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 58; Nelson, "Herem," 49–51. On the framing of Josiah's reform as an act of *herem*, see Lauren A. S. Monroe, "Herem Ideology and the Politics of Destruction" in *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of the Biblical Text* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 45–76.

breath” (Deut 20:16–17; Josh 10:40; 11:11, 14). Likewise, both Deuteronomy and Joshua contain prohibitions against the personal possession of physical objects under the category of *herem* (Deut 7:26; Josh 7:11, 15) and both offer strict warnings against even the desire to possess such objects (Deut 13:17; Josh 6:18). Importantly, however, the book of Joshua does not explicitly use the language found in Deuteronomy to refer to physical objects under *herem*, such as objects being “abhorrent” (תועבה) or that the people should “detest” (שקץ) them (Deut 7:26). Joshua also does not contain the Deuteronomistic framework of the danger of religious infidelity caused by the inhabitants of the land as a necessity for the invocation of *herem*.

The concept of *herem* in Joshua is likewise indebted to the priestly *herem* tradition, as noted by Thomas Dozeman.⁵⁷ This indebtedness can be seen in Joshua’s instruction to the people on the seventh day regarding the destruction of Jericho:

¹⁶And at the seventh time, when the priests had blown the trumpets, Joshua said to the people, “Shout! For the LORD has given you the city. ¹⁷The city and all that is in it shall be devoted to the LORD for destruction (וְהִיְתָה הָעִיר חֶרֶם הִיא וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר-בָּהּ לַיהוָה). Only Rahab the prostitute and all who are with her in her house shall live because she hid the messengers we sent. ¹⁸As for you, keep away from the things devoted to destruction, so as not to covet and take any of the devoted things (מִן-הַחֶרֶם מִן-הַחֶרֶם) and make the camp of Israel an object for destruction (לְחֶרֶם), bringing trouble upon it. ¹⁹But all the silver and gold, and vessels of bronze and iron, are sacred to the LORD (קֹדֶשׁ הוּא לַיהוָה); they shall go into the treasury of the LORD.” (Josh 6:16–19)

As noted previously, the use of the phrase לַיהוָה (“to the LORD”) in connection with *herem* occurs only within the priestly tradition, in the Lev 27:28 prohibition against selling or redeeming anything that has been “devoted to destruction for the LORD” (אֲדָכֶלְכֶם אֲשֶׁר יָחֵרֵם לַיהוָה). Significantly, the phrase לַיהוָה appears here in Joshua’s instructions to the people in Josh 6:17.⁵⁸ Moreover, the description of the objects falling under *herem* as “sacred to the

⁵⁷ See Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 58–59.

⁵⁸ The Mesha Inscription utilizes a similar construction in recounting the destruction of Nebo by King Mesha: “for I devoted it to Ashtar-Kemosh (כִּי לַעֲשֵׂתָר כִּמֹּשׁ הַחֶרְמָתָה)” (l. 17). As previously mentioned, this construction

LORD” (קִדְּשׁ הוּא לַיהוָה) in 6:19 echoes that of Lev 27:28 where devoted objects are similarly described as being “most holy to the LORD” (קִדְּשׁ-קִדְּשִׁים הוּא לַיהוָה). This suggests that the narrative of the destruction of Jericho in Josh 6 combines priestly and Deuteronomistic *herem* traditions in a way that is singularly innovative.

Broadly speaking, Dozeman is of the opinion that the conception of *herem* expressed in the book of Joshua was not for the purpose of conquest, *per se*, but of extermination, “an act of sacrifice ‘to Yahweh’ that is intended to bring peace to the land.”⁵⁹ More akin to the Mesha Inscription, Stern understands *herem* in Josh 6 as the creation of order out of chaos, which he describes as “the purposeful destruction of the forces of chaos in order to bring about world order.”⁶⁰ For Stern, *herem* is a part of the creation process by which a new land is consecrated and thus available for the Israelites to inhabit.⁶¹ In this sense, *herem* is a part of a cosmic drama, the struggle between the forces of chaos and the forces of order. This suggests that the expression of *herem* in Josh 6 can be understood as the initial act of the creation of a new, Israelite order.⁶²

I would suggest that such a conception of *herem* is in view in the Qumran war tradition. Within an eschatological setting, the war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness is similarly a part of a cosmic drama, a struggle between the forces of order and chaos. This desire to set aright the cosmos accounts for the first stage of the war being the reoccupation of

combined with the reference that King Mesha “dragged them [the vessels of Yahweh] before Kemosh” (l. 18) adds to the religious and cultic nature of the destruction of Nebo as recounted in the inscription. See 6.3.2.1.

⁵⁹ Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 59. On *herem* as sacrificial act, see Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 28–55; John J. Collins, *Does the Bible Justify Violence? Facets* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 4–13. Contra, see Nelson, “*Herem*,” 47–48.

⁶⁰ Stern, *The Biblical Herem*, 141.

⁶¹ Stern, *The Biblical Herem*, 145.

⁶² See C. L. Crouch, *War and Ethics in the Ancient Near East: Military Violence in Light of Cosmology and History*, BZAW 407 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 177–81. Crouch suggests that the pattern of six/seven in the Jericho narrative provides an echo to the seven-day creation thus highlighting the creative character of the Josh 6 narrative (p. 179).

Jerusalem and the reinstatement of properly conducted Temple sacrifice, as discussed in Chapter 4. Since the eschatological war is framed within the cosmic struggle between the forces of order and those of chaos, it is not surprising, therefore, that the War Scroll refers to the *herem* of the enemy, the forces of Belial. For the writer(s) of 1QM, the *herem* of the enemy was a crucial step in the creation of a cosmic world order, purified from the defilement of the enemy and consecrated for the inhabitation of a newly rejuvenated faithful remnant.

6.3.2.3 *Herem* in Jewish-Hellenistic Compositions

Before we examine the usage of *herem* in the *War Scroll* a brief word is necessary regarding the conception of חרם, particularly the employment of ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα and ἀναθεματίζω as Greek equivalents, in the context of warfare within Jewish-Hellenistic compositions of the Second Temple period.⁶³ What stands out in this regard is not only the paucity of references to the biblical concept of *herem* and the employment of ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα and ἀναθεματίζω within these compositions, but also that when there is a reference to ἀνάθεμα, we find that the term predominantly reflects its classical Greek meaning of “offering” or “dedication” without the sense of destruction.

In the book of Judith, the term predominantly used with reference to the destruction of the enemy in warfare is ἐξολεθρεύω (cf. 1:15; 3:8; 5:15, 18; 6:2, 8; 14:13), none of which carry the sense of the root חרם as seen in the Deuteronomistic conception.⁶⁴ The term ἀνάθημα does

⁶³ While our study focuses on the usage of the term *herem* in the context of warfare, it should be noted that there are usages in Second Temple literature that reflect the priestly conception, specifically regarding votive oaths and physical objects (e.g., 1 Enoch 6:4–6 // 4QEn^a ar [4Q201] iii 1–3; 11QT^a [11Q19] 60:5; 4QapocJoshua^b [4Q379] 3:6; 4QHalakha A [4Q251]). For an overview these usages and a detailed examination of 4QHalakha A, see Gordon, *Land and Temple*, 181–204.

⁶⁴ The description of Holophernes’ destruction of shrines and cultic objects at Azotus and Ascalon in Jdt 3:8 is reminiscent of Deut 7:5. Similarly, Jdt 5:15 and 18 echo to the destruction of the Amorites (cf. LXX Deut 2:34; 3:6; Josh 2:10 where ἐξολεθρεύω is likewise used. In both locations, the verbal form ἀναθεματίζω is not employed,

occur in Jdt 16:19, where Judith dedicates (ἀνέθηκεν) the possessions of Holofernes as a “votive offering” to God (εἰς ἀνάθημα τῷ θεῷ).⁶⁵ What is central in this narrative is the act of offering and dedication to God, a more classical Greek understanding, as opposed to the Deuteronomistic conception of wartime *herem*.

One noteworthy use of ἀναθεματίζω occurs in 1 Macc 5:5 within the larger narrative of Judas Maccabeus’ battle against Judaea’s neighbors.⁶⁶ At the victorious conclusion of the conflict with the sons of Baean, the forces of Judah “devoted them to destruction” (ἀνεθεμάτισεν), burning their towers and all who were in them (5:5). The recounting of the event in Acraba in 2 Macc 10:15–17, however, makes no reference to the “anathematizing” of the sons of Baean, similarly with Josephus’ account of the event (*Ant.* 12.328). This singular employment of ἀναθεματίζω here is striking given the lack of any sense of the Hasmonean wars as fulfilling God’s commands to Joshua to “utterly destroy” the inhabitants of the land.⁶⁷ Subsequently, as Berthelot and others have argued, it seems best to envisage the isolated usage of ἀναθεματίζω in 1 Macc 5:5 not as reflective of the biblical concept of *herem*, but rather in the broad sense of “to massacre,” conveying the severity of the destruction wrought upon the sons of Baean.⁶⁸

potentially due to the fact that we are dealing with the military actions of a foreign general. See Deborah Levine Gera, *Judith*, CEJL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 212 and 214.

⁶⁵ See Gera, *Judith*, 440, 470; Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 40B (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 245, 252.

⁶⁶ For detailed study of 1 Macc 5, see Katell Berthelot, “Judas Maccabeus’ Wars against Judaea’s Neighbors in 1 Maccabees 5: A Reassessment of the Evidence,” *Electrum* 21 (2014): 73–85.

⁶⁷ See Berthelot, “The Biblical Conquest of the Promised Land,” 45–60.

⁶⁸ See Berthelot, “The Notion of *Anathema*,” 46; Gordon, *Land and Temple*, 181; Schwartz, *1 Maccabees*, 240. Schwartz also notes the lack of additional implications, especially the prohibition against the taking of objects placed under *herem* (cf. Deut 7:25–26; 13:15–17; 20:12–18; and Josh 6:16–19). Berthelot has elsewhere argued that the use of ἀναθεματίζω may reflect a connection with the command to Saul to *herem* the Amalekites (1 Sam 15) arguing for the identification of the “sons of Baean” with the Amalekites. See Berthelot, “Judas Maccabeus’ Wars,” 79–82. Christophe Batsch has proposed that the sense here does reflect the biblical concept of *herem* analogous to that carried out upon the Canaanites and, furthermore, that the concept is present in the Hasmonean period. See Batsch, *La guerre et les rites de guerre*, 418–21, 438–43. Similarly, Kai Trampedach suggested that the wars of Judas Maccabeus were carried out in a manner corresponding to the biblical stipulations for *herem*. Trampedach offers 1 Macc 5:4–5, 43–44, 46–51, 68; 10:83–85; 2 Macc 12:9, 26–28 as examples. While certain wartime acts may appear similar to descriptions found in the Deuteronomistic conception of *herem* (specifically Deut 7:1–26; 13:13–19; 20:16–18), the lack of *herem* ideology and terminology surrounding the Hasmonean wars is problematic for

The term ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα appears within the writings of Josephus and Philo, almost exclusively reflecting the classical Greek meaning of an “offering” or “dedication.”⁶⁹ For Josephus, the term ἀνάθημα/ἀνάθηματa is exclusively utilized to refer to various offerings and donations made in variety of circumstances.⁷⁰ Noteworthy, however, is the complete lack of employment of the term regarding the warfare contexts, either in the recounting of biblical narratives, such as the destruction of Jericho (Ant. 5.25–30), nor in his own personal accounts where one might find reference (cf. *Life* 81 and 370). Regarding the larger Joshua tradition, it has been argued that Josephus sought to “de-theologize” various aspects of narratives to avoid theological difficulties for his Roman audience.⁷¹ This tendency may account for the lack of reference to *herem* in both his biblical and personal recounting.

Similarly, the use of ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα in the works of Philo reflects the meaning of classical Greek writers. In Philo’s work, the term generally denotes a “votive offering,” one which is dedicated and consecrated to God without being destroyed.⁷² Representative of Philo is the metaphorical declaration: “The whole heaven and the whole world is an offering dedicated (ἀνάθημα) to God, and He it is who created the offering (πεποιηκότος τὸ ἀνάθημα)” (*Dreams* 1.243 [Colson, LCL]). Philo’s singular use of ἀνάθεμα is noteworthy. In his recounting of the war against the king of Arad (Num 21:1–3) Philo describes that the people “vowed to devote to

Trampedach’s suggestion. See “The Wars of the Hasmoneans,” in *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective*, ed. Gabriela Signori, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 206 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 67–69.

⁶⁹ On the use of ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα in the works of Josephus and Philo, see Berthelot, “The Notion of *Anathema*,” 46–50; Katell Berthelot, “Philo of Alexandria and the Conquest of Canaan,” *JSJ* 38 (2007): 39–56, esp. 44–49.

⁷⁰ See *Ant.* 3.188; 6.148; 7.367; 8.99, 147, 195; 9.170, 254, 257; 10.52; 11.92; 12.35, 47, 50, 58, 61, 77, 85, 249, 354; 13.78; 17.151, 156, 158, 162, 265; 18.19, 312; 19.7; *J.W.* 1.425; 2.413; 4.181, 649; 5.562; 6.335; 7.44, 45, 428, 433, 434; *Ag. Ap.* 1.1, 113, 199; and 2.48.

⁷¹ See Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus’s Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 453–57.

⁷² Berthelot, “Philo of Alexandria,” 46–47. See *Worse* 19; *Planting* 126; *Migration* 98; *Heir* 200; *Flight* 42; *Names* 220; *Dreams* 1.243, 251, 253; *Decalogue* 133; *Spec. Laws* 1.66; 2.32, 37, 115; 4.69; *Embassy* 151, 157, 280, 297, 319, and 335.

God (ἀναθήσειν τῷ θεῷ) the cities of the king and the citizens in each as a first fruits of the land” and after doing so subsequently named the whole kingdom “devoted (ἀνάθεμα)” (*Moses* 1.252–53 [Colson, LCL]). While seemingly to reflect the Deuteronomistic concept of *herem* expressed in Num 21:1–3, Philo’s use of the ἀνάθεμα (as opposed to the usual ἀνάθημα in Philo’s works) as a proper noun is best understood as reflective of the proper noun Ἀνάθεμα in the LXX (*Hormah* in the MT). Outside of the use of ἀνάθεμα, there is no indication that Philo has the notion of *herem* in mind.⁷³ Furthermore, by utilizing the verb ἀνατίθημι (“to dedicate”) as opposed to ἀναθεματίζω (“to consign by cursing to destruction”) as used in the Num 21:3 LXX, Philo highlights Israel’s dedication to God as opposed to the biblical conception of wartime *herem*.⁷⁴ This emphasis on dedication is strengthened by the introduction of the metaphor of first fruits, which highlights the dedicatory nature of the act.⁷⁵

In sum, I would suggest that the employment of ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα and ἀναθεματίζω within Jewish-Hellenistic compositions in the Second Temple period does not seem to reflect the Deuteronomistic conception of *herem*, but rather the classical Greek meaning of “offering” or “dedication” to God. In other words, whereas the translators of the LXX chose to employ ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα and the neologism ἀναθεματίζω to reflect the Deuteronomistic conception of *herem*, this is not the case within the wider Jewish-Hellenistic compositional landscape. These texts, such as *Judith*, the books of *Maccabees*, and the works of *Josephus* and *Philo*, rather, generally retain the classical Greek understanding of a “votive offering” or dedication to God.

⁷³ Hyung Dae Park has also argued that the reference in *Moses* 1.253 does not express the concept of חרם. See Hyung Dae Park, *Finding Herem? A Study of Luke-Acts in Light of Herem*, LNTS 357 (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 106–9.

⁷⁴ It should be noted that the verb ἀνατίθημι is rendered for the *hiphil* form of חרם in Lev 27:28, 29; Mic 4:13, all of which are priestly in conception.

⁷⁵ See Berthelot, “Philo of Alexandria,” 48. Berthelot further suggested that this emphasis is seen in *Moses* 1.259, in which Philo recounts that the Hebrews “had captured their enemies [the Canaanites] with abundant ease, while they left the spoil untouched in their eagerness to dedicate the first prizes to God (τὰ πρῶτα τῶν ἄθλων ἀναθεῖναι τῷ θεῷ σπουδάσαντες)” (Colson, LCL).

This finding makes the employment of *herem* in the *War Scroll* even more pronounced, where, as we will see, it is directly indebted to the Joshua tradition, particularly the conquest narratives of Josh 6 and 10.

6.3.2.4 *Herem* in the Qumran War Tradition

The root חרם is preserved eleven times within texts that would later be included in the Hebrew Bible: 4QpaleoDeut^r (4Q45) 2 1 (cf. Deut 7:2); four times in 4QJosh^a (4Q47) 9i–12 1–4 (cf. Josh 7:12–13); 1QIsa^a 11:4 (11:15); 28:2 (34:2); 28:5 (34:5); 30:16 (37:11); 37:6 (43:28); and 1QIsa^b 15 6 (37:11).⁷⁶ These references are largely in agreement with the what is found in the later MT tradition. Including fragmentary witnesses, *herem* occurs twenty-three times within Qumran texts so-categorized as “non-biblical.”⁷⁷ Of these occurrences, the majority are chiefly connected within the cultic sphere, whether in reference to items that are devoted or the act of devoting them into the cultic sphere (CD 6:15, 9:1, 16:15; 3QCopper Scroll (3Q15) 9:16, 11:7; 4QHalakha A (4Q251) 10 9, 14 2, 15 2; 4QS^d (4Q258) 1 12; 4QD^f (4Q271) 4 ii 15; and 11QT^a 2:10–11 [2], 55:11, 62:14). The predominance of the cultic sphere as a contextual framework for *herem* provides further evidence of the priestly nature of varying texts within the Qumran corpus. The only identifiable occurrences within a wartime context are attested in 1QM 9:7; 18:5; 4QRP^b (4Q364) 24a–c 10; 4QapocrJosh^b (4Q379) 3 i 6; and 11QT^a 62:14. The occurrences

⁷⁶ The term is reconstructed an additional fourteen times: 2QExod^b (2Q3) 5 5 (cf. Exod 22:19 [22:20]); 4QLev–Num^a (4Q23) 24–26 7–8 (cf. Lev 27:21); 4QDeut^a (4Q28) 1 15 (cf. Deut 2:34); 4QpaleoDeut^r (4Q45) 2 1 (cf. Deut 7:2); 4QDeut^c (4Q32) 2ii + 3i + 4 15–16 (2) (cf. Deut 7:26); 4QDeut^{k2} (4Q38a) 2_3 11–12 (2) (cf. Deut 20:17); 4QJosh^b (4Q48) 1 1 (cf. Josh 2:10); 4QSam^b (4Q52) 3 3 (cf. 1 Sam 15:18); 7 2 (cf. 1 Sam 15:20); 1QIsa^b 18:28; Mur 88 14 3 (cf. Mic 4:13); and 4QXII^a (4Q76) 4 20 (cf. Mal 3:24).

⁷⁷ See Appendix C for the distribution of the root חרם in the “non-biblical” scrolls. The term is reconstructed in 4QD^a (4Q266) 3 ii 21; 8 ii 8 (2); 4QD^c (4Q270) 6 iii 16 (2); 4QRP^b (4Q364) 24a–c 8; and 4QTemple (4Q524) 4 1. The term does appear in 11QT^a 60:5 (reconstructed in 4QTemple 6–13 9). In this location the verbal form is usually rendered as “to net.” The reference occurs within a set of instructions regarding what offerings belong to the priests.

in 4QRP^b and 11QT^a reflect a reworking of the book of Deuteronomy, 2:34 and 20:17 respectively, while the remaining three in 1QM and 4QapocrJosh^b reflect the Joshua tradition.

Several occurrences require further discussion. First, the employment of the concept of *herem* in 4QCommGen A (4Q252) 3 4 is noteworthy. Within a portion of text presenting an abbreviated and adapted form of Abraham bargaining with God over Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen 18:23–33, we read, “I will not [...] only they shall be utterly destroyed (יחרמו). And if [ten?] are not found there [...] and everything] that is found in it, its spoil, its children, and the rest of [...] forever” (3 4–6).⁷⁸ The usage here is noteworthy in that the writer(s) interpreted the events of Gen 18:23–33 in light of God’s invocation of *herem* upon the idolatrous Israelite city in Deut 13:13–19.⁷⁹ The concern for the idolatrous contagion of the inhabitants of the city and subsequent need to devote them as *herem* is transferred here to the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, the latter being reasonably reconstructed in line 2. This allusion to the invocation of *herem* in Deut 13:13–19 suggests not only the severity with which the writer(s) saw the deeds of Sodom and Gemorrah, but also, and more importantly, it shows that the concept of *herem* as something devoted to God through destruction was still conceptually available within the Qumran movement.

Second, the usage of *herem* in 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a) is significant. Originally considered a part of 4QTestament of Naphtali (4Q215), 4QTime of Righteousness is a poetically styled eschatological work consisting of four fragments, the first of which is the largest and contains the largest amount of preserved text.⁸⁰ The composition describes the end of

⁷⁸ See George Brooke, “4QCommentary on Genesis A,” DJD 22:185–207, esp. 202–03. See also, George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 186–88.

⁷⁹ Brooke, DJD 22:202–03; Moshe Bernstein, “4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 15.

⁸⁰ On 4QTime of Righteousness, see Esther Chazon and Michael Stone, “4QTime of Righteousness,” DJD 36:172–84; Esther G. Chazon, “A Case of Mistaken Identity: *Testament of Naphtali* (4Q215) and *Time of Righteousness*

“the period of wickedness” in which all unrighteousness will pass away and the inauguration of “the time of righteousness” when the earth will be full of knowledge and the glorification of God (1 ii 4–5). Important for our study is fragment 3 line 1, which reads, “[...] to destroy [להחרים] earth [in] his anger and to renew it[....]”⁸¹ Due to the highly fragmentary nature of fragment 3, it is impossible to ascertain the context of this line, but it seems plausible that God is the subject and is portrayed as the one who will destroy the earth and renew it in the eschatological future. The usage here is reminiscent of what we find in Isa 34:2, “For the LORD is enraged against the nations, and furious against their hoards; he has doomed them (הַחֲרִימָם), has given them over for slaughter (לְטָבַח).” This, along with Jer 25:9 and 4Q215a, are the only occurrences in which God is also the subject of the *hiphil* form of חרם. Whereas in the biblical tradition God’s destruction is upon human entities what stands out regarding 4Q215a 3 1 is the presentation of the earth itself as the object of God’s eschatological destruction and subsequent renewal. This feature is highly distinctive in Second Temple compositions.⁸²

(4Q215a),” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 110–23; Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone, “4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a, Olim 4QNaphtali): A Preliminary Publication of Fragment 1 II,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 124–25; Årstein Justnes, “4Q215A (Time of Righteousness) in Context,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*, eds. John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 141–61; Torleif Elgvin and Årstein Justnes, “Appendix: 4Q215A, Frgs. 1, 2, 3, and 4 – Text and Notes,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*, eds. John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 162–70. See PAM 43.245 and 41.915.

⁸¹ Here I am following Chazon and Stone’s translation in DJD 26:183. Elgvin and Justnes follow similarly, “[t]o destroy (the) earth with his anger and to renew[.]” 170. So also, García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE, 457. Martin Abegg renders this line as “[...]to proscribe earth [by] His wrath and to renew[.]” See Accordance module “Qumran non-Biblical English.”

⁸² Reference to the destruction of the earth occurs in 1 Enoch 1–36, 2 Enoch, 4 Ezra, and the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 91:14).

Equally important is the utilization of the term *herem* within an eschatological setting. While it is impossible to reconstruct the context in which it is used, the employment of the term is nonetheless significant. Most commentators render the term as “destroy” eschewing the biblical concept of *herem*. This seems appropriate given the object of the action and the fragmentary nature of 4Q215a 3. That said, the choice of the term suggests that for the writers the term *herem* carried some significance for the eschatological future. While that significance eludes us, it illuminates the concept of *herem* as employed within the eschatological framework of the *War Scroll*.

The employment of the root חרם in the Qumran war traditions has garnered scant attention.⁸³ This is surprising given the amount of scholarly attention focused on the religious and sacral characteristics of the overall tradition. The root חרם appears twice in the *War Scroll*, both within battle instructions (1QM 9:7; 18:5). The first reference occurs within what Yigael Yadin referred to as the “Battle Serekh Series,” a series of instructions spanning 2:15–9:16.⁸⁴ Within this section is a set of tactical instructions regarding engagement with the enemy, which conclude with the final destruction of the enemy forces (7:9–9:9). The end of this engagement is described as follows:

⁵All these [the warriors and horsemen] shall pursue the enemy to exterminate (להשמיד) (them) in the battle of God for the ⁶everlasting destruction (לכלת עולמים). The priests shall blow for them on the trumpets of pursuit, and [they] shall divi[de] against all the enemy for the destructive pursuit (לרדף כלה). The cavalry ⁷shall bring (them) back to the battle area⁸⁵ until (their) annihilation (עד החרם). When the slain fall down, the pri[est]s shall keep blowing from afar. (1QM 9:5–7)

⁸³ Early commentators either did not address the occurrences, such as Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, offered only cross references in their translation, as in Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, or made brief comment on their presence in the text, such as Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*. The most substantive engagement is that of Johannes van der Ploeg in his discussion of 1QM 18:5. See van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 186.

⁸⁴ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 8–10.

⁸⁵ The cavalry are instructed to משיבים על ידי המלחמה. This difficult phrase has been translated variously. Yadin renders this phrase as “roll back *the enemy* at the sides of the *field of battle*.” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 300. Carmignac as “bring back against the edges of the battle.” See Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 128. Van der

In line 6, the priests set in motion the final act of the engagement with the sounding of the trumpets of pursuit (מרדף), the only reference to the use of these trumpets in the war tradition. At their sound, the warriors and horsemen are to divide against the enemy with the cavalry instructed to encircle or contain the entire enemy “until (their) annihilation (עד החרם)” (9:7).⁸⁶ Two observations are worthy of note. First, this description utilizes a rare occurrence of the substantive form of the root חרם in the adverbial clause describing the containment of the enemy. Second, given the linguistic constellation of terms related to destruction in these lines, including שמד (9:5, “destroy”) and כלה (9:6 [2], “completely destroy, annihilate”), it can be argued that the term *herem* in 9:7 could reflect a concept larger than the mere destruction of the enemy. It is plausible that the reference can be read as reflecting the concept of *herem* found in the Deuteronomistic warfare tradition.⁸⁷ This suggestion is strengthened when we consider the second occurrence of the root in 1QM.

At the conclusion of the seventh and final engagement against the forces of Belial, we find the following description:

¹[...] When the great hand of God is [rai]sed against Belial and against [...] of his dominion in an everlasting slaughter (במגפת עולמים) ²[...] and the alarm of the holy ones when they pursue Asshur; the sons of Japhet will be falling down without recovery; the Kittim shall be crushed without ³[...] the upraising of the hand of the God of Israel against all the multitude of Belial. At that time, the priests shall blow ⁴[... the trum]pets of memorial; all the battle lines shall gather towards them and they shall divide against all ⁵m[...] of the K[it]tim ⁵to annihilate them (להחרימם). (1QM 18:1–5)

Lines 1–5 describe the culmination of the battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness under the direction of “the great hand of God” (9:1). The use of the term מגפה, usually

Ploeg as “repel (the enemy) on the flanks of the fight.” See, van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 44. Jongeling roughly follows van der Ploeg. See Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 231.

⁸⁶ Note that 4QM^c (4Q493) 4–6, a text parallel to 1QM 9:7–9, does not contain reference to *herem*.

⁸⁷ Yadin compares this usage to that in 1 Sam 15:18; Josh 8:26; 11:11; Num 14:45; and 21:3. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 300.

rendered as a “plague” (e.g., the Exodus tradition), here denoting a military “slaughter” is noteworthy, occurring only in the Samuel tradition (cf. in 1 Sam 4:17; 2 Sam 17:9; 18:7) and here in 1QM 18:1, 12.⁸⁸ The sense is that of an astonishing or great victory, as seen in the phrase *מִגְפָּה גְדוֹלָה* in 1 Sam 4:17 and 2 Sam 18:7. In column 18, this “everlasting slaughter” is highlighted as coming about by the hand of God (cf. ll. 1, 3, 11, 13). The theme of God’s intervention on behalf of his people is central to the war tradition and is invoked through the frequent image of God’s mighty hand (cf. 1:14; 3:8; 11:1, 8, 11; 12:10; 13:12, 14; 15:13; 18:1, 3, 11, 13; 19:3; 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 4; 11 i 23; 15 6) or the battle being described as belonging to God (4:12; 9:5; 11:1, 2, 4; 15:12; 16:14; 18:13; 4QM^a [4Q491] 11 ii 12). These features, along with the theologically oriented inscriptions on the trumpets and the banners examined in Chapter 5, imbue the final battle with a sense of divine pre-determinism. The battle is already decided, and it is through God’s mighty hand that victory is assured—a proclamation reminiscent of the great victories of Israel’s past (cf. Josh 6:2, 16; 8:1, 7; 10:8, 14, 30, 32, 42; 11:6, 8; 1 Sam 17:47; Prov 21:31; 1 Chr 5:22).

In lines 3–4, the priests are to blow the trumpets of memorial (*זכרון*) to commence the *herem* of the enemy. As we concluded in Chapter 5, the trumpets of memorial fulfill a ceremonial function of remembrance and are blown at the initial moment of engagement (cf. Num 10:9; 4QM^c [4Q493] 2) and here at the climactic moment of the war. At the sound of the trumpets, the battle lines are to be assembled against the Kittim “to annihilate them” (*להחרים*). Just as was the case in the occurrence in 1QM 9, the employment of the phrase *במגפת עולמים* (“everlasting slaughter”) in line 1 and *מגפת כלה* (“destructive slaughter”) in line 12, hint that the use of *herem* here reflects a concept greater than the mere destruction of the enemy and more

⁸⁸ See “מִגְפָּה,” *DCH* 5:137.

towards the larger Deuteronomic conception as expressed in the book of Joshua.⁸⁹ Therefore, unlike the usage of ἀνάθεμα/ἀνάθημα and ἀναθεματίζω in Jewish-Hellenistic compositions, which seems largely distinct from the biblical conception of *herem*, the usage here in the *War Scroll* does draw on the conception employed in the book of Joshua.

6.3.3 Joshua 10 and the *War Scroll*

Significant for our study is the allusion to Joshua’s request for divine intervention (Josh 10:12–14) in 1QM 18. In Josh 10:12–14, Joshua invokes the sun to stand still presumably to allow the Israelites to gain victory over the kings of the Amorites at Gibeon:

¹²On the day when the LORD gave the Amorites over to the Israelites, Joshua spoke to the LORD; and he said in the sight of Israel, “Sun, stand still at Gibeon, and Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.” ¹³*And the sun stood still, and the moon stopped, until the nation took vengeance on their enemies.* Is this not written in the Book of Jashar? The sun stopped in mid-heaven, and did not hurry to set for about a whole day. ¹⁴*There has been no day like it before or since, when the LORD heeded a human voice; for the LORD fought for Israel.* (Josh 10:12–14, emphasis mine)

Considered by commentators to be an independent composition, the poem to the sun is introduced in verse 12 by the phrase אָז יְדַבֵּר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ (“then Joshua spoke”), with the poem itself contained in verses 12b–13a.⁹⁰ As Isaac Rabinowitz has argued, the syntactical construction of אָז followed by an imperfect verb often indicates a literary insertion refer to the preceding context and providing exegetical importance (cf. Exod 15:1; Num 21:17; Deut 4:41; Josh 8:30; 22:1; 1 Kgs 3:16; 8:1; 9:11; 11:7; 16:21; 2 Kgs 8:20; 12:18; 15:16; 16:2).⁹¹ Here, the construction

⁸⁹ A similar expression occurs in Josh 10:10 and 20 when Joshua and the Israelites are said to have “inflicted a great slaughter [lit., a “wound” or “blow”]” (וַיִּכּוּ מַכָּה גְדוֹלָה) on their enemies and Gibeon (v. 10) and to have inflicted “a very great slaughter” (לְהַכּוֹתָם מַכָּה גְדוֹלָה מְאֹד) on their enemies (v. 20).

⁹⁰ On Josh 10:12–14 as an independent composition and its original meaning, see Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 441–45; Nelson, *Joshua*, 141–45.

⁹¹ Isaac Rabinowitz, “*‘Az Followed by Imperfect Verb-Form in Preterite Contexts: A Redactional Device in Biblical Hebrew*,” *VT* 34 (1984): 53–62. See also Waltke and O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 513–14 (31.6.3b).

signals that verses 12–14 provide exegetical insight on the miraculous nature of the battle with the kings of the Amorites.

Various attempts to understand the phenomenon of the sun “standing still” in Josh 10:13 have been set forth by scholars.⁹² Some have sought to understand the description in light of naturally occurring phenomena, such as an eclipse.⁹³ Others have read the description against the backdrop of mythological astrology with the sun and moon as celestial omens, thus this was a prayer of incantation seeking a good omen before engaging the enemy.⁹⁴ Yet others have sought to situate the meaning within the solar worship of the sun.⁹⁵ Finally, some have read the poem as reflective of the celestial powers as a part of God’s entourage as divine warrior.⁹⁶ Regardless, it seems best to read the poem in light of its current rhetorical situation in the text. Therefore, in its current form, the pericope highlights the authority of Joshua to influence God in that the miracle is no longer the sun standing motionless, but rather that God listened and obeyed Joshua’s invocation causing the sun to cease movement (v. 14; cf. Hab 3:11).⁹⁷

A similar description to that of Josh 10:12–14 is found in 1QM 18 when the sons of light are gathered against the Kittim to annihilate them (להחריםם), the climactic moment of the battle:

⁵[*And when*] *the sun hastens to go down*, on that day the chief priest shall take position and the priests and the [Levite]s who ⁶(are) with him, the chi[efs of ... of] the rule. They shall bless there the God of Israel. (1QM 18:5–6, emphasis mine)

⁹² For an overview on scholarly discussions, see Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 442–44; Nelson, *Joshua*, 142–45; K. Lawson Younger, Jr., *Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing*, JSOTSup 98 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 211–15.

⁹³ See John F. A. Sawyer, “Joshua 10:12–14 and the Solar Eclipse of 30 September 1131 B.C.,” *PEQ* 104 (1972): 139–46; Daniel Vainstub, Hezi Yizhaq, and Uzi Avner, “The Miracle of the Sun and Moon in Joshua 10 as a Solar Eclipse,” *VT* 70 (2020): 722–51.

⁹⁴ See John S. Holladay, Jr., “The Day(s) the Moon Stood Still,” *JBL* 87 (1968): 166–78; John H. Walton, “Joshua 10:12–15 and the Mesopotamian Celestial Omen Texts,” in *Faith, Tradition and History*, eds Alan R. Millard, James K. Hoffmeier, and David W. Baker (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 181–90.

⁹⁵ Jan Dus, “Gibeon—ein Kultstätte des šmš und die Stadt des benjaministischen Schicksals,” *VT* 10 (1960): 353–74; J. Glen Taylor, *Yahweh and the Sun: Biblical and Archaeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel*, JSOTSup 111 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 114–18.

⁹⁶ Miller, *The Divine Warrior*, 123–28; Nelson, *Joshua*, 144.

⁹⁷ Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 444–45. Nelson, *Joshua*, 144–45. On the reversal in roles between Joshua and God (i.e., God obeying Joshua and Joshua commanding the luminaries), see Hawk, *Joshua*, 151–54.

This is followed by a prayer of blessing by the Chief Priest, proclaiming,

¹⁰[...] you have done wonders among us, wonder after wonder. *From of old, there has not been anything like it*, for you have known (it) to (be) our appointed time and today it appears ¹¹for us, [for] you [have shown] us *the hand of your mercy with us* in everlasting redemption, to remove the domi[ni]on of the enemy to be no more, *and the hand of your mighty hand*. ¹²And in the bat[tle ... agains]t our enemies for a destructive slaughter (למגפת כלה). And now the day is hastening for us to pursue their multitude, for you ¹³[...] and the heart of the mighty ones, you have delivered⁹⁸ so that none (of them) could stand. *To you is the might and in your hand is the battle*. (1QM 18:10–13, translation and emphasis my own)

The section begins with a reference to the sun “hastening to go down.” Preceding the phrase and directly following the reference to *herem* is a lacuna measuring approximately 17 mm, which has been reconstructed variously by commentators.⁹⁹ Following Yadin and Johannes van der Ploeg, it seems best to read the phrase as referring to the state of the day when the Chief Priest proclaims the blessing, “[And when (or “before”)] the sun hastens to go down, on that day..., (ביום) [באין]” hence, the gathering of the battle lines and the blessing is portrayed as occurring in the latter part of the day as the sun was beginning to set. If this reading is correct, the description in line 5, as well as the statement by the Chief Priest in line 12: “And now the day is hastening for us to pursue their multitude...” amounts to a request of God to perform the same miraculous phenomenon as in Josh 10:12–14, namely, that the sun would stand motionless (and thus not set) so that the sons of light could likewise take “vengeance on their enemies” as Joshua

⁹⁸ Yadin, followed by Abegg, preferred the translation “broken” for מגנתה in line 13. See *The Scroll of the War*, 346–47. Yadin suggested that the phrase is based upon Lam 3:65 (מְגֵנַת-לֵב, “anguish of heart”).

⁹⁹ Yadin suggested the lacuna included a vacat with the first word following as באין[ו], thus “[And] when the sun hastens to go down...” See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 222–23 and 345. Similarly, van der Ploeg (“[before] the sun hastens to set...”) and Jongeling (“[And when] the sun will hasten to set on that day...”). See van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 53 and 186; Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 366–68 and 371. Carmignac suggested the reconstructed lacuna and first word as באין/יאין [כיא לוא], thus “[for] the sun [will not] hasten to set in that day.” See Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 248–49. More recently, Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar follow Yadin (DSSSE, 142), whereas Jean Duhaime conservatively chooses to leave the lacuna and first letter unreconstructed (PTSDSSP 2:136).

did at Gibeon.¹⁰⁰ This allusion to Josh 10 is strengthened further by the statement, “From of old, there has not been anything like it” (18:10), a phrase reminiscent of Josh 10:14. While the invocation of Josh 10 is not made explicit in the text, those who formed and transmitted this tradition envisaged the victory over the Kittim as no less divinely miraculous.¹⁰¹ Just as God heeded the request of Joshua and intervened by making the sun stand still, so too the Chief Priest—by asking for the sun to stand still—echoes the belief that God is on the side of the sons of light and will intervene on their behalf.

Joshua 10:14 concludes with the declaration that God “fought for Israel,” a summation of God’s interventional actions on behalf of Israel, which include God throwing the enemy into a “panic” (וַיִּהְיֶה מַחַד) in 10:10 (cf. Deut 7:23) and throwing down of hailstones upon the enemy in 10:11.¹⁰² The reference to “panic” may potentially relate to the reference to the enemy being thrown into a panic (מהומה) in 1QM 1:5 (cf. 4QM^f [4Q496] 3 5) and 11:18 and the banner inscription, “The Panic of God” (מהומת אל), in 1QM 4:7. The larger notion of God’s intervention is made explicit in the reference to “the congregation of your holy ones in our midst for an everlasti[ng] help” (1QM 12:7), the call upon the faithful to rejoice “and be glad for [your] hel[p]” (13:13), the declaration that God has “done wonders among us, wonder after wonder” (18:10), and the frequent references to God’s mighty hand, as previously discussed.

¹⁰⁰ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 222–23; van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 186.

¹⁰¹ Van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 186. Van der Ploeg adds, “One does not get the impression that the author means to say that the miracle of the stopping of the sun will be repeated, but he is convinced that God can again stop the course of the sun, if it will be necessary; the omnipotence of God can, however, do without miracles, because the complete victory of the Sons of light over the powers of darkness will sufficiently prove that He is the Master of creation” (p. 186).

¹⁰² Younger notes that the hurling down of stones as a form of divine intervention is a common feature within ancient conquest narratives, citing the Ten-Year Annals of the Muršili (*KBo* III 4 Vs. II.15–49) and Sargon’s Letter to the God (ll. 141–52). See Younger, Jr., *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 208–11.

One final connection is worth noting. After the defeat of the five Amorite kings and before their execution, Joshua summoned all the Israelites and instructed the military leaders to “come near and put your feet on the necks of these kings” (Josh 10:24). Joshua encouraged them not to fear but to be strong and courageous “for thus the LORD will do to all the enemies against whom you fight” (10:25). The placing of the foot on the neck of the vanquished enemy, a symbolic act of the complete subjugation, is known from ancient Near Eastern iconography (e.g., *ANEP* 308, 351, 355, 393).¹⁰³ The act also lies behind references to placing one’s enemies under their feet, including enemies being made a “footstool,” in the biblical tradition (e.g., Deut 33:29; 1 Kgs 5:17 [Eng. 5:3]; Ps 18:39; 47:3; 110:1). Importantly, a similar image to that of Josh 10:24 appears in 1QM 12:11 (cf. 19:3; Gen 49:8) when God is called upon to “put your hand upon the neck of your enemies and your foot upon the piles of slain!” A slightly different but related image appears later in the column in lines 14–15: “Their kings shall serve you (cities of Judah); all your oppressors shall bow down before you and [lick] the dust [from your feet” (cf. 4QM^b [4Q492] 1 6–7, which reads רגליך ילחכו [ועפר; Isa 49:23]).¹⁰⁴ These images of the subjugation of the enemy in the war tradition have a deep indebtedness to the biblical tradition. What is missing from much of the scholarly discussion surrounding 1QM 12, however, is reference to Josh 10:24, which seems surprising given the description in 10:25 that God would do the same “to all the enemies against whom you fight” and the invocation for God to act similarly in 1QM 12. I would suggest that Josh 10:24–25 also lies behind the references in 1QM 12.

¹⁰³ See Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 454; Nelson, *Joshua*, 146; Younger, Jr., *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 317 n. 86. See also, Martin Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, 2nd ed. HAT 7 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971), 66; Robert G. Boling and G. Ernest Wright, *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*, AB 6 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1982), 286.

¹⁰⁴ The translation, first proposed by Sukenik and universally accepted by subsequent translators, is based upon Isa 49:23, “Kings shall be your foster fathers, and their queens your nursing mothers. With their faces to the ground they shall bow down to you, and lick the dust of your feet. Then they will know that I am the LORD; those who wait for me shall not be put to shame.” See Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth II*.

What these connections between the book of Joshua and the Qumran war tradition intimate is that the creators and transmitters of the war traditions used the conquest narratives of Joshua to frame the final eschatological battle. In Josh 6, the principal role of the priesthood in the destruction of Jericho, including leading the preparatory procession and blowing of trumpets, provided the writer(s) a tangible image of sacerdotal combatants leading the faithful into battle. The prominence of the concept of *herem* and its faithful execution in the conquest narratives offered a vision of the wartime consecration of the enemy to God and the divine sphere. In the invocation of Joshua in Josh 10:12–14 the shapers of the war tradition found a discernable expression of God’s mighty hand intervening for the faithful as they sought to complete the annihilation of the enemy. In short, the conquest narratives of Josh 6–10 proffered an account of divine, cultic warfare in which God fought on behalf of the faithful and assured their victory over their enemies, those deemed to be animated by darkness. Viewed in this light, the Qumran war tradition is deeply indebted to the conquest narratives of the Joshua tradition.

6.4 The Joshua Conquest Tradition in 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381)

One noteworthy example of allusion to the Joshua conquest tradition is found in 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) 69. Paleographically dated to approximately 75 BCE, 4Q381 consists of a collection of psalm-like compositions pseudepigraphically attributed to various biblical figures.¹⁰⁵ Whereas the majority of psalms in 4Q381 are stylistically and thematically reflective of biblical psalmody, fragments 69 and 77 are distinctive in style, more closely

¹⁰⁵ On 4Q381, see Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran*, HSS 28 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); Schuller, “4QNon-Canonical Psalms B,” DJD 11:87–172; Schuller, “Qumran Pseudepigraphic Psalms (4Q380 and 4Q381),” PTSDSSP 4A:1–39. The designation “non-canonical,” as noted by Schuller, is meant to highlight that the psalms contained in 4Q380 and 4Q381 do not appear in another other psalter collection as opposed to making any determination regarding “canonical” status at the time of composition. See Eileen M. Schuller, “4QNon-Canonical Psalms A,” DJD 11:77.

associated with “elevated prose” rather than poetry.¹⁰⁶ First suggested by Schuller, fragments 69 and 77 are now considered a unified psalm, with fragment 69 following 77, which is distinctly Deuteronomistic in style, content, and language.¹⁰⁷ Important for our discussion is 4Q381 69, which reads as follows:¹⁰⁸

- 1 [...]lkm because t[...]lm. When he saw that the peoples of [the la]nd (עמי הארץ) acted abominably
- 2 [...] all the land [became] total unclean defilement (לנדת טמאה בנדת טמאה). And marvelously from the first
- 3 [... he to]ok counsel with himself to destroy them (להשמידם) from upon it, and to make upon it a people
- 4 [...]bkm, and he gave them to you by his spirit, prophets to instruct and to teach you
- 5^{sup} [...]km from heaven he came down, and he spoke with you to instruct you, and to turn (you) away from the deeds of the inhabitants of
- 5 [He gave la]ws, instructions, and commandments by the covenant he established through[Moses]
- 6 [...]take possession, dwell upon the land; then it will be purified and y.. [...]
- 7 [...] to consider among yourselves, if you will be his, or if [...]
- 8 [...] and to break the covenant which he cut with you, and to act as strangers, and not [...]
- 9 [...] against wickedness, and to change the words of his mouth m 'l' [...]
- 10 [...] [...]l[...]

As Schuller has noted, the fragment is indebted to Neh 9:13–14, 20, and 24, and, to a lesser degree, Ezra 9:11, a connection examined more fully in the next chapter.¹⁰⁹ Additionally,

¹⁰⁶ See Schuller, DJD 11:149; Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 209. Schuller highlights the use of the second person plural for the addressee, phrases that are longer than those found in poetic cola, and the frequent use of the infinitive form. Schuller tentatively joins frg. 76 with 77 based upon the matching edges and the lines of folding. Mika Pajunen joins frgs. 1 and 14+5 (column I) followed by frgs. 10 and 76 (column II) as its own distinct psalm. See Mika S. Pajunen, *The Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381*, JAJSup 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 143–58.

¹⁰⁷ See Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 225; Schuller, DJD 11:176. Schuller further suggests that the format, style, and content is reminiscent of “covenantal lawsuit” (ריב) much in the same light as Mic 6 and Deut 32 (cf. 1 Enoch 1–5; CD 1:1–4:12; 4QAdmonitory Parable [4Q302]).

¹⁰⁸ Translation by Schuller, DJD 11:150. For images of 4Q381 69, see PAM 41.974; 42.826; 43.224; I-190444; I-190455. See also, B-363976, B-363977, and B-371358 in LLDSSDL. This fragment contains a supralinear addition above line 5. For a detailed discussion on the addition, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 206; Schuller, DJD 11:151.

¹⁰⁹ For a comprehensive listing of linguistic connections between Neh 9 and 4Q381 69, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 209–10. On the connection between Ezra 9:11 and 4Q381 69 2, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 204; Pajunen, *The Land to the Elect*, 166. On the unique terminology used in Ezra 9:11, see Juha Pakkala, *Ezra the Scribe: The Development of Ezra 7–10 and Nehemiah 8*, BZAW 347 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 115.

Schuller has compellingly argued that the setting for the events narrated in 4Q381 is that of the time of Sinai and the conquest.¹¹⁰ The reference to the “peoples of the land” (עמי הארץ) in line 1 is closely connected to Neh 9:24 where the phrase directly refers to the pre-Israelite inhabitants of the land (cf. Ezra 3:3; 9:2, 11; 10:2, 11; Neh 9:10; 10:29, 31, 32).¹¹¹ Moreover, the idea that the עמי הארץ acted abominably is likewise clearly expressed in the Deuteronomistic tradition (Deut 7:25–26; 18:9, 12; 20:18; cf. Ezra 9:1, 11, 14). The use of the verb להשמיד in line 3 to describe the destruction of the inhabitants of the land provides clear allusion to the Joshua conquest tradition (Josh 9:24; 11:14, 20; 24:8; cf. Deut 7:4, 23, 24; 9:3; 1 Chr 5:25).¹¹² Finally, the fragmentary reference to the verb ירשו (“take possession”) at the beginning of line 6 is reflective of the conquest narrative, occurring twenty-nine times in the book of Joshua (e.g., Josh 1:11, 15; 3:10; 8:7; 12:1).¹¹³ Of special note are the verbs שמד and ירש together (Deut 9:3; Josh 24:8). This evidence suggests that while a strong allusive connection between Neh 9 and Ezra 9 is clear, a connection between 4Q381 69 and the book of Joshua, particularly the conquest narratives, seems justified. However, it should be acknowledged that the fragment does not preserve any direct quotes from the book of Joshua, making this connection more implicit in nature.

Regarding the provenience of 4Q381, as Schuller has aptly noted, there is no prevailing evidence that the composition originated within the Qumran movement. Schuller specifically highlights the absence of distinctly sectarian terminology and ideology, as well as the relatively

¹¹⁰ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 210–12.

¹¹¹ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 204.

¹¹² Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 205.

¹¹³ The verb ירש occurs an additional seventy-one times in the book of Deuteronomy.

frequent appearance of the Tetragrammaton (cf. 4Q381 1 2; 24 4, 8; 33 2; 77 12; 86 2).¹¹⁴ While this remains the consensus view, some commentators have attempted to account for the presence of 4Q381 at Qumran. Russell Arnold has suggested a liturgical use for 4Q381, observing that the election terminology contained in the composition might have had some appeal for the Qumran movement and possibly played a role in the forming of communal identity within the movement.¹¹⁵ Mika Pajunen has proposed that 4Q381 could have followed the original conception of the composition, namely, to provide a lesson from the past to properly live in the present while predicting some future reality.¹¹⁶ In the end, the fragmentary nature of the manuscript defies positing any specific purpose for the composition with any certainty.

Regardless of the provenience or potential usage within the Qumran movement, however, several conclusions are significant. First, the presence of 4Q381 in Cave 4 should not be passed over lightly as it demonstrates the composition was of significance to the movement and potentially used within the community at Qumran.¹¹⁷ The themes of the future destruction of the wicked and the elect taking possession of the land, both important within 4Q381 69 and 77, are likewise expressed within other liturgical and exegetical texts from Qumran (cf. 4QBarkhi Nafshi^a [4Q434] 2; 4QpPs^a [4Q171] 1–10 ii 4–12; iii 9–13). This suggests not only the importance of the themes of the destruction of the wicked and possession of the land within the Qumran movement, but also that 4Q381 might have resonated with the worldview of the

¹¹⁴ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 22–23, 38–43. Elsewhere, Schuller has suggested that “perhaps it is best to situate the composition of these psalms very broadly within mainstream Second Temple Judaism.” See PTSDSSP 4A, 2.

¹¹⁵ Russell C. D. Arnold, *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community*, STDJ 60 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 227–29.

¹¹⁶ Pajunen, *The Land to the Elect*, 365–68.

¹¹⁷ Pajunen observed that the phrase בן אמתך in 4Q381 15 2 and 33 5, appropriately translated “son of your handmaiden,” could have been read by those in the Qumran movement as “son of your truth,” a phrase found in other writings in the Qumran corpus closely associated with the movement (e.g., 1QS 4:5–6; 11:16; 1QM 17:8; 1QH 8:27; 14:29; 17:35; 18:27; 19:11). See Pajunen, *The Land to the Elect*, 367.

community as well.¹¹⁸ Given the prevalence of these themes in the Joshua tradition, Feldman's assertion of the importance of the Joshua tradition within the interpretive enterprise of the Second Temple period seems more than justified. Finally, and important for our study, 4Q381 69 demonstrates that near the time of the formation and transmission of the Qumran war tradition there was an interpretive tradition, framed within the Joshua conquest tradition, which understood the land as defiled on account of the abominable acts of the people of the land, and furthermore, that the taking possession of the land by the elect would result in the purification of the land. It has been our suggestion that those who formed and transmitted the Qumran war tradition constructed a similar framework of the final battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness from the Joshua conquest tradition, envisaging the land as having been defiled (גדת טמאה, cf. 1QM 13:5; 4Q381 69 2) by the works of the forces of Belial and in need of purification.

6.5 Conclusion

As Feldman has argued, the book of Joshua was not only the subject of intense exegetical activity within the last two centuries BCE, but also was perhaps the most rewritten book of the Former Prophets in the Qumran corpus.¹¹⁹ Our contention here has been that the Joshua tradition also played a significant role in the framing of the imagined future final battle between the sons of light and the sons of darkness. We demonstrated in this chapter largely overlooked significant connections between the two traditions by examining their linguistic and thematic relationship.

¹¹⁸ On the theme of the possession of the land in 11QSefer ha-Milhamah (11Q14) and 4QSefer ha-Milhamah (4Q285), see William J. Lyons, "Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and Eschatological Victory," *DSD* 3 (1996): 130–51.

¹¹⁹ Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls*, 193.

Over the course of our investigation, we have highlighted the distinct terminological relationship between the Joshua conquest narratives and the war tradition from Qumran. Moreover, we examined the priestly and Deuteronomistic conception of *herem* in its most expansive expression in the destruction of Jericho in Josh 6. We observed that the concept of *herem* in the book of Joshua was largely, if not completely, absent in Jewish-Hellenistic writings. Within these writings, the use of ἀνάθημα reflected a classically Greek notion of a votive offering. Significantly, the concept of *herem* from the Joshua tradition reemerges within the Qumran war tradition. Finally, we were able to demonstrate a series of allusions between Joshua's request for the sun to stand still and God's subsequent intervention in Josh 10:12–14 and 1QM 18. Our findings suggest that for those who formed and transmitted the war tradition the conquest narratives in the book of Joshua offered a thematic backdrop for the future eschatological battle. Whereas the Joshua tradition envisages the conquest of the land on an earthly scale, the Qumran war tradition sees the conquest and subsequent purification of the land on a decidedly cosmic scale, a development that is currently distinctive within Second Temple literature.

CHAPTER 7 – PURITY AND POLLUTION: THE PURIFICATION AND RENEWAL OF THE EARTH

7.1 Introduction

The increased importance of purity within Judaism of the late Second Temple period is beyond question. The widespread presence of *miqva'ot* from the late first century BCE to 70 CE and beyond including their distribution within residential areas, near synagogues, agricultural installations, pilgrimage routes, and cemeteries, as well as the widespread use of stone vessels all attest to this notion of an intensified concern for ritual purity.¹ The archaeological record of Khirbet Qumran only strengthens this portrayal, including the presence of potentially upwards of ten large *miqva'ot*, as well as the use of stone lids, stoppers, and storage jars.²

With the full publication of the Qumran corpus, the evidence available concerning the nature of purity and impurity has grown dramatically offering a more nuanced depiction of the issues. Nevertheless, this increase in available evidence has not always resulted in greater clarity, nor universal agreement. Discussion continues concerning the development of an adequate conceptual framework for understanding the diverse nature of impurity concerns.³ Regarding the

¹ On *miqva'ot* in the late Second Temple period, see Boaz Zissu and David Amit, “Common Judaism, Common Purity, and the Second Temple Period Judean *Miqva'ot* (Ritual Immersion Baths),” in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, eds. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 47–62; revised and updated as “A Classification of the Second Temple Period Judean *Miqva'ot* (Ritual Immersion Baths),” in *Speleology and Speleology: To the Centenary of A. V. Ryumin's Birth: Proceedings of the V International Scientific Correspondence Conference* (Naberezhnye Chelny, 2014), 246–61; Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 176–80. On the use of *miqva'ot* past 70 CE, see Yonatan Adler, “The Decline of Jewish Ritual Purity Observance in Roman Palestine: An Archaeological Perspective on Chronology and Historical Context,” in *Expressions of Cult in the Southern Levant in the Greco-Roman Period: Manifestations in Text and Material Culture*, eds. Oren Tal and Zeev Weiss, CS 6 (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2017), 269–84.

² Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 92–102 and 180–90.

³ Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, 1966); *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 766–68, 816–20, 1000–1004; Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Tracy Lemos, “Where

Qumran movement specifically, there has been ongoing debate as to if and to what degree we might speak of a coherent system of purity at Qumran. This has raised further questions in relation to which texts should be seen as representative of such a system, as opposed to texts merely received by the Qumran movement and not informing the lived practice of the movement as a whole or those at Khirbet Qumran specifically.⁴ There continues to be discourse regarding the level of stringency seen in purity requirements at Qumran vis-à-vis those required by other expressions of Judaism in the Second Temple period.⁵ Finally, debate continues as to the amount of intersection between the categories of ritual and moral purity envisaged within so-called “purity texts” in the Qumran corpus.⁶

For the large part, and rightly so, discussions surrounding purity and impurity at Qumran have tended to focus on the conceptual framework of purity and impurity and its implications in light of various *serekh* and *halakhic* texts, such as the *Damascus Document*, the *Community*

There is Dirt, Is There System? Revisiting Biblical Purity Constructions,” *JSOT* 37 (2013): 265–94. Thomas Kazen has recently argued persuasively for the role of disgust as a common denominator underlying various conceptions of purity. See Thomas Kazen, *Emotions in Biblical Law: A Cognitive Science Approach*, HBM 36 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011); Kazen, “The Role of Disgust in Priestly Purity Law: Insights from Conceptual Metaphor and Blending Theories,” *JLRS* 3 (2014): 62–92; Kazen, “Disgust in Body, Mind, and Language: The Case of Impurity in the Hebrew Bible,” in *Mixed Feelings and Vexed Passions in Biblical Literature: Exploring Emotions in Biblical Literature*, ed. F. Scott Spencer, RBS 90 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 97–115; repr., *Impurity and Purification in Early Judaism and the Jesus Tradition*, RBS 98 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021), 137–53; Kazen, “Levels of Explanation for Ideas of Impurity: Why Structuralist and Symbolic Models Often Fail While Evolutionary and Cognitive Models Succeed,” *JAJ* 9 (2018): 74–99.

⁴ In support of a coherent system, see Hannah K. Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations*, SBLDS (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993); Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, CQS 5 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 12–30. For the contrasting position, see Ian C. Werrett, *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 72 (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

⁵ Hannah Harrington suggest that the Qumran “system” was more consistently more stringent. See Harrington, *Impurity Systems*, 47–67; Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 12. Vered Noam and Ian Werrett have convincingly demonstrated that Qumran purity requirements were at times more lenient. See Vered Noam, “Stringency in Qumran: A Reassessment,” *JSJ* 40 (2009): 1–14; Werrett, *Ritual Purity*, 288–305.

⁶ Klawans argues that ritual and moral impurity have become a “singular conception of defilement.” See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 90. Also, Eyal Regev, “Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 243–78. For a contrasting position, see Martha Himmelfarb, “Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 9–37; Gudrun Holtz, “Purity Conceptions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: ‘Ritual-Physical’ and ‘Moral’ Purity in a Diachronic Perspective,” in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*, eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, DHR 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 519–36; Cecilia Wassén, “Purity and Holiness,” *CDSS*, 513–15.

Rule, 4QTohorot (4Q274–280 and 4Q284a), 4QOrdinances^{a-c} (4Q159; 4Q513–514), the Temple Scroll (11Q19), and *Miqṣat Ma‘aše ha-Torah* (4QMMT or 4Q394–399).⁷ The intention of this chapter is to examine matters of purity, impurity, and defilement in the Qumran war tradition, specifically the stipulations surrounding the purity of the war camp (1QM 7:3–7), the regulations focused on the concern for corpse defilement of the combatants (1QM 9:7–9; 14:2–3), and the employment of defilement terminology, especially חלל (“slain or defiled”), טמאה (“uncleanness”), and נדה (“impurity”). Of particular significance will be the linguistic cluster עבודת נדה טמאתם (“their works of impure uncleanness”) in 1QM 13:5 and its implication within exilic and post-exilic literature including other texts from the Qumran corpus.

In the last chapter, we established the influence of the Joshua conquest narratives on the war tradition from Qumran, concluding that the Joshua conquest tradition provided the thematic backdrop for the eschatological battle. Albeit on an earthly scale in the book of Joshua, we noted that the Qumran war tradition expanded the earthly themes of conquest, placing them on a cosmic stage. Here, in this chapter, we will conclude that matters of purity and defilement in the war tradition function to heighten the requisite level of purity for the combatants, requisite for the co-participation of angelic beings, for the extermination of the guilty, those who have defiled the land with their abominable acts. In this light, the eschatological war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, the lot of Belial, is a cosmological act of purification of the earth.

7.2 Purity and the Protection of the Holy

It is universally recognized that the purity requirements found within the priestly stratum and the Holiness Code demonstrate a concern for contact between impurity and that which is holy, most

⁷ For example, see Hannah K. Harrington, “Purity,” *EDSS* 2:724–28; Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 45–67.

notably the Temple.⁸ Purity regulations were therefore requisite for contact with the holy, protecting that which was holy from defilement by impurity, and essential for God's holiness to be present.⁹ Moreover, it has been widely recognized that there is an interconnection between concepts of sin and impurity. Jacob Milgrom observed that whereas the priestly tradition focuses on ritual defilement and ritual purification, the notion of abominable moral acts as impurities that defile the land is inherent to the Holiness Code tradition.¹⁰ Building on the work of Milgrom, Jonathan Klawans has distinguished between two types of impurity: ritual impurity and moral impurity.¹¹ Whereas ritual impurity is an impermanent defilement that can be ameliorated by purification rites, moral impurity is a long-lasting, if not permanent defilement, which requires punishment and atonement. Acts that lead to moral impurity are considered defiling and are frequently referred to as "abominations" (תועבות), including sexual sins (Lev 18:24–30), idolatry (Lev 19:31; 20:1–3), and the shedding of blood (Num 35:33–34).¹² As we will see, the concept of moral impurity is important for understanding the conceptual universe of the Qumran war tradition.

The stringency of purity requirements characterized at Qumran likewise attest to an intensification of concern for purity and perfection. Within this context, purity regulations provide strict boundaries which demarcate and protect the "holy community" from defilement. This concern is particularly noticeable in the self-referential titles given to the community, such as "holy congregation" (1QS 5:20; 9:2; 1QSa 1:9, 13), "holy council" (1QS 2:25; 8:25; 1QSa

⁸ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 976–85.

⁹ Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 8–12; Wassén, "Purity and Holiness," 511.

¹⁰ Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3A (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1573–74.

¹¹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 21–42.

¹² Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 26.

2:9; 1QM 3:4; CD 20:25; 1QH 15:10), “men of holiness” (1QS 8:17), and “men of perfect holiness” (CD 20:2–7; 1QS 8:20).¹³

Due to the metaphorical use of temple language in connection with the community in the *Community Rule* (1QS 5:5–6; 8:4–6; 9:3–6) and 4QFlor (4Q174) 1–2 i 6, the rationale for the purity regulations have tended to be Temple-focused, envisaging the community as a type of substitute or replacement for the Jerusalem Temple or as the embodiment of the pure status incumbent by the Torah in expectation of a renewed Temple in the future.¹⁴ Inherent in these notions is the suggestion that the intensified levels of purity at Qumran were to parallel those required for the Temple and the holy city. More recently, attention has been focused on the eschatological nature of the community, specifically, the developing belief of the presence of angelic beings in their midst and the communion between the divine and human realms (as witnessed in 1QS 11:7–9; 1QSa 3:3–9; CD 15:15–17; 1QM 7:3–6; 1QH^a 11:21–23; and 4QShir^{a–b} [4Q510–511]).¹⁵ As such, the enhanced requirements are necessary in order to achieve and maintain an intensified degree of holiness in relation with and due to the presence of angels and

¹³ Wassén, “Purity and Holiness,” 513.

¹⁴ Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 49; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Impurity of the Dead in the Temple Scroll,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, JSJSup 8; JSOT/ASOR 8 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 135–56; Elisha Qimron, “Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectariness,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*, eds. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:286–94; E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 376–77; Harrington, *Impurity Systems*, 56–57; Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 38; Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 162–68. Florentino García Martínez sees Qumran purity requirements as an extension of the requirements for Temple purity to the whole holy city and thus to the community itself as a substitute for the Temple. While acknowledging the rationale of the presence of angels, he sees this as the supreme ideal to which the community pursued. See Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden: Brill: 1995. Contra to these positions, see Cecilia Wassén, “Do You Have to be Pure in a Metaphorical Temple? Sanctuary Metaphors and Construction of Sacred Space in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul’s Letters,” in *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*, eds. Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen Schuller, WUNT 305 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 55–86.

¹⁵ See Cecilia Wassén, “Angels and Humans: Boundaries and Synergies,” in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*, eds. Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Baek, EJL 30 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 523–39.

the communion between the human and heavenly realms.¹⁶ Therefore, the avoidance of impurities and, as we will see, the various rules of exclusion were imperative within the eschatological community for contact with the holy.¹⁷ Regarding the war tradition, an elevated requirement for purity and perfection was requisite to fight alongside angelic warriors in the eschatological battle.

7.3 Purity and Protection in the Context of Warfare

Whereas priestly literature includes a myriad of regulations regarding purity and defilement, instructions regulating purity in times of war are strikingly minimal. Two locations in the Hebrew Bible, Deut 23:10–15 (Eng. 9–14) and Num 31:19–24, are worthy of note as they demonstrate a marked influence on the war tradition from Qumran.

7.3.1 Purity Regulations and the War Camp (Deut 23:10–15)

Directly following a series of regulations in Deut 23:1–9 addressing individuals excluded from the community is a series of regulations aimed at the protection of the sacred sphere of the war camp (vv. 10–15). What is clear from these regulations is that the sanctity of the war camp requires more stringent protection than that of the Israelite camp in general. This stringency is indebted to the fact that God is present within the war camp and fighting on behalf of Israel (v. 15), a reality likewise made clear in Deut 7:21 and 20:1 and 4. As we have already noted, Leviticus and Numbers emphasize the notion that impurity is incompatible with the presence of

¹⁶ Harrington noted that the enhanced state of purity fits with the Qumran movements' "apocalyptic character," whereby purity was necessary for the required holiness for fighting holy war, the purification of evil, and for receiving on-going revelation. See Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 39–41.

¹⁷ Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 37–52. Also, Cecilia Wassén, "What Do Angels Have against the Blind and the Deaf? Rules of Exclusion in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, eds. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 115–29.

God and threatens the defilement of the Tabernacle (Lev 15:31) and thus requires that those with a skin disease, genital discharge, or unclean through contact with a corpse be removed from the Israelite camp (Num 5:1–5). Sharing a similar premise as these instructions, the regulations in Deut 23:10–15, as we will see, demonstrate a heightened concern for protecting the holiness of the war camp over that of the Israelite camp.¹⁸

¹⁰When you are encamped against your enemies you shall guard against any impropriety (דְּבַר רָע). ¹¹If one of you becomes unclean because of a nocturnal emission (מִקְרָה לַיְלָה), then he shall go outside the camp; he must not come within the camp. ¹²When evening comes, he shall wash himself with water, and when the sun has set, he may come back into the camp. ¹³You shall have a designated area outside the camp to which you shall go. ¹⁴With your utensils you shall have a trowel; when you relieve yourself outside, you shall dig a hole with it and then cover up your excrement. ¹⁵Because the LORD your God travels along with your camp, to save you and to hand over your enemies to you, therefore your camp must be holy, so that he may not see anything indecent (עֲרֹת דְּבַר) among you and turn away from you. (Deut 23:10–15 [Eng. 9–14])

The regulations begin with a general command concerning the guarding of the camp “against any bad thing (דְּבַר רָע).” The phrase is distinctly opaque allowing for a wider application than the more narrowly defined regulations regarding the Israelite camp and thus heightening the requirement. Significantly, the exact same term is used in Deut 17:1 to refer to bodily defects in sacrificial animals, and whose sacrifice is considered abhorrent to God (תּוֹעֵבַת יְהוָה אֲלֵהֶיךָ).¹⁹

This likewise strengthens the concern and stringency required within the war camp. The command is then expanded upon with two specific cases—uncleanness regarding nocturnal emission (vv. 11–12) and the proper treatment of human excrement (vv. 13–14)—both of which are understood to fall under the designation of an impropriety.

¹⁸ Commenting on this pericope, Ibn Ezra suggested that the heightened requirements reflect a time in which the Ark traveled with the army. Ramban and Shadal suggested that the regulations were to keep the soldiers constantly aware of God’s presence with them. For a discussion on these positions, see Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 213.

¹⁹ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 213.

The first example regards an “occurrence or accident of the night (מְקַרְהָ לַיְלָה)” commonly understood to be a nocturnal emission of semen.²⁰ The regulation instructs that the person who becomes unclean must separate himself and not re-enter the war camp. When evening comes, the individual undergoes the required ablution and when the sun has set may then re-enter the camp.²¹ This requirement is reminiscent of the prescription found in Lev 15:16, “If a man has an emission of semen, he shall bathe his whole body in water, and be unclean until the evening.” What is significant here is the heightened requirement of separation for the seminal emitter from the war camp.²² Leviticus 15:16 offers no indication that the seminal emitter needs to separate themselves from the community while undergoing purification. Contrary to this, the seminal emitter is required in 23:11 to leave the camp and not re-enter until the completion of their purification. This unique intensification is undoubtedly due to the presence of God within the war camp (v. 15).²³

The text then shifts to a second example: specific regulations regarding the proper treatment of human excrement (vv. 13–14). The text instructs that a location outside of the camp should be selected for the purpose of defecation. As we will see, while no distance away from the war camp is stated in Deut 23, 1QM 7:6–7 mandates two thousand cubits away from the war camp whereas 1QT^a 46:13–16 designates three thousand cubits from Jerusalem. A “trowel” (תְּהַד), literally a “tent-peg”) is to be used for digging a hole and covering the excrement. It is noteworthy that nowhere in the Torah is human excrement explicitly described as impure or

²⁰ See *DCH* “קְרָה,” 7:319. Richard Nelson suggested that this could be understood more broadly as improprieties that might occur under the cover of darkness. See Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 279.

²¹ On ritual bathing, see Jonathan D. Lawrence, *Washing in Water: Trajectories of Ritual Bathing in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).

²² For a more detailed discussion, see Olyan, *Rites and Rank*, 51.

²³ See Martha Himmelfarb, “Sexual Relations and Purity in the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 6 (1999): 18.

defiling.²⁴ Some commentators ascribe a connection with Ezek 4:12–15, where Ezekiel, a priest, objects to eating food cooked over human excrement as fuel.²⁵ Others, such as Thomas Kazen, have focused on the issue of disgust as to what makes human excrement objectionable in God’s presence in Deut 23:12–14.²⁶ Importantly, however, at the end of a description similar to that of Deut 23:10–14 Josephus notes that while defecation is a normal human function the Essenes washed themselves after defecation “as if defiled” (*J.W.* 2.148–149 [Thackeray, LCL]).²⁷

The rationale for these heightened regulations is explicitly given in verse 15, namely the camp must maintain strict holiness since God is present in the camp and should not see “anything indecent” (עֲרוֹת דָּבָר, literally “anything naked”) among them and potentially turn away. Much as the use of “bad thing” (דָּבָר רָע) in verse 10, the idiom “anything indecent” is broad enough to include any number of offenses from which the war camp must be protected. This can be seen in the use of the same phrase in the divorce regulations of Deut 24:1 whereby a man can divorce his wife for finding something objectionable (עֲרוֹת דָּבָר) about her. The picture given in Deut 23:10–15 is that to sustain the presence of God within the war camp, an enhanced level of holiness must be maintained by the combatants, a level of holiness that exceeds that of the Israelite camp in general. The maintained presence of God is essential for the war camp because God is present “to save you and to hand over your enemies to you” (v. 15).²⁸ In other words, the success of

²⁴ The lack of reference in the Torah to the defiling nature of human excrement led Moshe Weinfeld to conclude that the regulations in Deut 23:10–15 address the cleanliness of the war camp as much as sacral purity concerns. See Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 238.

²⁵ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 279; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 214.

²⁶ Kazen, *Emotions in Biblical Law*, 88–90. On disgust and impurity in general, see Kazen, “Disgust in Body, Mind, and Language,” 97–115; repr., *Impurity and Purification*, 137–53. Tigay suggested that human excrement may be objectionable in God’s presence “simply because it was filthy and repugnant.” See Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 214.

²⁷ In his description of the Essenes, Josephus states, “On other days (non-Sabbath) they dig a trench a foot deep with a mattock—such is the nature of the hatchet which they present to the neophytes—and wrapping their mantle about them, that they may not offend the rays of the deity, sit above it. they then replace the excavated soil in the trench. For this purpose they select the more retired spots. and though this discharge of excrements is a natural function, they make it a rule to wash themselves after it, as if defiled” (*J.W.* 2.148–149 [Thackeray, LCL]).

²⁸ On the overall concept of war in the book of Deuteronomy, see Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 430.

Israel's military campaign is portrayed as being directly dependent upon strict adherence to a set of guidelines regulating the protection of the holiness of God's presence.

7.3.2 Post-War Purification in the Priestly Tradition (Num 31:19–24)

Numbers 31 recounts the war of vengeance waged against the Midianites (cf. Num 25). After the Israelites are victorious in battle (vv. 1–12), they return to the Israelite camp with captives and spoils and are met outside the camp by Moses, Eleazar the priest, and all the leaders of the congregation. Moses, after giving instructions on the fate of the captives, offers a series of purification procedures for the post-war combatants, captives, and organic objects (vv. 19–20). This is followed by additional instructions given by Eleazar regarding the purification of objects by means of fire and water (vv. 21–24). The chapter concludes with instructions regarding the distribution of captives and spoils (vv. 25–54). The latter unit of text, Num 31:13–54, is not only the largest account of post-battle rituals in the Hebrew Bible, but also the only account of post-war purification instructions regarding combatants, captives, and objects.²⁹ The instructions for purification in vv. 19–24 depend on the priestly laws concerning corpse contamination (cf. Num 5:1–4; 19:1–22).³⁰ The purification procedures read as follows:

¹⁹“Camp outside the camp seven days; whoever of you has killed any person or touched a corpse, purify yourselves (וַאֲשֶׁר־תִּשְׁׁרְפוּ) and your captives on the third and on the seventh day.

²⁰You shall purify (וַאֲשֶׁר־תִּשְׁׁרְפוּ) every garment, every article of skin, everything made of goats' hair, and every article of wood.”

²¹Eleazar the priest said to the troops who had gone to battle: “This is the statute of the law that the LORD has commended Moses: ²²gold, silver, bronze, iron, tin, and lead—²³everything that can withstand fire, shall be passed through fire, and it shall be clean. Nevertheless it shall also be purified (וַאֲשֶׁר־תִּשְׁׁרְפוּ) with the water for purification (מֵי־הַקִּדְּוֶה); and whatever cannot withstand fire, shall be passed through the water. ²⁴You must wash your clothes on the seventh day and you shall be clean; afterward you may come into the camp.” (Num 31:19–24)

²⁹ For a detailed analysis of post-war rituals, see Kelle, “Postwar Rituals,” 205–41.

³⁰ On the connection between purification procedures in Num 31:19–24 and 19:10–20, see David P. Wright, “Purification from Corpse-Contamination in Numbers XXXI 19–24,” *VT* 35 (1985): 213–23.

Moses commands that all combatants who have killed someone or touched a corpse, along with their captives, are to remain outside the camps during which time all persons and organic materials must be purified. As noted above, the purification procedures described in vv. 19–20 depend on the purification regulations regarding corpse contamination connected with the red heifer purification ritual in Num 19:³¹

¹¹Those who touch a dead body of any human being shall be unclean for seven days.

¹²They shall purify themselves (אֶטְהַרְתִּי) with the water on the third and seventh day, and so be clean; but if they do not purify themselves (אֶטְהַרְתִּי) on the third day and on the seventh day, they will not become clean. ¹³All who touch a corpse, the body of a human being who has died, and do not purify themselves (אֶטְהַרְתִּי), defile the tabernacle of the LORD; such persons shall be cut off from Israel. Since water for cleansing was not dashed on them, they remain unclean; their uncleanness is still on them. (Num 19:11–13)

Both sets of text explicitly state an unclean period of seven days, a length of time equivalent to other impurity regulations (cf. Lev 13:31; 15:13, 19, 28). Both sets of regulations require purification on the third and seventh day and are further linked using the *hithpael* imperfect form of the verb אֶטְהַר, “purify oneself/be purified.”³² The *hithpael* imperfect form, found only in Num 8:21; 19:12, 13, 20; and 31:19, 20, 23, refers solely to the purification of people or material objects with the use of water.³³

Following Moses’ instructions, Eleazar adds further purification requirements regarding inorganic materials (vv. 21–23) and the washing of clothing (v. 24). Significantly, Eleazar introduces these requirements as “the statute of the Law” (חֻקַּת הַתּוֹרָה), a phrase only found in Num 19:2, thus portraying the expansive regulations as a continuation of the purification

³¹ For a discussion on the red heifer purification ritual, see Jacob Milgrom, “The Paradox of the Red Cow (Num XIX),” *VT* 31 (1981): 62–72; Milgrom, *Numbers*, 438–43; Baumgarten, “The Red Cow Purification Rites,” 112–19; Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel, Volume 2: Religious Institutions*, 461–62.

³² See *DCH* “אֶטְהַר,” 3:196.

³³ On the use of אֶטְהַר in the context of purification, see Jay Skyler, *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions*, HBM 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015), 109–11.

procedures described in Num 19.³⁴ All metallic items must be passed through fire for purification, but also must be purified with the water for purification (מִן הַמַּיִם, cf. 19:9), whereas those items which cannot withstand fire must be passed through water only and are then considered clean.³⁵ The phrase מִן הַמַּיִם likewise occurs in Num 19:18–20 whereby the corpse contaminated person is purified by sprinkling with מִן הַמַּיִם on the third and seventh day. The purification process is completed on the seventh day with the washing of the combatant's clothing, after which they may re-enter the camp. Given that Num 19:19 instructs both the washing of clothes and bathing in water as the final stage of purification from corpse contamination (cf. Lev 11:25, 28, 40), some form of ritual bathing might plausibly be assumed in Num 31 as well.³⁶ As we will see below, the washing of clothes as a part of the post-battle purification process is likewise highlighted in 1QM 14:2–3.

What is striking in these purification procedures is the overt priestly ideology of warfare presented.³⁷ Within this ideology, warfare was a ritually defiling activity requiring the purification of combatants, captives, and even objects—presumably both spoils and weapons—from corpse defilement.³⁸ This imbuing of warfare with priestly concerns regarding purity and

³⁴ Milgrom, *Numbers*, 260.

³⁵ David Wright has suggested that the introduction of fire along with water for purification logically follows from the need for washing in addition to the sprinkling of water to purify those with corpse contamination. Wright concludes that the introduction of fire as a means of purification in Num 31 is due to the severity of corpse contamination. See Wright, "Purification from Corpse-Contamination," 223.

³⁶ See Milgrom, *Numbers*, 261.

³⁷ See Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 78–89.

³⁸ Brad Kelle has suggested that the underlying notion of death being the "utmost desacralization" is what accounts for the priestly notion that warfare is defiling. See Kelle, "Postwar Rituals," 213–14. Roland de Vaux proposed that the purification rites reflect the notion of those who participated in holy war were sanctified and that before returning to normal life combatants and spoils needed to be "de-consecrated." See de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 461. Susan Niditch interpreted the defiling nature of warfare as somewhat ethical in nature with the destruction of the human enemy as having cosmic implications, which "must be duly marked off, separated from mundane experiences." See Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 87. More recently, Thomas Kazen has proposed disgust at the blood and gore of warfare as triggering the conception of warfare as a defiling activity. See Thomas Kazen, "Dirt and Disgust: Body and Morality in Biblical Purity Laws," in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*, eds. Baruch J. Schwartz et al., LHBOTS 474 (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 58; Kazen, *Emotions in Biblical Law*, 82–83.

defilement is a unique perspective in the Hebrew Bible, occurring only in Num 31. Significantly, this is also what we encounter in the war tradition from Qumran, namely, warfare imbued with deep concern for purity and defilement.³⁹ In fact, as we will see, the Qumran war tradition demonstrates a similarly profound concern for corpse defilement (cf. 1QM 9:7–9; 14:2–3). This is not to say that the war tradition originated within priestly circles, however, but that priestly ideology of warfare as a ritually defiling activity was appealing to those who shaped and transmitted the tradition.

7.4 Enhanced Purity in the War Tradition from Qumran

The elevated concern for purity with respect to warfare expressed in the priestly tradition in the Hebrew Bible is likewise exhibited in the constellation of the texts comprising the Qumran war tradition. That said, as we will see, the war tradition demonstrates a marked elevation of purity concerns beyond that of the priestly tradition. Drawing together additional purity regulations from the priestly tradition, the Qumran war tradition specifically creates a more enhanced purity requirement for combatants, both lay and sacerdotal. To explore this synthesis of purity concerns and their implications, we will look at three examples. First, we will examine the war camp purity regulations in 1QM 7:3–7 (cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 6–10). We will then address corpse defilement concerns in 1QM 9:6–9 (cf. 4QM^c [4Q493] 4–6) before finally turning our attention to post-battle purifications as found in 1QM 14:2–3.

³⁹ Additionally, Niditch noted that the hierarchical vision of warfare in Num 31 has a greater connection to the war tradition at Qumran than with the wars described in the Deuteronomistic History. See Niditch, *War in the Hebrew Bible*, 82.

7.4.1 War Camp Purity Regulations in 1QM 7:3–7 // 4Q491 1–3 6–10

Located within a section of the *War Scroll* addressing the organization and tactics in the eschatological battle (columns 2–9) and directly following upon rules concerning the age requirements for various military duties (7:1–2; cf. 1QSa 1:6–25a), 1QM 7:3–7 contains regulations regarding the purity of the war camp. Of central concern is the protection of the enhanced state of holiness required within the war camp, including various rules demarcating who is excluded from joining the combatants in the eschatological battle.⁴⁰ Lines 3–7 read as follows:⁴¹

³No young boy or woman shall enter their camps when they leave ⁴Jerusalem to go to battle until they return. Neither lame,⁴² nor blind, nor crippled, nor a man in whose flesh there is a permanent blemish, nor a man stricken by some uncleanness ⁵in his flesh, none of them shall go to battle with them. They shall be volunteers for war, perfect ones of spirit and flesh, and ready for the Day of Vengeance. Any ⁶man who is not purified from a (bodily) discharge (לוא יהיה טהור ממקורו) on the day of the battle shall not go down with them, for the holy angels are together with their army. There shall be a distance ⁷between all their camps and the place of the hand two thousand cubits or so. No indecent nakedness (ערות דבר רע) shall be seen in the surroundings of all their camps. (1QM 7:3–7)

A parallel reading of these regulations is preserved in the fragmentary manuscript 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 6–10:

⁶This is the rule (to observe) in their encampments and in [...and in] their [di]visions m[...]mym the surrounding, on the outside [...] No woman or young boy or a man stric[ken...] ⁷[the li]ne. The craftsman [and the] sm[el]ters and those appointed to the me[n of] mm[...] their [...] y'y to their stations in [...] the line until their return. There shall be two thousand cubits between the [camps...] ⁸nakedness shall not be seen in the[ir] surroundings. 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, for the daily duty. [...] ⁹(On) that day, from all their tribes, they [shall m]arch out of the camps towards the house of meet[ing... shall m]arch out towards them the [priest]s, the

⁴⁰ The Temple Scroll requires the combatants to guard against all types of ritual impurity, indecency (nakedness), iniquity, and guilt (11QT^a 58:17).

⁴¹ Unless otherwise noted, translations taken from Jean Duhaime, PTSDSSP 2.

⁴² The term used in Lev 21:16 rendered as “lame” is פֶּסֶחַ. In 1QM 7:4, both the terms פֶּסֶחַ (“lame”) and קָרַח (“crippled”) are utilized. Milgrom noted that the Qumran movement distinguished between the two terms (cf. CD 15:16; 4QD^a [4Q266] 8 i 8) as did the rabbis (*m. Pe'ah* 8:9). See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1826.

Lev[i]tes, and all the camp commanders. There they shall pass in front of [...] ¹⁰to the thousands, the hundreds, the fifties and the te[n]s. Any man who will not be [...] on] that [ni]ght [shall] no[t c]ome with them to the [b]attle, for the holy angels (are) togeth[er] within their lines (במערכותמה) [...] (4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 6–10)

The reliance of the war camp purity regulations in 1QM 7:3–7 upon those found in Deut 23:10–15 has been persuasively established.⁴³ Both refer to those defiled by a genital discharge (7:6; Deut 23:10–11) followed directly by instructions for the proper treatment of human excrement (7:6–7; Deut 23:12–13).⁴⁴ Both locations utilize the same linguistic cluster regarding prohibited impropriety within the war camp: “indecent nakedness” (ערוֹת דְּבַר רַע) in 7:7 and “anything naked” (עֲרוֹת דְּבַר) and “bad thing” (דְּבַר רַע) in Deut 23:10 and 14, respectively. Both also employ a similar rationale for the heightened purity requirement for the war camp, namely the presence of divine beings in their midst (7:6; Deut 23:14).

The regulations begin with the prohibition of young boys and women from the war camp (7:3–4, cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 6), the rationale of which is not made explicit. Yigael Yadin suggested that the two categories should be understood together as an attempt to protect the combatants from the uncleanness of genital emissions through heterosexual (Lev 15:18) and homosexual contact (Lev 18:22; 20:13).⁴⁵ More recent analysis, such as that of Cecilia Wassén,

⁴³ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 70–75; Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 42; Mila Ginsburskaya, “The Right of Council and the Idea of Purity in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS) and the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa),” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings from the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*, eds. Daniel K. Falk et al., STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 82–84.

⁴⁴ For a comprehensive discussion on toilet practices and purity concerns in the late Second Temple period, see Jodi Magness, “Toilet Practices, Purity Concerns, and Sectarianism in the Late Second Temple Period,” in *Jewish Identity and Politics between Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*, ed. Benedikt Eckhardt, JSJSup 155 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 51–70.

⁴⁵ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 71. Cf. Exod 19:15; 1 Sam 21:4–5; 2 Sam 11:11. Similar with Yadin, William Loader proposed the prohibition against women was to guard against impurities brought into the camp through menstruation or seminal emission in sexual intercourse. See William Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 211. Also, Sidnie White Crawford, “Not According to Rule: Women the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran,” in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, eds. Shalom M. Paul et al., VTSup 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 136.

have tended to separate the two categories, understanding the prohibition against women as reflecting the threat women pose to the purity of men with regard to the taboo against sexual contact within the parameters of holy war (cf. 2 Sam 11:11) and that against young boys as associated with the age requirements enumerated in 1QM 6:13–7:3.⁴⁶ Ian Werrett and Stephen Parker have noted similar age requirements regarding entrance into the eschatological community (1QSa 1:6–9, 27b), serving as witnesses in murder trials (CD 9:23b–10:3), for “judges of the nations” (CD 10:4–7a), and to enter the Temple area (11QT^a 39:10–11a).⁴⁷ That said, as Moshe Bernstein has noted, whatever the exact rationale behind the prohibition might be, for the shapers of the war tradition women and young boys presented a distinct threat to the level of purity required for the war camp.⁴⁸

After the prohibition on young boys and women, a list of those excluded from the war camp is elucidated in 7:4–6, a set of regulations not preserved in the parallel reading in 4QM^a (4Q491). The list is reminiscent of other lists of exclusionary impairments found in the Qumran corpus: 1QSa 2:3–9; CD 15:15–17; 4QD^a (4Q266) 8 i 6–9; 4QFlor (4Q174) 1–2 i 3–5; 4QMMT B 39–54; and 11QT^a 45:12–18. The list in 7:4–6 includes two main groupings: those with permanently disqualifying effects—lame, blind, crippled, and those with permanent blemishes—and those afflicted with “uncleanness in his flesh” (בטמאת בשרו). It is commonly accepted that the list of exclusions in 7:4–6 is based upon the exclusions in Lev 21:16–23 which enumerates

⁴⁶ Wassén, “What Do Angels,” 126–27. See also Werrett and Parker, “Purity in War,” 302. Werrett and Parker add menstrual uncleanness as a potential rationale behind the exclusion of women from the war camp.

⁴⁷ Werrett and Parker, “Purity in War,” 302. Loader reads the prohibition regarding young boys as a matter of maturity. See Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality*, 211.

⁴⁸ See Moshe J. Bernstein, “Women and Children in Legal and Liturgical Texts from Qumran,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 184–211. Bernstein concludes the purity regulations demonstrate “a level of purity in the camp which women and children were presumed not to be able to attain or maintain” (p. 209). Similarly, Chaim Rabin suggested that boys below the age of 25, as with all women, were forbidden from the war camp because they did not possess “the necessary degree of ritual purity.” See Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 5.

the physical defects which render the descendants of Aaron ineligible for involvement in cultic service.⁴⁹

¹⁶The LORD spoke to Moses, saying: ¹⁷Speak to Aaron and say: No one of your offspring throughout their generations who has a blemish may approach to offer the food of his God. ¹⁸For no one who has a blemish shall draw near, one who is blind or lame, or one who has a mutilated face or a limb too long, ¹⁹or one who has a broken foot or a broken hand, ²⁰or a hunchback, or a dwarf, or a man with a blemish in his eyes or an itching disease or scabs or crushed testicles. ²¹No descendant of Aaron the priest who has a blemish shall come near to offer the LORD'S offerings by fire; since he has a blemish, he shall not come near to offer the food of his God. ²²He may eat the food of his God, of the most holy as well as of the holy. ²³But he shall not come near the curtain or approach the altar, because he has a blemish, that he may not profane my sanctuaries; for I am the LORD; I sanctify them. (Lev 21:16–23)

Here, Moses is commanded to instruct Aaron that no one with a blemish (מום) may approach to “offer the food of his God” (Lev 21:17). This prohibition is repeated in the following verse, followed by a listing of twelve specific blemishes: those who are blind, lame, mutilated, deformed, a broken foot or hand, a hunchback, dwarf, one with a defect in their eyes, an itching disease, scab or skin defect, or crushed testicles. This list highlights the need for priests involved in the sacrificing of unblemished animals to maintain an elevated status of physical perfection to have contact with the holy. Importantly, as Jacob Milgrom has observed, the twelve prohibitive blemishes presented in Lev 21 parallel the twelve prohibitive blemishes for the sacrificial animals themselves in Lev 22:22–24.⁵⁰ The overarching narrative is clear—those who enter the sacred sphere for a cultic function, whether human or animal, must attain an enhanced state of perfection.⁵¹ To not do so would result in the profanation of the sanctuary (vv. 23).

⁴⁹ Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 72; Aharon Shemesh, “‘The Holy Angels are in their Council’: The Exclusion of Deformed Persons from Holy Places in Qumranic and Rabbinic Literature,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 179–206; Saul M. Olyan, “The Exegetical Dimensions of Restrictions on the Blind and the Lame in the Texts from Qumran,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 38–50, repr., *Social Inequality in the World of the Text: The Significance of Ritual and Social Distinctions in the Hebrew Bible*, *JASup* 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 129–40.

⁵⁰ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1836–41. See also Baruch A. Levine, *Leviticus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*, *JPS Torah Commentary* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 140–41.

⁵¹ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1839.

The rationale behind the connection between 1QM 7:4–6 and Lev 21:16–23 has been a matter of discussion. Early commentators, such as Yadin, suggested the reason is not from military concerns but rather from concerns for the purity of the camp.⁵² By contrast, Philip Davies, while noting a similarity to the priestly exclusions of Lev 21, suggested this grouping of exemptions as simply reflecting common ancient military practices, additionally noting that any direct connection is doubtful.⁵³ Saul Olyan suggested that the laws of exclusion from the eschatological war camp reflect the tendency of the Qumran texts to increase in range and severity of the biblical exclusion laws.⁵⁴ Recent discussions, however, have shifted, correctly in my opinion, to focus on the Qumran movement’s wider ideology regarding angelic presence within the movement and the purity conditions necessary to protect the holiness required for such contact, seeing physical deformity as antithetical to divine presence.⁵⁵ Wassén has recently argued that the fear of demonic power and its implication for maintaining connection with the presence of angels should also be considered.⁵⁶ Wassén submitted that various impurities and physical deformities were associated with demonic affliction and thus required stringent exclusion. The exclusion of those with these maladies preserved and protected the holiness required for continued communion with angelic beings and hence accounts for the rules of exclusion concerning sacred spaces and activities.⁵⁷

⁵² Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 72–73. Johannes van der Ploeg suggested the regulations highlight the movement’s desire to realize “the priestly ideal” as well as the notion that the eschatological war was to be a holy action in which only “saints” could participate. See van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 113.

⁵³ Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 42.

⁵⁴ Olyan, “The Exegetical Dimensions,” 48–50.

⁵⁵ For an early expression of this idea, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10,” in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, ed. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor (Chicago: Priory Press, 1968), 42–43. More recently, see Shemesh, “The Holy Angels are in their Council,” 201–02; Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 55–56; Jonathan Klawans, “Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *OHDSS*, 382; Jodi Magness, “‘They Shall See the Glory of the Lord’ (Isa 35:2): Eschatological Perfection and Purity at Qumran and in Jesus’ Movement,” *JSHJ* 14 (2016): 99–119.

⁵⁶ Wassén, “What Do Angels,” 115–29. See also Yair Furstenberg, “Controlling Impurity: The Natures of Impurity in the Second Temple Debates,” *Dine Israel* 30 (2015): 187–89.

⁵⁷ Wassén, “What Do Angels,” 129.

Whatever the granular rationale might be, it seems most accurate to see the exclusionary laws in 7:4–6 as reflecting the holiness necessary for continued contact with angelic beings similar to what is seen in other texts from Qumran (cf. 1QSa 2:8–9; CD 15:17; 4QD^a (4Q266) 8 i 9; cf. 4QFlor (4Q174) 1–2 i 4–5; 11QT^a 45:14). This suggestion is strengthened by the stated requirement for military volunteers to be “perfect ones of spirit *and flesh*” (7:5, emphasis my own). Just as Lev 21:16–23 required that the descendants of Aaron were perfect in flesh to not be disqualified from involvement in the cultic proceedings of the Temple before God, so too the eschatological combatants should be perfect in flesh so that angelic beings might join with them in battle with the sons of darkness (7:6; 10:11; 12:4–5, 8; 17:6).⁵⁸ This concern for purity and perfection with regard to divine beings is made explicit when one who has not been purified from a genital discharge on the day of battle is prohibited from joining those in battle because “the holy angels are together with the army” (7:6; cf. 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 10).

In the end, what is significant about the war camp legislation in 1QM 7:3–7 vis-à-vis those described in Deut 23:10–15 is the elevated nature of the former over the latter. The shapers of the war tradition have taken the stipulations outlined in Deut 23:10–15 and elevated the requirement for purity and holiness for the eschatological combatants. First, the addition of the prohibition of the presence of young men and women from the army (7:3) denotes an elevation of purity, protecting the combatants from ritual defilement. Second, the employment of the regulations regarding the perfection required by the priesthood to sacrifice in the presence of

⁵⁸ On the idea of communion with angelic beings in the Qumran movement, see Björn Frennesson, “*In a Common Rejoicing*”: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran, SSU 14 (Uppsala: University of Uppsala Press, 1999); Wassén, “Angels and Humans,” 523–39; Cecilia Wassén, “Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*, eds. Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schöpflin, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 499–523; Michael Mach, “Angels,” *EDSS* 1:24–27; Hanne von Weissenberg, “God(s), Angels and Demons,” *CDSS*, 490–95. On angels and humans in the context of warfare, see Steven Weitzman, “Fighting with the Angels: On How to Build up a Celestial Army,” in *With the Loyal You Show Yourself Loyal: Essays on Relationships in the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Saul M. Olyan*, eds. T. M. Lemos et al., AIL 42 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021), 369–84.

God (Lev 21:16–23) elevates the requirement for bodily perfection of the combatants, a concern not expressed in Deut 23:10–15. Finally, as mentioned in 7.3.1, whereas Deut 23:13–14 does not explicitly establish the distance “the place of the hand” (למקום היד) was to be from the war camp 1QM 7:6–7 explicitly establishes the distance of two thousand cubits (cf. 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 7; 11QT^a 46:13–16a where it is set at three thousand cubits from Jerusalem). This explicit designation of distance, more stringent than the stipulations in Deut 23:13–14, demonstrates an elevated concern to ensure that no “bad thing” (ערות דבר רע) should be seen in the surroundings of the camp (7:7). All this was to ensure that the eschatological combatants stringently maintained the required elevated level of purity and perfection necessary to join the holy angels in victory over the sons of darkness (cf. 4Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285) 8 10–11; 11Q*Sefer ha-Milhamah* (11Q14) 1 ii 14b–15).

7.4.2 Corpse Defilement in 1QM 9:7–9 // 4Q493 4–6

The elevated concern for the purity of the military combatants is similarly applied to the sacerdotal combatants. Following the regulations on who is excluded from the war camp (7:3–7) is a long set of instructions regarding the role of the priesthood in the eschatological battle (7:9–9:9). The description in these two columns concerns the tactical orchestration provided by the priesthood during the engagement with the enemy. At the end of these instructions in 1QM 9:7–9 stipulations are given protecting the priesthood from defilement during the final stage of the battle:

⁶The priests shall blow for them on the trumpets of pursuit and [they] shall divi[de] against all the enemy for a destructive pursuit. The cavalry ⁷shall bring (them) back to the battle area until (their) annihilation. When the slain fall down, the pri[est]s shall keep blowing from afar. They shall not come ⁸to the midst of the slain (so as) to become defiled (להתגאל) in their unclean blood of uncleanness (בדם טמאתם), for they are holy.

They shall [no]t profane (לֹא יַחַלּוּ) the oil of their priestly anointing (שֶׁמֶן מְשִׁיחַת כְּהוֹנָתָם) through the blood ⁹of nations of vanity. (1QM 9:6–9)

A parallel reading of the instructions in 9:6–9 is preserved in 4QM^c (4Q493) 4–6.⁵⁹

גויים והכוחנים יצאו מבין החללים יעמ[דו]... הָ לְמַלְּוֹתָ	4
לְיַד הַחֶרֶף וְהַמַּאֲבָן וְלֹא יַחַלּוּ שֶׁמֶן כְּהוֹנָתָם[...]	5
[ו] לְכֹל מַעֲרֻכֹת הַבָּנִים לֹא יִגְשׁוּ וְתִקְעוּ בְּקוֹל חָדָּל לְטֹטְאֵם[...]	6

- 4 the nations. And the priests shall go out from among the slain and take posi[tion...]
- 5 on the side of the catapult and the ballista. And they shall not profane the oil of their priesthood [with the blood of the s]lai[n.]
- 6 [And] to any of the lines of the infantrymen they shall not approach. And they shall blow with a sharp sound for [...]

In 9:6, the priests are instructed to blow the trumpets of pursuit to initiate the pursuit of the enemy for their annihilation (הַחֶרֶם). As the slain fall, the priests are commanded to continue blowing from afar and not enter the midst of the slain for fear of defilement by their unclean blood “for they are holy” (9:8). Of central concern is the protection of the holiness of the priesthood from corpse defilement. This concern is further expounded upon in the form of a second prohibition regarding the profanation of “the oil of their priestly anointing” with the blood of the slain (9:8–9). 4QM^c (4Q493) 4–6 contains a parallel reading of this location and although significantly shorter in form similarly expresses a concern regarding the profanation of “the oil of their priesthood [with the blood of the s]lai[n]” (l. 5).⁶⁰ Notably, however, the prohibition in 4QM^c appears at the beginning of the battle instructions rather than at the end of the engagement with the enemy as presented in 1QM 9:7–9. Given the early literary stratum of 4QM^c in the war tradition, this suggests that either the shapers of 1QM relocated and expanded upon the prohibition or 4QM^c might represent a distinctly different expression of the tradition.

⁵⁹ Reconstruction and translation are my own. Regarding signa, see p. 53n.81.

⁶⁰ Note the lack of מְשִׁיחַת (“anointing”) in 4QM^c (4Q493) 5 compared to 1QM 9:8.

Regardless, what is made explicit in both locations is that it is the *blood of the corpses of the slain* would ritually defile the priests were they to contact it.⁶¹ The degree of defilement this would bring is described as the profanation of the oil of their priestly anointing (9:8; cf. 4QM_c [4Q493] 5).

Central to the discussion regarding this prohibition is the nature of blood and defilement. Regarding blood, the Hebrew Bible prohibits the eating of blood (Lev 3:17; 7:26–27; 17:10–14; Deut 12:16, 23; 15:23).⁶² Additionally, anyone who has touched a menstruant or anything she has touched or sat upon is pronouncing ritually impure (Lev 15:19–23). Anyone who has had sexual intercourse with a menstruant is rendered ritually impure for seven days (Lev 15:24; cf. with the strict prohibition in Lev 18:19; 20:18). That said, defilement due to contact with corpse-blood is never addressed in the Hebrew Bible. This has led to several plausible interpretations for the basis of this concern in 9:7–9.

Joseph Baumgarten argued for a distinction between לָאָה (‘‘to defile’’), which refers to staining by contact, and טָמֵא (‘‘to be unclean’’) denoting ritual impurity.⁶³ Building upon the work of Baumgarten, Werrett and Parker suggested that the blood of the enemy is not the defiling substance in and of itself, but rather is understood as a transmitter of corpse impurity from the impure corpses to the priests.⁶⁴ Noticing that corpse-blood as contagion is absent in

⁶¹ Harrington understands these concerns as an example of the ritually defiling nature of the property of the Gentiles. See Harrington, *Impurity Systems*, 104. This seems highly unlikely in my estimation as the text is explicitly concerned with the blood of the slain and not their property.

⁶² See Baruch J. Schwartz, ‘‘The Prohibitions Concerning the ‘Eating’ of Blood in Leviticus 17,’’ in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, eds. Saul M. Olyan and Gary A. Anderson, JSOTSup 125 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 34–66.

⁶³ Joseph M. Baumgarten, ‘‘The Essenes Avoidance of Oil and Laws of Purity,’’ *RevQ* 22 (1967): 185.

⁶⁴ Werrett and Parker, ‘‘Purity in War,’’ 305–06. On blood as a transmitter of impurity, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 91–95; Baumgarten, ‘‘Liquids and Susceptibility to Defilement in New 4Q Texts,’’ *JQR* 85 (1994): 91–101; Lawrence H. Schiffman, ‘‘The Relationship of the Zadokite Fragments to the Temple Scroll,’’ in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*, eds. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, STDJ 34 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 141.

Num 19 yet present within *Sifre Zuta* 19:11, Vered Noam posited the prohibitions in 11QT^a 50:4–7 as a way of reconstructing the exegetical lacuna.⁶⁵ In a paraphrased list of contagions from Num 19:16 that cause contamination “in an open field,” the *Temple Scroll* adds “or the blood of a dead man” (50:6). Noam argued that the reference to corpse-blood impurity in 11QT^a 5:6 demonstrates that the Qumran movement, to some degree, accepted corpse-blood as defiling. If this is the case, corpse-blood as a defiling substance in and of itself could be in view in 1QM 9:6–9, subsequently providing another example of this halakhic position within the Qumran movement. Regardless of whether corpse blood is understood as a transmitter of impurity or as the defiling substance itself, it seems best to understand the purity concern of 9:7–9 as dealing with the protection of the priesthood from corpse impurity (cf. Lev 21:1–4).

That this is the case is strengthened when we consider the regulations with respect to the high priest in Lev 21:10–15.⁶⁶ Specifically, in Lev 21:12 the high priest is prohibited from leaving the sanctuary “and thus profane the sanctuary of his God.” This prohibition is directly tied to the concern for corpse impurity in Lev 21:11. Of central concern here, then, is the profanation of the sanctuary if the high priest were to become defiled with corpse impurity and return to the sanctuary.⁶⁷ Since no purification rites are described here the prohibition is strictly apodictic in nature, the high priest must not become defiled with corpse impurity. The severity of such defilement to the high priest and subsequent profanation of the sanctuary is highlighted by noting that the “consecration of the anointing oil of his God (שָׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת אֱלֹהֵיו) is upon him” (21:12). Common to both Lev 21 and 1QM 9 is the invocation of the “oil of anointing” (21:10,

⁶⁵ Vered Noam, “Corpse-Blood Impurity: A Lost Biblical Reading?” *JBL* 128 (2009): 243–51.

⁶⁶ For a detailed discussion of these prohibitions, see Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1811–21.

⁶⁷ Levine, *Leviticus*, 145. See also, Kazen, *Impurity and Purification*, 291–92. Similar to this prohibition in Lev 15:31 in which the people of Israel are warned not to defile (תִּמְאָה) the tabernacle with their uncleanness (תְּמֻמָּה).

12; 1QM 9:8–9).⁶⁸ One important distinction should be noted, however. Whereas Lev 21:12 focuses attention on the profanation of the sanctuary, in 1QM 9:8–9 (cf. 4QM^c [4Q493] 5) of primary concern is the profanation of the oil of the anointing itself through corpse defilement. Of note, however, is the fact that while Lev 8:30 records the consecration of Aaron and his sons and their vestments with a mixture of the oil of anointing and sacrificial blood, the regulations in Lev 21:12 regarding the high priest is the only location that discusses the oil of anointing in the context of corpse defilement. Considering the similarity in terminology it seems that the concern regarding the high priest and corpse defilement in Lev 21:12 could also lie behind the specific regulation in 1QM 9:8–9 adding to the notion that what is of central concern in 9:7–9 is corpse defilement. In sum, 1QM 9:6–9 provides another example of the elevation of ritual purity concerns regarding the combatants in the eschatological battle, here demonstrating a concern for the ritual purity of the priesthood comparable to that of the high priest in Lev 21:10–15.

7.4.3 Post-Battle Purification in 1QM 14:2–3

Another example of defilement with regards to corpse defilement occurs in a short accounting of instructions within the larger series of prayers and blessings in 1QM 10–14. Column 14 contains a blessing for God’s faithfulness to the covenant and God’s people offered the day after the victorious return of the army to the war camp from the field of battle (14:4b–15).⁶⁹ Preceding this collective blessing are a series of instructions related to the return itself as well as the post-battle purifications associated with their return (14:2–4a). The text reads:

²When they have departed from the slain to enter the camp, they shall sing the hymn of the return. In the morning they shall wash (יִכְבְּסוּ) their clothes and wash (וִרְחִצּוּ) themselves ³of the blood of the guilty corpses (בְּדַם פְּגָרֵי הָאֲשָׁמָה). They shall return to the

⁶⁸ Cf. Lev 21:10 and 4QapocrMoses^a (4Q375) 1 i 9 where a similar phrase is used, “[the] anointed priest upon whose head the oil of anointing has been poured.”

⁶⁹ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 225–27.

place where they had taken position, where they had arrayed the line before the enemy's slain fell down. They shall bless there ⁴all together the God of Israel and they shall exalt his name in a joyful community. (1QM 14:2–4a)

The instructions begin with the reference that during their return the army shall sing the “hymn of return,” the contents of which are not included in the text. On the following morning, the army is to undergo several post-battle purification rites: the cleaning of their garments and washing themselves of the corpse-blood of the enemy (14:2–3).

Related to the post-battle purification rites from corpse impurity described in Num 31:19–24 (cf. Num 19:11–13, 18–20) there are several notable differences. Distinctly missing is an explicit reference to the required seven-day impurity period and purification on the third and seventh day. Furthermore, in Num 31:24 the washing of war garments occurs on the seventh day after which the impure are pronounced clean and can enter the camp. Noting the former difference, Jonathan Lawrence suggested that the purification rituals outlined in 14:2–3 do not follow those of corpse contact, but rather are more closely related to the regulations regarding animal carcasses in Lev 11:24–47.⁷⁰ This seems problematic, however, in that regulations regarding animal carcasses requires only the washing of clothes and waiting until evening and do not require any form of bathing, which is explicit in 14:2–3. What seems more likely is that the practice of first-day ablution to mitigate corpse impurity is in view.⁷¹ As Thomas Kazen has

⁷⁰ Lawrence, *Washing in Water*, 114–15.

⁷¹ On first-day ablution, see Jacob Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 512–18; Milgrom, “First Day Ablution in Qumran,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*, eds. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:561–70; Milgrom, “4QTohorot^a: An Unpublished Qumran Text on Purities,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*, eds. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, STDJ 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 59–68; Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Purification Rituals in *DJD* 7,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, eds. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, STDJ 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 199–209; Baumgarten, “The Use of מִי נִידָה for General Purifications,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 481–85; Esther Eshel, “4QRitual of Purification,” *DJD* 35:135–53; Eyal Regev, “Pure Individualism: The Idea of Non-priestly Purity in Ancient Judaism,” *JSJ* 31 (2000): 176–202; Regev, “Non-Priestly Purity and Its Religious Aspects according to Historical Sources and Archaeological Findings,” in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, eds. Marcel J. H. M. Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz,

convincingly argued, the practice of first-day ablution was generally practiced in the Second Temple period, even regarding corpse impurity.⁷² The practice was understood as a liminal means of mitigating the transmission of defilement and contagion through ablution on the first day so that the impure person might rejoin the community. This practice, I would suggest, is what is reflected in the regulations in 1QM 14:2–3.⁷³ Combatants are required to wash their clothes and undergo ablution on the first full day of return in the morning, thus mitigating the transmission of corpse defilement through the blood of the slain.⁷⁴ While the remainder of the purification regulations regarding corpse defilement expressed in Num 19 and 31, specifically the third- and seventh-day purifications, are not in view in 1QM 14, one might plausibly assume that they were still implied.⁷⁵ In this light, the focus of column 14 is on the first day purifications only, leading into the collective blessing for God’s faithfulness (14:4b–15).

What is noteworthy regarding the stipulations in 1QM 14:2–3 is the way in which the shapers of the war tradition harmonized the regulations from Num 31:19–24 with respect to the washing of war clothes and Num 19:11–13, 18–20 with respect to the ritual washing of corpse defiled person. Moreover, the shapers interpolated into the post-war purification their own ideology regarding corpse-blood defilement and the practice of first-day ablutions. This kind of

JCPS 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 223–44; Thomas Kazen, “Who Touched Whom? On Graded Impurity and First-Day Ablutions in 4Q274,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 53–87, repr., *Issues of Impurity in Early Judaism*, ConBNT 45 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 63–89.

⁷² Thomas Kazen, “Concern, Custom, and Common Sense: Discharge, Handwashing and Graded Purification,” *JSHJ* 13 (2015): 150–87, repr., *Impurity and Purification*, 181–216, esp. 195–97. Kazen points to 11QTa 49:16–21; 50: 13–16 where the practice is explicitly required. He also cites Ezek 44:25–26; Tob 2:5, 9; 4Q414, 1QM 14:2–3; 4Q274 1; 4Q514; Philo, *Spec.* 1.261; 3.205–206; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.261; *J.W.* 6.290; John 11:55.

⁷³ Yadin suggested that the difference between 1QM 14:2–3 and Num 31:24 could be explained in that while Num 31:24 addressed the final return to the Israelite camp at the conclusion of the war, 1QM 14:2–3 reflected the return to the camp from the battlefield at the end of the day. See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 226.

⁷⁴ See Werrett and Parker, “Purity in War,” 306.

⁷⁵ See Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 970; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 226.

halakhic harmonization and innovation is seen in other texts within the Qumran corpus, most notably the *Temple Scroll*.⁷⁶

7.4.4 The Role of Purity in the *War Scroll*: Preliminary Conclusions

What is clear from the purity requirements expressed in the war tradition is that they not only demonstrate a marked reliance upon purity regulations in the priestly stratum of the Hebrew Bible, but also evidence harmonization and halakhic innovation creating a heightened purity requirement regarding the eschatological combatants, both lay and priestly. The war was to be conducted under the utmost sense of purity and perfection as the angels were in their midst fighting on their behalf.

The regulations regarding the war camp, based on Deut 23:10–15, have been expanded to exclude women and young boys as well as those with permanent physical blemishes (cf. Lev 21:16–23). This latter stipulation for the physical perfection of the combatants equals that of the descendants of Aaron to participate in cultic sphere before God. Regulations regarding defilement from corpse impurity (Num 19:11–13, 18–20; 31:19–24) are applied to the army as well as the priesthood. Priests are instructed to avoid contact with the corpses of the slain so to not be defiled by their unclean blood as this would profane the “oil of their anointing” (1QM 9:8–9; cf. Lev 21:10–12) elevating the purity requirement of the priests to that the high priest signaling the stringency of the requirement as well as the severity of the perceived defilement. Finally, the army is instructed to wash their clothes and ritually bathe the morning after their return to camp (14:2–3), suggesting that the Second Temple practice of first-day ablution has been included in the purification process required for corpse contamination. In the case of corpse

⁷⁶ See Vered Noam, “Halakhah,” CDSS, 395–404; Aharon Shemesh, “Halakhah between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature,” OHDSS, 595–616.

defilement, the concern for corpse-blood is central. Whether this concern is linked to blood as an impurity transmission substance or evidence of a halakhic position regarding corpse-blood itself both seem to point to some halakhic innovation.

These elevated purity requirements for both lay and sacerdotal combatants suggest a requisite purity and perfection equal to that of those operating in a sacred, cultic sphere. Thus, the eschatological war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, therefore, was envisaged as necessitating a state of purity and perfection akin to the cultic sphere. This requisite level of purity was deemed necessary considering the presence of angelic beings fighting alongside the eschatological combatants (7:6).

7.5 The Language of Defilement in the War Tradition

In addition to concern for purity and perfection in the Qumran war tradition, the concept of defilement likewise plays a significant role. Important for our discussion is the employment of the term חלל (“slain, defiled”), טמאה (“uncleanness, ritual impurity”), and נדה (“impurity”) within 1QM. Of particular significance is the phrase עבודת נדת טמאתם (“their works of impure uncleanness”) in 1QM 13:5, a phrase that implies a unique sense of pollution.

7.5.1 “Slain, Defiled” (חלל)

The term חלל occurs frequently in the war tradition denoting the slain of the enemy. Of the sixty-two occurrences in the term in the “non-biblical” texts from Qumran, fifty-two of them occur within the war tradition with thirty-two of them in 1QM.⁷⁷ While the term in the nominal form

⁷⁷ חלל is preserved in 1QM 3:3, 8 (2), 4:7; 6:3 (2), 5, 17; 7:2; 8:9, 11, 19; 9:1, 2, 7, 8; 12:11; 14:2, 3; 16:7, 8, 9, 11, 15; 17:13, 14, 16; 19:10, 13; 4Q285 10 6; 4Q491 1–3 13; 10 ii 9, 11; 11 ii 7, 9, 23; 13 6; 18 4; 4Q492 1 10, 12;

denotes the corpses of those slain or killed, the verbal form predominantly refers to profanation or defilement.⁷⁸ A potential link between the notion of the slain and defilement could lie in the concept of corpse defilement. Whether the shapers of the war tradition had a sense of defilement in mind when using the nominal form of חלל seems plausible given the concern for corpse defilement expressed in 1QM 9:7–9 and 14:2–3.

7.5.2 “Uncleanness” (טמאה) and “Impurity” (נדח)

In its most basic sense, the term טמאָה reflects impurity or pollution brought about by menstruation or discharge from women (cf. Lev 15:25; 18:19; 2 Sam 11:4; 11QT^a 48:16), discharge from men (Lev 15:3), skin diseases (Lev 14:19), and corpse contact (Num 19:13; CD 12:16; 4QTohB^b 1 8).⁷⁹ Thus, the term טמאָה can be understood as the semantic opposite of קדוּשָׁה, and reflect an impurity that is imperative to keep from encroaching upon the holiness of God.⁸⁰ The term is also used regarding impurity caused by moral transgression, such as sin (e.g., Lev 16:16) and sexual immorality (e.g., Num 5:19).⁸¹ Kazen has argued that the underlying concrete meaning of the term refers to “dirt” whereas its predominant usage is to be understood as metaphorical in nature.⁸²

The term טמאה is preserved three times in 1QM, in 7:4; 9:8; and 13:5 and can plausibly be reconstructed in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 6. The first two occurrences in 1QM, as discussed above, carry the sense of ritual impurity. In 1QM 7:4, the term is used to describe one of the enumerated

4Q493 4, 5; 11Q14 1 i 15 and reconstructed in 1QM 9:18; 17:15; 19:14; 4Q285 10 6; 4Q491 11 ii 6, 12, 21; 4Q492 1 3; 4Q493 7.

⁷⁸ “חלל,” DCH 3:234–37.

⁷⁹ “טמאָה,” DCH 3:370–71.

⁸⁰ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1002–03.

⁸¹ On the moral implications, See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 26–31.

⁸² Thomas Kazen, “The Role of Disgust,” 120–32.

categories of those excluded from going into battle, a man stricken with an “uncleanliness of his flesh (בטמאת בשרו)” (1QM 7:4–5) presumably denoting those belonging to the categories mentioned in Lev 22:4 who suffer from a bodily or skin impurity (cf. Lev 13; 21:16–23).⁸³ A fragmentary parallel reading is preserved in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 6, which reads, “and any man who is stric[ken with uncleanness in his flesh shall not come near the battle] line.” In 1QM 9:8, the term is employed regarding impurity caused by contact with corpse-blood as seen in the prohibition of the priests from entering the midst of the slain so to not “become defiled in their unclean blood (להתגאל בדם טמאתם)” (1QM 9:8). The final occurrence comes in 1QM 13:5 in connection with the term נְדָה, a phrase we will explore below, which reflects a sense of moral impurity.

The term נְדָה primarily refers to the impurity of menstrual bleeding (e.g., Lev 12:2, 5; 15:9; 18:19; Ezek 18:6; 22:10; 36:17).⁸⁴ Kazen suggests that at its core the etymology of the term most likely deals with the expulsion of blood from the body, but carries with it a sense of disgust, thus leading to the term expanding to become indicative of repulsive behavior, as seen in Ezek 36:16–17:⁸⁵

The word of the LORD came to me: Mortal, when the house of Israel lived on their own soil, they defiled it with their ways and their deeds; their conduct was like the uncleanness of a woman in her menstrual period (כְּטִמְאַת הַנְּדָה).

Here, according to Kazen, Ezekiel utilizes the inherent disgust attached to menstrual blood to transfer a sense of emotional indignation to the issue of Israel’s idolatrous ways.⁸⁶ Thus,

⁸³ See van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 113.

⁸⁴ See “נְדָה,” *DCH* 5:621–24. On the potential etymology of the term, see Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 744–45, where Milgrom suggests the core meaning of נְדָה as “expulsion, elimination.” For a comparative study on the impurity of genital discharges and potential rationale, see Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 763–68.

⁸⁵ Kazen, *Emotions in Biblical Law*, 84. Kazen highlights that Ezekiel utilizes נְדָה in a concrete sense in 18:6 and 22:10, but not in 7:19 and 36:17.

⁸⁶ Kazen, *Emotions in Biblical Law*, 84.

menstrual terminology becomes strong emotional language to communicate a generalized sense of disgust and disapproval.⁸⁷ This expanded sense of נְדָה can also be seen in other exilic and post-exilic texts (e.g., Ezra 9:11; 2 Chron 29:5; Lam 1:8, 17; Zech 13:1) where the term is used to refer to moral transgressions and specifically to non-Israelite and their practices, which are seen as an abomination upon the land. In this light, נְדָה is near synonymous with תּוֹעֵבָה (“abomination”) as demonstrated in Ezra 9:11, which refers to the land defiled by the abominations of the people of the land as a “land unclean” (אֶרֶץ נְדָה).⁸⁸ As a result, within Second Temple texts more broadly, the term נְדָה came to denote a sense of moral impurity, one which distinctly defiles the offender, the sanctuary, or the land.⁸⁹ As we will see, concern for the defiling effects of moral transgression, and the use of נְדָה to reflect impure acts that defile, is reflected within texts from Qumran as well.⁹⁰ While the term נדה is used only once in the war tradition, in 1QM 13:5, it is in this sense that the shapers of the tradition employed the term.

7.5.3 “Impure Uncleaness” (עבודת נדה טמאתם) and the Defilement of the Land

Of central importance for our discussion is the phrase “works of impure uncleaness” (עבודת נדה טמאתם) in 1QM 13:5. Here, within a section pronouncing blessing upon God and those who righteously serve him and curses denouncing Belial and his lot, the spirits of Belial’s lot are denounced for “all their works of impure uncleaness,” the description of which is not elaborated

⁸⁷ Kazen, *Emotions in Biblical Law*, 84 and 93.

⁸⁸ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 44–45. See also, Kazen, “Disgust in Body, Mind, and Language,” 102.

⁸⁹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 26.

⁹⁰ See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 75–79.

upon within the text. The curse portion in 1QM 13:4–6, which has a parallel reading in 4QBer^a (4Q286) 7 ii 2–4, albeit within an entirely different context, reads:⁹¹

⁴Cursed be Belial for the hostile plan and may he be denounced for his guilty authority!
Cursed be all the spirits of his lot for their ⁵wicked plan and may they be denounced for
all their works of impure uncleanness (עבודת נדה טמאתם)! For they are the lot of
darkness, but the lot of God is for ⁶[everlast]ing light!

What is significant is the combination of both the terms נדה and טמאה within this text. This same combination of terms occurs in Lev 18:19 regarding sexual contact with a woman “while she is in her menstrual uncleanness (בַּנְּדָת טְמֵאָתָהּ)” (cf. 11QT^a 48:16–17).⁹² Whereas this occurrence conveys a sense of ritual impurity, others convey the more expansive reference to abominable acts which have defiled the land.⁹³ Ezekiel 36:17, cited above, compares Israel’s sinful deeds, which have resulted in the defilement of the land, with “the uncleanness of a woman in her menstrual period (כְּטִמְאֵת הַנְּדָה).” In Ezra 9, Ezra is informed by the elders of the sacrilege of the people because “the holy seed” has been mixed with the peoples of the land through intermarriage (Ezra 9:1–2). Ezra mourns and prays to God, recounting what was commanded through “your servants the prophets”:

“The land that you are entering to possess is a land unclean (אֶרֶץ נְדָה) with the pollutions (נְדָה) of the peoples of the lands, with their abominations (בְּתוֹעֲבֹתֵיהֶם). They have filled it from end to end with their uncleanness (בְּטִמְאָתָם).” (Ezra 9:11)

⁹¹ 4QBer^a (4Q286) 7 ii 2–4 and reads, “Cursed by [B]elial in his hostile [sc]heme, and damned is he in his guilty authority. And cursed are all the spir[it]s of his [lo]t in their wicked scheme, and they are damned in the schemes of their [un]clean impurity (נדה טמאתם); for [they are the lo]t of darkness, and their punishment is in the eternal pit.” Translation from Bilhah Nitzan, “4QBerakhot,” DJD 11:28. The phrase is not preserved in the fragmentary parallel reading in 4QBer^b (4Q287) 6 4, but Nitzan reconstructed the phrase. For the similarities and differences between 1QM 13:4–6 and 4QBer^a (4Q286) 7 ii 2–4, see Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 284–85.

⁹² נדה and טמאה both appear in Lev 18:19, “You shall not approach a woman to uncover her nakedness while she is in her menstrual uncleanness (בַּנְּדָת טְמֵאָתָהּ).”

⁹³ Milgrom observed that the notion of abominable moral acts defiling the land is inherent to the H tradition as opposed to the P tradition, which focuses on ritual defilement and ritual purification (cf. Lev 18:24–30; Num 35:33–34). See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1573–74.

The supposed citation does not come from a single, fixed location, but is rather comprised of a mosaic of images and allusions (e.g., Deut 7:1–3; 11:8; 23:6; Lev 18:24–30; 2 Kgs 21:16).⁹⁴ The passage clearly echoes both Lev 18:19 and Ezek 36:17 in the use of נְדָה and טְמֵאָה.⁹⁵ The writer’s use of תּוֹעֵבָה and טְמֵאָה along with the expanded sense of נְדָה creates a strong emotional response. The works of the people of the land are envisaged as a pollution upon the land, which has subsequently made “a land unclean (אֶרֶץ נְדָה).” For the writer, the employment of this collage of evocative defilement language connotes a distinct disgust and revulsion regarding moral acts deemed abominable and defiling.

This specific linguistic cluster and connotation also appear in a variety texts from Qumran.⁹⁶ For example, within a *peshet* of Hab 2:5–6 in 1QpHab 8:8–13 the Wicked Priest is accused of taking the wealth of the people, thus “adding to himself the guilt of sin and ways of abomination (דַּרְכֵי תוֹעֵבוֹת) he committed in every impurity of uncleanness (בְּכֹל גִּדַּת טִמְאָה)” (1QpHab 8:12–13).⁹⁷ The phrase “ways of abomination” is best understood as synonymous with “deeds of abomination” committed by the Wicked Priest in Jerusalem (1QpHab 12:7–9), which, according to the *peshet*, “defiled the sanctuary of God” (12:9).⁹⁸ Thus, the shared context between the two passages demonstrates a link between abominable moral acts perpetrated by the Wicked Priest and defilement. In 1QpHab 7:9, these abominable deeds are further qualified as

⁹⁴ See H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, WBC 16 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985), 137; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), 184–85; Bob Becking, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 2018), 150.

⁹⁵ See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 44. Klawans adds that this was first suggested many years earlier by Adolph Büchler. See Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century* (London: Oxford University Press, 1928; repr., New York: Ktav Publishing, 1967), 214–18. For a succinct overview of both Büchler and Klawans work, see Susan Haber, “*They Shall Purify Themselves*”: *Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*, ed. Adele Reinhartz, EJM 24 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 11–12, 27–28, 40–46, 57–64.

⁹⁶ Cf. 1QpHab 8:13; 1QS 4:10; 4QBer^a (4Q286) 7 ii 2–4; 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) 69 2; 4QShir^b (4Q511) 2 ii 8; 4QpapRitPur B (4Q512) 1–6 9; 11QT^a 45:10 // 11Q20 12:4; 11QT^a 48:15–17.

⁹⁷ Translation from Lim, *The Earliest Commentary*, 110–11.

⁹⁸ Lim, *The Earliest Commentary*, 121.

being committed in “every impurity of uncleanness.” As we have seen, by employing this linguistic cluster the pesherist highlights the immoral and defiling nature of these perceived abominations.⁹⁹

Almost the exact same phrase used in 1QM 13:5 occurs in the Teaching on the Two Spirits in 1QS 4:10 where the spirit of injustice is characterized by “impure ways in the service of uncleanness (נדה בעבודה טמאה).”¹⁰⁰ While these deeds are left ambiguous in the text, what is noteworthy is that this characterization comes in a context not of acts of ritual impurity, but of acts deemed morally abominable by the writer (1QS 4:9–14; cf. 4QpapS^c [4Q257] 5:7–8, 12–13). Whatever these “impure ways” might be, they are deemed by the writer as being morally unclean, potentially defiling in nature. Significantly, as noted by Charlotte Hempel, the characterization of the spirit of injustice is related to the “glorious purity” typified by the spirit of truth in 1QS 4:5 (cf. 4QpapS^c [4Q257] 5:2).¹⁰¹ Given the similar dualistic outlook with 1QM 13 and near identical terminology, there seems a plausible conceptual connection between those guided by the spirit of injustice in 1QM 4 and those included in the spirits of Belial’s lot in 1QM 13:4–5 in the movement’s ideology.¹⁰² As with the Wicked Priest in 1QpHab 8:9 and 12:7–9, both are guilty of moral impurity that, in the eyes of the writers, is considered not only abominable, but also defiling in nature (cf. Ezek 36:17; Ezra 9:11).

For our discussion, 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) 69 is particularly illuminating. As discussed in Chapter 6, Eileen Schuller has persuasively argued that 4Q381 69 and 77

⁹⁹ Klawans tentatively suggested that these abominations were either acts of avarice or bloodshed as well as perhaps to grave sinfulness in general. See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 71. Lim proposed that they were deeds associated with violence and theft (cf. Ezek 8:17). See Lim, *The Earliest Commentary*, 121.

¹⁰⁰ Translation from Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 106.

¹⁰¹ Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 118.

¹⁰² Klawans suggested that in the mind of the Qumran movement these would consist of all outsiders, including non-sectarian Jews and Gentiles. See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 82.

contains a type of historical narration, different from the register of the rest of 4Q381.¹⁰³

Additionally, Schuller concluded that fragment 69 reflects a setting at the time of Sinai and the conquest.¹⁰⁴ The fragment begins: “When he [God] saw that the peoples of the land acted abominably (התעיבו) all the land [became] total unclean defilement (לנדת טמאה בנדת טמאה).”¹⁰⁵ As we have seen with other texts thus far, 4Q381 69 1–2 employs the same linguistic cluster of “to act abominably” (תעב) as well as “unclean defilement” (נדת טמאה). This latter phrase is a unique syntactical construction consisting of ל + construct + ב + repetitive construct. The force of this idiomatic construction is akin to a repetitive apposition-styled clause, thus emphasizing the evocative force to the description.¹⁰⁶ Striking here is that the description is applied to the land and not to the abominable acts of the people of the land. In 4Q381 69, the land has become “unclean defilement” due to the peoples of the land acting abominably. As Schuller noted, this description is especially connected with Ezra 9:11, particularly in the fact that in Ezra 9:11 the land is described as “a land unclean (אֶרֶץ נְדָה)” and this due to the abominable acts of the “peoples of the land (עַמֵּי הָעָרֶץ)” (cf. Ezra 9:11; 4Q381 69 1).¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ On 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) 69, see 6.4.

¹⁰⁴ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 210–12.

¹⁰⁵ Translation from Schuller, DJD 11:150. Edward Cook translated this construction as “doubly filthy through impurity.” See DSSNT, 435 (accessed as QUMENG Accordance module). García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate it as “unclean defilement altogether.” See DSSSE, 761. Vermes as “wholly into impure uncleanness.” See CDSSE, 325.

¹⁰⁶ On the repetitive apposition construction, see Waltke and O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 233 (12.5); Christo H. J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, BLH 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 230. Schuller additionally notes that while the idiom “noun + ב + noun” in biblical Hebrew is used solely within temporal clauses (e.g., Lev 25:53; 1 Chr 12:23), in Qumran Hebrew the construction is also used non-temporally (e.g., 4QShirShabb^a [4Q400] 1 i 9; 4QShirShabb^d [4Q403] 1 i 1). See Schuller, DJD 11:150–151.

¹⁰⁷ Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 204. Schuller provides the following as linguistic evidence (linguistic correlations underlined): “כִּי הַתְּעִיבו עַמֵּי [הָאֶרֶץ] הִיְתָה [כָּל הָאֶרֶץ לְנִדְת טַמְאָה בְּנִדְת טַמְאָה]” (4Q381 69 1–2) and “הָאֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם בָּאִים לְרִשְׁתָּהּ אֶרֶץ נְדָה הִיא בְּנִדְת עַמֵּי הָאֶרְצוֹת בְּתוֹעֲבוֹתֵיהֶם אֲשֶׁר מֵלֹאֹת מִפֶּה אֵל פֶּה בְּטַמְאָתָם” (Ezra 9:11). See Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms*, 209. On the uniqueness of the ideas expressed in Ezra 9:11, see Pakkala, *Ezra the Scribe*, 115.

Equally significant is the reference to the purification of the land in 4Q381 69 6: “[...]take possession, dwell upon the land; then it will be purified (תטהר), and y’..[.]” For the writer(s), it is in the taking possession of the land and the dwelling upon it that brings about the purification of the land from the total unclean defilement (לנדת טמאה בנדת טמאה). As we concluded in the last chapter, 4Q381 69 demonstrates an interpretive tradition, which, framed within the Joshua conquest tradition, connected the abominable acts of the peoples of the land with the complete defilement of the land. This interpretive tradition, as we have seen in this chapter, finds familiarity with other exilic and post-exilic traditions (e.g., Ezra 9:11; Ezek 36:17). What is striking is that 4Q381 69 2 provides a means for the purification of the land in the form of the elect taking possession and dwelling upon land.¹⁰⁸ Given that we have established the employment of the wilderness motif and a reliance upon the Joshua conquest tradition in the Qumran war traditions (Chapters 5 and 6, respectively), this is significant. By denouncing the “works of impure uncleanness” (עבודת נדת טמאתם) of the spirits of Belial’s lot (1QM 13:5) with the same linguistic cluster we have been discussing, I would tentatively suggest that the same conception is present within the war tradition, namely, that the abominable acts of spirits of Belial’s lot are understood as defiling the land. Moreover, given the introduction of the purification of the land in 4Q381 69 6, a similar vision of re-possessing Jerusalem and the destruction of the forces of Belial thus leading to the purification of the land, while not made explicit in the war tradition, is not completely out of the question.

¹⁰⁸ The exact relationship between line 5 and 6 is not conclusive due to the fragmentary nature of the manuscript. That said, the faithful observance of the “law, instructions, and commandments by the covenant he established through[Moses]” presumably may have a role in the purification of the land. See Pajunen, *The Land to the Elect*, 167.

7.6 Purification and Renewal of the Land in the Eschatological Imagination

As we have seen, the connection between the concepts of sin and impurity, which Klawans categorized as moral impurity, has been well established.¹⁰⁹ One of the key distinctions between ritual and moral impurity is that whereas ritual impurity results in an impermanent defilement, which can be ameliorated by purification rites, moral impurity results in a long-lasting defilement of the sinner (Lev 18:24), the sanctuary (Lev 20:3; Ezek 5:11), and the land (Lev 18:25; Num 35:33–34; Ezek 36:17; Ezra 9:11), which requires punishment and atonement.¹¹⁰ As Klawans summarized:

Moral impurity is best understood as a potent force unleashed by certain sinful human actions. The force unleashed defiles the sinner, the sanctuary, and the land, even though the sinner is not ritually impure and does not ritually defile. Yet—and this is the source of much confusion—the sinner *is* seen as morally impure.¹¹¹

Regarding the defilement of the land specifically, Tikva Frymer-Kensky has argued that the progressive pollution of the land caused by moral impurity is considered the most catastrophic, as God protects and dwells in the land (Num 35:34).¹¹² Frymer-Kensky further suggested that such a pollution of the land was so cataclysmic that it required the offender(s) be “cut off” (כרת) from the people.¹¹³ Thus, the non-pollution of the land was a matter of protection of the holy and

¹⁰⁹ On the relationship between sin and impurity and the relevance of כִּפּוּר regarding moral impurity, see Skylar, *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement*, 139–59.

¹¹⁰ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 26–31; Skylar, *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement*, 144–50.

¹¹¹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 29.

¹¹² Tikva Frymer-Kensky, “Pollution, Purification, and Purgation in Biblical Israel,” in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, eds. Carol L. Myers and M. O’Connor, American Schools of Oriental Research Special Volume Series 1 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 406–09. In addressing the relationship between sin and impurity, Frymer-Kensky refers to those deeds that result in permanent pollution associated with moral wrongdoing and pose a threat to people and the land as “danger beliefs.” See Frymer-Kensky, “Pollution,” 404.

¹¹³ Frymer-Kensky, “Pollution,” 404–06. See also Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1550.

of national survival and, if left unaddressed, this moral impurity could result in the destruction of the land and the removal or exile of the people from the land.¹¹⁴

As we have seen so far, the concept of the defilement of the land due to acts of abominable moral transgression, influenced by the Holiness Code and Ezekiel, is found in texts from Qumran.¹¹⁵ Moreover, as 4Q381 69 demonstrates, there was an interpretative tradition found at Qumran that not only saw works of “impure uncleanness” as a pollutant on the land, but also envisaged the possession and occupation of the land by the elect, with the presumable removal of its inhabitants, as a means of purification of the land. A similar concern for the purification of the land might lie behind the references in 1QS to the atonement of the land and the judgment of the wicked (1QS 8:6–7, 10; 9:4) and elsewhere in the Qumran corpus (1QSa 1:3; 4QMiscellaneous Rules [4Q265] 7 9–10).¹¹⁶ Particularly interesting is 1QS 9:4, which notes the community will “atone for the guilt of wrongdoing and the betrayal of sin so that the land may be accepted,” thus linking atonement for the land and a sense of moral impurity.

The notion that there will be an end to wickedness and guilt and that the earth will be renewed in the eschaton is not only common in apocalyptic eschatology but is also a part of the conceptual universe found at Qumran. In 4QRenewed Earth (4Q475), a fragmentary text paleographically dated to the early Herodian period (50–1 BCE) and addressing God’s

¹¹⁴ Frymer-Kensky, “Pollution,” 409; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 30, 33–34; Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement*, 215–16.

¹¹⁵ On the general influence of Ezekiel on the Qumran movement, see É. Cothenet, “Influence d’Ézéchiél sur la spiritualité de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 431–39; Florentino García Martínez, “L’Interprétation de la Torah d’Ézéchiél dans les mss. de Qumran,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 441–52.

¹¹⁶ Cf. 1QS 8:6–7 // 4QS^e (4Q259) 2:15–16; 1QS 8:10 // 4QS^d (4Q258) 6:4; 1QS 9:4 // 4QS^d (4Q258) 7:4–5.

eschatological renewal of the earth and the faithful, we see the removal of guilt from the land as a central feature of the renewed earth.¹¹⁷ The text reads:¹¹⁸

1 [Zio]n(?) [did] He choose, and by a righteous life[
2 [His laws(?)]they forgot and did not seek them, and a land[
3 [He stretched out(?) (His h]ands in their midst, and told them all the[precepts(?]
4 [al]l the earth, and there will no longer be any guilt (אשמות) in the land, and there will not
b[e any more(?]
5 [There will be(?) destruc]tion and great envy, and then all the earth will be like Eden, and all
who li[ve there
6 []the land will be quiet for ever, and those who live[there] will seek(?)[
7 [Israel will be unto Him(?)]a beloved son, and they will seek it all, and ri[ghteousness(?]
8 [] for [

Important for our discussion, the phrase “there will no longer be any guilt in the land” in line 4 is an indication that for the eschatologically renewed earth sin and guilt have become past realities.

Torleif Elgvin has suggested that the three parallel clauses in line 4 describe the renewal and purification of the earth and humankind.¹¹⁹ This is followed by judgment on the earth and its

inhabitants resulting in an Edenic state of peace and a renewed obedience of the people to God.

The description of the removal of “guilt” (אשמות) as a part of the purification and renewal of the earth is striking. The notion of an eschatological cessation of iniquity and wickedness is found in other texts from Qumran.¹²⁰ Much like 4Q475, the idea of the removal of the “guilty” from the land in the eschaton is also expressed in 4QpPs^a (4Q171) 1–10 ii 7–9, a *peshet* of Psalm 37:10, which notes:

¹¹⁷ On 4Q475, see P. A. Spijkerman, “Chronique du Musée de la Flagellation,” *SBFLA* 12 (1961–62): 324–25; Torleif Elgvin, “Renewed Earth and Renewed People: 4Q475,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 577–91; Torleif Elgvin, “4QRenewed Earth,” *DJD* 36:464–73. See PAM 40.990, 991.

¹¹⁸ Translation by Torleif Elgvin, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 2:870–73. Corrected in 2004 from Torleif Elgvin, *DJD* 36:466.

¹¹⁹ Elgvin, *DJD* 36:467, 469. Elgvin proposed a tentative reconstruction of the first phrase as ויחדש כן[ול תבל].

¹²⁰ Cf. 4QpsDan^c ar (4Q245) 2 2; 1QH 6:30; 11:22; 14:15–16; 1QS 4:20; 4Q*Serekh ha-Milhamah* (4Q285) 6 1; 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a) 1 ii 3; 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1 14; 1QMyst (1Q27) 1 i 6–7; 4QMyst^c? (4Q301) 3 8; 4QTQahat ar (4Q542) ii 8.

⁷... Its interpretation concerns all the wickedness at the end of ⁸the forty years: they will be consumed, and there will not be found on the earth any [wi]cked ⁹man.¹²¹

Importantly, the term “guilt” (אשמה) is employed within the Qumran war tradition to describe the enemy combatants in general (1QM 11:11; 12:12; 13:15), the slain of the enemy (1QM 6:17; 14:3; 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 13; 11 ii 23), and Belial and his dominion (1QM 13:4, 11).¹²²

Particularly illuminating is 1QM 11:10–11 where, within a blessing to God for his past faithfulness and the foretold downfall of the troops of Belial “by the hand of the poor ones (אביונים)” (11:9), we read of the promised destruction of the guilty (cf. 1QM 13:5):

¹⁰The low of spirit (נבאי רוח) you will cause to burn like a flaming torch in a sheaf, devouring wickedness (אוכלת רשעה), not turning away until ¹¹the extermination of guiltiness (כלות אשמה).¹²³

As early commentators noticed, those who are “low of spirit” are said to burn “like a flaming torch in a sheaf,” a reference to Zech 12:6:¹²⁴

On that day I will make the clans of Judah like a blazing pot on a pile of wood, like a flaming torch among sheaves; and they shall devour to the right and to the left all the surrounding peoples, while Jerusalem shall again be inhabited in its place, in Jerusalem.

For the writer(s), the comparison is clear: just as the clans of Judah were made like a flaming torch devouring the surrounding people like sheaves, so too the low in spirit will devour wickedness.¹²⁵ The writer(s) then further qualify that the devouring of wickedness by the נבאי רוח will not be abated until all guiltiness has been exterminated. This suggests that the removal

¹²¹ Translation from Maurya P. Horgan, “Psalm Peshier 1 (4Q171 = 4QpPs^a = 4QpPs37 and 45),” PTSDSSP 6B:11.

¹²² Additionally, the theme of “guilt” is seen in Belial being cursed for “all your guilty works of wickedness” (1QS 2:5; cf. 4Q256 2:13; 4Q257 2:1–2) and “for his guilty dominion” (4Q286 7 ii 2–3; cf. the cursing of the “angel of the pit” or “spirit of Abaddon” in 4Q286 7 ii 8–9), in the hatred for the “children of darkness each according to his guilt” (1QS 1:10), the destruction of the “sons of guilt” (1QH 14:33–35), and the reference to “guilty corpses” (4Q169 3–4 ii 6).

¹²³ Translation my own.

¹²⁴ See Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 312; Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 163; van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 141; Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 266.

¹²⁵ See Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, 163.

of all wickedness and guilt from the earth was not only a constitutive feature of the eschatological worldview of the Qumran movement, as we have seen in 4QRenewed Earth (4Q475) and 4QPsalms Peshera (4Q171), but also was an operational facet of the imagined world of the Qumran war tradition. Moreover, the terminological and ideological correlation between the war tradition and 4Q381 69 suggests that the annihilation of the enemy in the war tradition quite plausibly could be understood as an eschatological act of purification of the land. The abominable “works of impure uncleanness” (עבודת נדה טמאתם) perpetrated by the spirits of Belial’s lot have defiled the land resulting in a catastrophic state of pollution, of which only the extermination of wickedness and guiltiness will bring about purification. Importantly, for the Qumran war tradition, this was not solely an earthly purification, but a cosmic one as well. The annihilation of the sons of darkness, thus removing guilt and wickedness from the earth, would bring about a cosmic purification, one which would usher in the dawn of the new age.

7.7 Conclusion

That the Second Temple is marked by a heightened concern for matters of purity and impurity is without question. This concern, furthermore, is not only expressed within various texts in the Qumran corpus but is also persuasively demonstrated in the archaeological remains at Khirbet Qumran.¹²⁶ In short, for the Qumran movement, and especially those living at Khirbet Qumran, matters of purity and impurity were central to daily religious life and ideological worldview. Over the course of this chapter, it has been our position that the concepts of purity and defilement play a significant role within the Qumran war tradition. Given the priestly nature of the Qumran war tradition, this is to be expected. That said, however, while matters of purity in

¹²⁶ See Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 86–87, 96–100.

the war tradition have often been recognized by scholars, the role defilement plays within the tradition has often been underexamined. A proper appreciation for both purity and defilement, however, is requisite for a more complete picture of the eschatological imagination of the Qumran movement as well as how the movement conceived of the final war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness.

Regarding purity in the war tradition, we observed a heightened requisite level of purity for the eschatological combatants, both lay and sacerdotal, regarding the war camp (1QM 7:3–7) as well as corpse impurity (1QM 9:7–9; 14:2–3). This elevated level of purity is articulated through the introduction of purity requirements requisite of those operating within a sacred, cultic sphere (Lev 21:10–12, 16–23). The rationale for such an enhancement in purity and perfection in the war tradition, we concluded, is explicitly due to the presence of angelic beings fighting alongside the eschatological combatants (1QM 7:6; cf. 4QM^a [4Q491] 1–3 10), an underlying belief concerning the eschatological battle made explicit in 1QM 10:11; 12:4–5, 8; and 17:6. As Wassén has pointed out, it was incumbent upon those in close connection with the angels to imitate the angels in purity and perfection.¹²⁷

Alongside the concept of purity, the notion of defilement is also significant within the war tradition at Qumran. As we have seen, the eschatological enemy, including Belial, is conceived of in terms of guilt and defilement. Specifically, the reference to the spirits of Belial’s “works of impure uncleanness” (עבודת גדת טמאתם) in 1QM 13:5 is particularly illuminating. The linguistic cluster was shown to convey a sense of abominable moral transgression, one which resulted in the defilement of the land (cf. Ezek 36:17; Ezra 9:11; 4QNon-Canonical Psalms [4Q381] 69 2). Significant for our discussion was the reference to the purification of the

¹²⁷ Wassén, “What Do Angels,” 128.

land through possession and occupation of the land in 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B 69. This suggested that near the same time as the Qumran war tradition was taking shape there existed an exegetical tradition that saw the Joshua conquest narratives in terms of purification of the land from the “impure uncleanness” of the inhabitants. Equally important, 4QRenewed Earth (4Q475) presented a vision of the renewed earth that included the extermination of guilt, a concept articulated in 1QM 11:10 and 13:15.

This evidence argues that not only was the concept of the purification of the land and the removal of the guilty from the land in the eschaton a constitutive feature of the eschatological imagination of the Qumran movement, but the argument can be made that it is also operational in the conceptual universe of the war tradition. Here again, 4Q381 69 is striking. We have already demonstrated that both 4Q381 69 and 1QM demonstrate a marked reliance upon the Joshua conquest tradition. Now, since 4Q381 69 ideologically understands the land as polluted through abominable acts and that possession of the land and the displacement of the inhabitants by the elect brings purification of the land, it is quite plausible that the extermination of guiltiness and the “works of impure uncleanness” in 1QM could be seen as an act of purification leading to the re-possession and re-occupation of the land. This affords with the image in 1QM 2 with the re-entry into the land from exile in the wilderness and re-occupation of Jerusalem as the goal of the first phase of the war. As Zech 12:6 promises, “Jerusalem shall once again be inhabited in its place, in Jerusalem.”

CONCLUSION

When first brought to light by E. L. Sukenik in 1948, the *War Scroll* represented a previously unknown composition depicting a cosmic war between the sons of light and the sons of darkness “when the exiles, the sons of light, return from the wilderness of the peoples to encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem” (1QM 1:3). So remarkable was the writing that Yadin declared, “there is none like it, either Jewish or Christian, in the literature of the time of the Second Temple or in the period following. Nor is there any work like it among the sect’s own books.”¹ With the full publication of the Cave 4 manuscripts, we now know that the *War Scroll* was a part of a rich literary tradition within the wider eschatological imagination of the Qumran movement. Moreover, the full publication of manuscripts has provided a much fuller picture of the movement itself, including its beliefs and ideologies, its hopes and desires. This clearer vision has led to a scholarly re-assessment of previous held positions on issues such as the origin and nature of the movement, as well as its foundational beliefs, ideologies, and practices.

The intention of this study has been to provide a new reading of the Qumran war tradition given this fuller picture of the nature and ideology of the Qumran movement. Our focus has been on various features and themes present within the war tradition and the light they shed upon the movement’s eschatological imagination. What might they ideologically reveal about how the movement understood a future, imagined cosmic conflict between the forces of light and those of darkness? Other texts, such as 4QInstruction^b (4Q416) 1, 4Q4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) 69, and 4QRenewed Earth (4Q475) were brought to bear on the war tradition to situate the war tradition within the wider eschatological writings found at Qumran.

¹ Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls*, 128.

Our analysis concluded that the Qumran war tradition relies extensively upon the priestly and holiness traditions preserved in the Hebrew Bible. First, the war tradition relies on the priestly ideology of warfare, including those traditions in Num 31; Josh 6; and 2 Chr 13; 20. These traditions form the framework by which the eschatological war assumes a highly ritualized and sacral characterization of warfare. Furthermore, we concluded that this reliance reflects an employment of priestly ideology rather than reflecting any priestly origins of the movement or identity of those who shaped and transmitted of the war tradition. As has been convincingly argued, the so-called “priestly origins” of the movement is not reflected in the cumulative textual evidence we possess. Thus, the Qumran war tradition should be understood as a tradition that draws upon priestly and holiness traditions insofar as those traditions provide an ideological framework for the imagined eschatological conflict.

Significant for the war tradition is its cosmological orientation. Whereas the priestly and holy war traditions preserved in the Hebrew Bible are earthly in orientation, the Qumran war tradition evinces both earthly and a cosmic theater of war. Within the later stratum of the war tradition this is demonstrated in the belief that the angels are fighting alongside the elect in their battle against the enemy. Within the dualistic reworking in the later stratum of the tradition, the elect become the “sons of light,” while the enemy is envisaged as the “sons of darkness,” the lot of Belial. This process of “satanization” of an earthly enemy, as Mark Juergensmeyer describes it, is a constitutive element of cosmic warfare, transforming the enemy into a mythical force that “only divine power could subdue.”² That a cosmological orientation is at work on the war tradition is strengthened by the presence of calendrical concerns and regulations related to the re-

² Mark Juergensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*, 4th ed. (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2017), 225–29.

institution of properly functioning Temple service in 1QM 2:1–6, an act of re-ordering the cosmos.

There is likewise a strong reliance upon the priestly wilderness preparation narratives in Num 2 and 10, which connect the epic struggle with darkness in the war tradition with Israel's time of preparation in the wilderness. Just as the wilderness represented as time of purification and preparation for the Israelites prior to entering the land, so too the "exile in the wilderness" was a locus of purification and preparation for the exiles, the sons of light, who would "return from the wilderness of the peoples to encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem" to engage the sons of darkness (1QM 1:3). The use of trumpets and standards in the war tradition, while demonstrating a knowledge of Hasmonean and Greco-Roman military practices, connects the war tradition with the wilderness preparation narratives of Num 2 and 10. The memorial function of trumpets employed within the priestly tradition, preserved in the earliest stratum of the war tradition in 4QM^c (4Q493), underwent a significant expansion in the later evolution of the tradition becoming the main vehicle for the tactical orchestration of the elect. The allusive connection with the wilderness motif, we concluded, frames the elect as "exiles" whose time in the wilderness was one of purification and preparation for a re-entry into the land and the subsequent engagement with their enemies.

Our analysis also established a strong connection between the Joshua conquest tradition and the war tradition. Linguistically and thematically, the war tradition employed the Joshua conquest narratives as a means by which the eschatological conflict could be characterized as a re-entry into and the taking possession of the land. The employment of the concept of *herem* in the Qumran war tradition is particularly striking. As we demonstrated, the use of ἀνάθεμα, the Greek equivalent, within Jewish-Hellenistic compositions in the Second Temple period does not

seem to reflect the Deuteronomistic conception of *herem*, but rather the classical Greek meaning of an “offering” or “dedication” to God. The reemergence of the conception of *herem* as expressed in the Joshua conquest tradition in the Qumran war tradition is thus a radical departure from Jewish Hellenistic literature of the period, thus signaling a strong connection to the concept of *herem* as the dispossession of the people of the land. Significant is 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q3481) 69, which understood the Joshua conquest tradition in terms of the taking possession of a land defiled on account of the abominable acts of the people of the land, an act understood as leading to the purification of the land.

Finally, we established that the war tradition demonstrates a heightened concern for purity and defilement, including the pollution of the land. Relying on the priestly tradition, the eschatological battle was to be conducted with the utmost stringency regarding ritual purity and perfection. The requisite purity and perfection for the war camp, based upon the regulations in Deut 23:10–15, was enhanced equal to that of those serving God before the altar (Lev 21:16–23). Similarly, a concern for corpse impurity was applied to both lay and sacerdotal combatants, with the priesthood instructed to orchestrate the battle in strict avoidance of the blood of the slain to as to not “become defiled by their unclean blood” and “profane the oil of their anointing” (1QM 9:8–9; cf. Lev 21:10–12). This requisite elevation of purity, as we noted, is required of the high priest, thus signaling not only the urgency of the requirement, but also the severity of the defilement.

Important for our study was the notion of defilement and pollution employed in the war tradition. We argued that the terminology of defilement used within the war tradition regarding the enemy reflects a substantial, yet often neglected, thematic element. Significantly, the spirits of Belial’s lot are denounced for “their works of impure uncleanness” (עבודת נדת טמאתם). This

linguistic cluster is preserved in Ezek 36:17 and Ezra 9:11, both of which employ the cluster to denote abominable acts that lead to the defilement of the land, acts for which only the removal of the people will bring about purification of the land. Likewise appearing in other texts from Qumran, such as 1QpHab 8:12–13 and 1QS 4:10, the utilization of the linguistic cluster in 4Q381 69 1–2 is striking as it coalesces the ideas of the pollution of the land through abominable acts and the possessing of the land as a means of purification. This coalescence reflects the holiness tradition contained in exilic and post-exilic traditions. We argued that a similar conception is at work in the war tradition, whereby the re-possessing of Jerusalem and the destruction of the forces of Belial results in the purification of the land from the pollution of their abominable acts.

In sum, our study has proposed that the shapers and transmitters of the war tradition drew upon priestly and holiness traditions, specifically priestly warfare ideology, wilderness traditions, and traditions regarding purity and pollution as a narrative framework for the imagined eschatological struggle. These traditions coalesce with the Joshua conquest tradition as well as movement-oriented ideologies, such as calendrical concerns, cosmological ordering, the communion with angelic beings, and the eschatological renewal of the earth. The resulting portrait is one in which the eschatological battle is framed as a conflict between the elect of God and the wicked who are under the dominion of Belial. The sons of light after a time of exile in the wilderness, a time of purification and preparation, return to encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem to initiate the final battle, the first phase of which is the re-occupation of Jerusalem and the re-institution of properly conducted Temple service, an act initiating the ordering of the cosmos. Fighting alongside an angelic army, the conflict with the forces of darkness is waged in a cosmic arena marked by purity and defilement. Whereas the forces of light are held to a

stringent requisite purity, the forces of darkness have polluted the land with abominable acts. The destruction of the enemy and the repossession of the land by the elect of God is nothing less than an act of purification of the earth from the pollution of the wicked. In short, the authors of the Qumran war tradition created a new expression of the priestly warfare tradition, one in which the goal was the cosmological purification of the earth through the annihilation of the wicked, so that “there will no longer be any guilt in the land” (4QRenewed Earth [4Q475] 4).

While this certainly does not constitute the only reading of the Qumran war tradition available to us, our interpretation offers a fresh understanding of the evolving war tradition, one that invites further inquiry. Several possible avenues are worth noting. First, our study calls into question the nature of dualism expressed in the war tradition. As discussed earlier in our investigation, the *War Scroll* has long been looked to as an expression of “cosmic dualism,” which Jörg Frey has defined as “the division of the world (κόσμος) and of humanity into two opposing forces of good and evil, light and darkness.”³ Jörg Frey has gone so far as to suggest that the dualism in the *War Scroll* is “a purely *cosmic* one.”⁴ Whereas ideas such as good and evil and the righteous and the wicked have previously characterized “ethical dualism,” our study suggests that notions of purity and defilement need also be taken into consideration in the discussion regarding expressions of dualism. This suggestion broadens our understanding of dualism and those texts that metaphorically employ images of purity and defilement, pollution and purification.

³ Jörg Frey, “Differing Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on their Background and History,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, eds. Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 283. See also Frey, “Apocalyptic Dualism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 272. Frey goes even further noting that “there is no ethical dualism in the War Rule.” See Frey, “Differing Patterns,” 312.

⁴ Frey, “Differing Patterns,” 310; Frey, “Apocalyptic Dualism,” 284.

Second, whereas our study explored the issue of the pollution and purification in the eschatological imagination of the Qumran war tradition it also invites further investigative questions. Where else do we see these ideas and themes expressed within the Qumran corpus and what might this tell us about those texts and the movement? What about the wider literary landscape of the Second Temple period? How are themes of purity and defilement, pollution and purification utilized? How might their employment further illuminate our understanding of these texts or refine our insight into the larger ideology of various ancient Jewish movements? Regarding the nature of religious violence, how might the themes of the Qumran war tradition illuminate current theorization on the connection between religious texts and religious violence, whether fictional or realized?⁵

Finally, as noted earlier, Kimberly Stratton has observed, “eschatological fantasies of reversal and revenge constitute a literary genre that was appropriated for a variety of ideological purposes, including social critique.”⁶ In this light, our study suggests that the powerful imagery employed in the war tradition, such as that of exile and wilderness, purity and defilement, pollution and purification might have offered a visceral critique of those outside the movement and labeled the “sons of darkness.” Moreover, given the long transmission history of the war tradition and its potential performative qualities, these images and themes might have played a formative role in the shaping and formation of identity of the Qumran movement. While the exact function of the war tradition within the movement might ultimately elude us, we can say

⁵ For current studies on religious texts and violence, see James W. Jones, *Blood That Cries Out from the Earth: The Psychology of Religious Terrorism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Mark Juergensmeyer and Margo Kitts, eds., *Princeton Readings in Religion and Violence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011); Mark Juergensmeyer, Margo Kitts, and Michael Jerryson, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Violence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); Juergensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God*.

⁶ Stratton, “The Eschatological Arena,” 48.

unequivocally that the imagery and themes employed in the war tradition remain evocative and powerful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note that the full publication information for volumes from the DJD and PTSDSSP series are found in the list of abbreviations and frequently cited sources.

- Abegg, Martin G. "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?" Pages 136–47 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. JSOT Sup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- _____. "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment." *JBL* 113 (1994): 81–91.
- _____. "The War Scroll from Cave 1 and 4: A Critical Edition." PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1993.
- Abegg, Jr., Martin G., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003–2016.
- Adler, Yonatan. "The Decline of Jewish Ritual Purity Observance in Roman Palestine: An Archaeological Perspective on Chronology and Historical Context." Pages 269–84 in *Expressions of Cult in the Southern Levant in the Greco-Roman Period: Manifestations in Text and Material Culture*. Edited by Oren Tal and Zeev Weiss. CS 6. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2017.
- Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, and Onasander*. Translated by Charles Henry Oldfather and William Abbott Oldfather. LCL 156. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Aksu, Ayhan. "The Qumran Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as an Intentional Collection of Prayers." *DSD* 29 (2022): 292–324.
- Alexander, Philip S. "The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of Jewish Opposition to Rome." Pages 17–31 in vol. 1 of *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and the 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.
- _____. "The Material Reconstruction and Genre of 4Q285 (Sefer ha-Milhamah) Reconsidered." Pages 333–48 in *Studia Semitica: The Journal of Semitic Studies Jubilee Volume*. Edited by Philip S. Alexander, George J. Brooke, Andreas Christmann, John F. Healey, and Philip C. Sadgrove. JSSSup 16. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- _____. "A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah)." *RevQ* 19 (1999–2000): 333–48.
- _____. "Rules." *EDSS* 2:799–803.
- Alexander, Philip S. and Geza Vermes. "4QSefer ha-Milhamah." DJD 36:228–46.
- Allegro, John M. "Commentary on Psalms (A)." DJD 5:42–51.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1957.
- Anderson, Gary A. "Aaron." *EDSS* 1:1–2.
- Angel, Joseph L. *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 86. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Arnold, Bill T. and John H. Choi. *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

- Arnold, Russell C. D. *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community*. STDJ 60. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Arrian. *Flavii Arriani Quae exstant omnia*. Edited by A. G. Roos, with corrections and additions by Gerhard Wirth. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1968.
- Avalos, Hector. *Fighting Words: The Origins of Religious Violence*. Amherst: Prometheus, 2005.
- _____. *The Reality of Religious Violence: From Biblical to Modern Times*. BMW 72. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2019.
- Bahrani, Zainab. *Rituals of War: The Body and Violence in Mesopotamia*. New York: Zone Books, 2008.
- Baillet, Maurice. “Débris de textes sur papyrus de la grotte 4 de Qumrân.” *RB* 71 (1964): 353–71.
- _____. “Les manuscrits de la Règle de la Guerre de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân.” *RB* 79 (1972): 217–26.
- _____. *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- _____. “Le volume VII de ‘Discoveries in the Judean Desert’: Présentation.” Pages 75–89 in *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by Mathias Delcor. BETL 46. Paris: Duculot, 1978.
- Baker, Cynthia. “When Jews were Women.” *HR* 45 (2005): 114–34.
- Bakker, Arjen. “תבן.” *ThWQ* 3:1123–28.
- Bardtke, Hans. “Die Kriegerrolle von Qumran übersetzt.” *TLZ* 80 (1955): 401–20.
- Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989.
- Barthélemy, D. and J. T. Milik. “La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres” (1QM).” *DJD* 1:135–36.
- Batsch, Christophe. *La guerre et les rites de la guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple*. JSJSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- _____. “Le ‘pacifisme des Esséniens,’ un mythe historiographique.” *RevQ* 21 (2004): 457–68.
- _____. “Priests in Warfare in Second Temple Judaism: 1QM or the *Anti-Phinehas*.” Pages 165–78 in *Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings from the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. “The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration.” *DSD* 4 (1997): 137–56.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. “The Essenes Avoidance of Oil and Laws of Purity.” *RevQ* 22 (1967): 183–92.
- _____. “Liquids and Susceptibility to Defilement in New 4Q Texts.” *JQR* 85 (1994): 91–101.
- _____. “The Purification Rituals in *DJD* 7.” Pages 199–209 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- _____. “The Red Cow Purification Rites in Qumran Texts.” *JJS* 46 (1995): 112–19.
- _____. “The Sabbath Trumpets in 4Q493 M^c.” *RevQ* 12 (1987): 555–59.
- _____. “Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls.” *HTR* 46 (1953): 141–57.
- _____. *Studies in Qumran Law*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

- _____. “The Use of מִי נִידָה for General Purifications.” Pages 481–85 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: Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
- Beale, G. K. *The Use of Daniel in the Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John*. New York: University Press of America, 1984.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Becking, Bob. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. HCOT. Leuven: Peeters, 2018.
- Bell, Catherine. “Ritual.” Pages 397–411 in *The Blackwell Companion to the Study of Religion*. Edited by Robert A. Segal. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- _____. “The Ritualization of Texts and the Textualization of Ritual in the Codification of Taoist Literature.” *HR* 27 (1988): 366–92.
- _____. *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- _____. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. “4QOtot.” *DJD* 21:195–244.
- _____. “The Book of HGY and Ancient Reading Practices.” Pages 423–37 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 Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioată, and Charlotte Hempel. *STDJ* 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. “4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary.” *JJS* 45 (1994): 1–27.
- _____. “Women and Children in Legal and Liturgical Texts from Qumran.” *DSD* 11 (2004): 184–211.
- Berthelot, Katell. “4QTestimonia as a Polemic against the Prophetic Claims of John Hyrcanus.” Pages 99–116 in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, With the Assistance of Lucas L. Schulte. *CBET* 52. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- _____. “ἀνάθημα, ἀνάθεμα, ἀναθεματίζω.” Pages 478–87 in *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint, Volume I: Alpha – Gamma*. Edited by Eberhard Bons. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- _____. “The Biblical Conquest of the Promised Land and the Hasmonean Wars according to 1 and 2 Maccabees.” Pages 45–60 in *The Books of Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9–11 June, 2005*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. *JSJSup* 118. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. “Judas Maccabeus’ Wars against Judaea’s Neighbors in 1 Maccabees 5: A Reassessment of the Evidence.” *Electrum* 21 (2014): 73–85.
- _____. “The Notion of *Anathema* in Ancient Jewish Literature Written in Greek.” Pages 39–52 in *The Reception of Septuagint Words in Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian Literature*. Edited by Eberhard Bons, Ralph Brucker, and Jan Joosten. *WUNT* II/367. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- _____. “Philo of Alexandria and the Conquest of Canaan.” *JSJ* 38 (2007): 39–56.
- Bibb, Bryan D. *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus*. *LHBOTS* 480. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

- Billows, Richard. "International Relations." Pages 303–24 in *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, Volume 1: Greece, Hellenistic World and the Rise of Rome*. Edited by Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees, and Michael Whitby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Birnbaum, Solomon A. *The Hebrew Scripts, I, Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988.
- _____. *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Boda, Mark J. "Gazing through the Cloud of Incense: Davidic Dynasty and Temple Community in the Chronicler's Perspective." Pages 215–45 in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*. Edited by Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Boling, Robert G. and G. Ernest Wright. *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. AB 6. Garden City: Doubleday, 1982.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis, Douglas W. Scott, David E. Green. Rev. ed. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Bowman, John. "Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?" *RevQ* 1 (1958): 73–84.
- Boyer, Pascal and Pierre Liénard. "Whence Collective Rituals? A Cultural Selection Model of Ritualized Behavior." *American Anthropologist* 108 (2006): 814–27.
- Brekelmans, C. H. W. *De herem in het Oude Testament*. Nijmegen: Central Drukkerij, 1959.
- _____. "Le herem chez les prophètes du royaume du Nord et dans le Deutéronome." Pages 377–83 in vol. 1 of *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*. Edited by J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and É. Massaux. BETL 12. Gembloux: Duculot, 1959.
- Brooke, George J. "4QCommentary on Genesis A." *DJD* 22:185–207.
- _____. "Between Scroll and Codex? Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs." Pages 123–38 in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*. Edited by James K. Aitken, Katherine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin. BZAW 420. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- _____. "Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin: Culture, 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 Vanderberghe. JSJSup 178. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- _____. "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community." Pages 117–32 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by George Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 15. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- _____. "Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." Pages 105–29 in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac, Volume I: General Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls; Qumran and the New Testament; the Present State of Qumranology*. Edited by Zdzislaw Jan Kapera. QM 2. Kraków: Enigma Press, 1993.
- _____. "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. Aufère, Philip S. Alexander, and Zlatko Pleše. OLA 232. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- _____. “Shared Exegetical Traditions Between the Scrolls and the New Testament.” OHDSS, 565–91.
- Büchler, Adolph. *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*. London: Oxford University Press, 1928; New York: Ktav Publishing, 1967.
- Budde, Karl. “Das nomadische Ideal im Alten Testament.” *Preussische Jahrbücher* 88 (1896): 57–79.
- _____. “The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament.” *The New World* 4 (1895): 726–45.
- Burrows, Millar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Viking, 1955.
- _____. *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New Interpretations with Translations of Important Recent Discoveries*. New York: Viking, 1958.
- Campbell, Brian. *Warfare and Society in Imperial Rome: 31 BC–AD 284*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Carmignac, Jean. “Les citations de l’Ancien Testament dans la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres.” *RB* 63 (1956): 234–60, 375–90.
- _____. “Concordance hébraïque de la Règle de la Guerre.” *RevQ* 1 (1958): 7–49.
- _____. “Les Kittim dans la Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres.” *NRTh* 77 (1955): 725–48.
- _____. “Précisions apportées au vocabulaire de l’hébreu biblique par la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres.” *VT* 5 (1955): 345–65.
- _____. *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres: Texte restauré, traduit et commenté*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958.
- Carmignac, J. and P. Guilbert. *Les texts de Qumran: Traduits et annotés*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961.
- Cazeaux, Jacques. *Le refus de la guerre sainte: Josué, Juges, et Ruth*. LD 174. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1998.
- Cerquiglini, Bernard. *Éloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie*. Paris: Seuil, 1989.
- _____. *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*. Translated by Betsy Wing. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Charlesworth, James. “XJoshua.” *DJD* 38:231–39.
- Charlesworth, James H. and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. “Rule of the Congregation (1QS^a).” *PTSDSSP* 1:108–17.
- Chazon, Esther G. “A Case of Mistaken Identity: *Testament of Naphtali* (4Q215) and *Time of Righteousness* (4Q215^a).” Pages 110–23 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.
- Chazon Esther and Michael Stone. “4QTime of Righteousness.” *DJD* 26:172–84.
- _____. “4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215^a, Olim 4QNaphtali): A Preliminary Publication of Fragment 1 II.” Pages 124–25 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.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–2011.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge, 1997.

- _____. *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. “Canon, Canonization.” EDEJ, 460–63.
- _____. *Does the Bible Justify Violence?* Facets. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- _____. “Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P. R. Davies.” *VT* 29 (1979): 212–16.
- _____. “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, Matthew A. “Scholarly and Popular Reception.” CDSS, 59–73.
- Cothenet, É. “Influence d’Ézéchiél sur la spiritualité de Qumrân.” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 431–39.
- Craigie, Peter C. *The Problem of War in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. “Not According to Rule: Women the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran.” Pages 127–50 in *Emanuel: Studies in the 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.
- _____. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SDSSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- _____. *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*. CQS 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Cross, Jr., Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- _____. “The Development of the Jewish Scripts.” Pages 133–202 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1979.
- _____. “Paleography.” *EDSS* 2:629–34.
- Crouch, C. L. *War and Ethics in the Ancient Near East: Military Violence in Light of Cosmology and History*. BZAW 407. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Cudworth, Troy D. *War in Chronicles: Temple Faithfulness and Israel’s Place in the Land*. LHBOTS 627. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.
- Davage, David. “Stitching Psalms Together: On the Function and Use of Psalms in 4Q171.” *CBQ* 85 (2023): 256–75.
- Davies, Philip R. *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*. BibOr 32. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.
- _____. “Ark or Ephod in 1 Sam XIV. 18?” *JTS* 26 (1975): 82–87.
- _____. *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. BJS 94. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- _____. “The Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War.” Pages 206–32 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- _____. “Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Rejoinder.” *VT* 30 (1980): 93–97.
- _____. “Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll.” *VT* 28 (1978): 28–36.
- _____. “Dualism in the Qumran War Texts.” Pages 8–19 in *Dualism in Qumran*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits. LSTS 76. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- _____. “Zadok, Sons of.” *EDSS* 2:1005–07.
- Davis, Kipp. “‘There and Back Again’: Reconstruction and Reconciliation of the War Text 4QMilhamah^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, Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Dearman, Andrew, ed. *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. ABS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Debel, Hans. "Discoveries." CDSS, 7–16.
- Delcor, Mathias. "La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres ou le 'Manuel du parfait combattant.'" *NRTh* 77 (1955): 372–99.
- deSilva, David A. "The Revelation of John: A Case Study in Apocalyptic Propaganda and Maintenance of Sectarian Identity." *Sociological Analysis* 53 (1992): 375–95.
- DeVries, Michael. "The Priesthood in Times of War: Sacerdotal and Militaristic Functions." Paper presented at the Western Jewish Studies Association 2017 Annual Conference. Claremont, CA, 26 March 2017.
- DeVries, Michael and Jutta Jokiranta. "Ritual Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Review." Pages 156–96 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Ancient Media Culture*. Edited by Travis B. Williams, Chris Keith, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. STDJ 144. Leiden: Brill, 2023.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in Spirit: The Peshet of Isa 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community* and the History of the Scrolls Community." Pages 455–64 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. FAT 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Dimant, Devorah, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research*. STDJ 99. Leiden: Brill: 2012.
- Douglas, Mary. *In the Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- _____. *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge, 1966.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. *Joshua 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 6B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Driscoll, M. J. "The Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New." Pages 87–104 in *Creating the Medieval Saga: Version, Variability, and Editorial Interpretation of Old Norse Saga Literature*. Edited by Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge. The Viking Collection 18. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2010.
- Duhaime, Jean. "Dualisme et construction de l'identité sectaire à Qumrân." *Théologiques* 13 (2005): 43–57.
- _____. "Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran." *CBQ* 49 (1987): 32–56.
- _____. "Étude comparative de 4QM^a Fgg. 1–3 et 1QM." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 459–72.
- _____. "Le rédaction de 1QM XIII et l'évolution du dualisme à Qumrân." *RB* 84 (1977): 210–38.
- _____. "War Scroll." Pages 3116–151 in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2013.
- _____. "War Scroll (1QM; 1Q33; 4Q491–496 = 4QM1–6; 4Q497)." *PTSDSSP* 2:80–203.
- _____. "The *War Scroll* from Qumran and Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 133–51.
- _____. *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*. CQS 6. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

- Dupont-Sommer, André. *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte*. Paris: Payot, 1959.
- _____. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- _____. “‘Règlement de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière’: Traduction et notes.” *RHR* 148 (1955): 25–43, 141–80.
- Dus, Jan. “Gibeon—ein Kultstätte des šmš und die Stadt des benjaministischen Schicksals.” *VT* 10 (1960): 353–74.
- Elgavish, David. “The Division of the Spoils of War in the Bible and in the Ancient Near East.” *ZABR* 8 (2000): 242–73.
- Elgvin, Torleif. “4QRenewed Earth.” *DJD* 36:464–73.
- _____. “Renewed Earth and Renewed People: 4Q475.” Pages 577–91 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich. *STDJ* 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Elgvin, Torleif, Kipp Davis, and Michael Langlois. *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection*. *LSTS* 71. London: T&T Clark, 2018.
- Elgvin, Torleif and Årstein Justnes. “Appendix: 4Q215A, Frgs. 1, 2, 3, and 4 – Text and Notes.” Pages 162–70 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements. *STDJ* 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Erho, Ted M. “The Motif of the Eschatological Battle in the *War Scroll* (1QM).” Pages 359–74 in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Baek. *EJL* 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Eshel, Esther. “4QRitual of Purification.” *DJD* 35:135–53.
- _____. “Self-Glorification Hymn.” *DJD* 29:421–32.
- Eshel, Esther and Hanan Eshel. “4Q471 Fragment 1 and *Ma’amadot* in the *War Scroll*.” Pages 611–20 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21, 1991*. Edited by Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. *STDJ* 11. Leiden, Brill, 1992.
- _____. “4QWar Scroll-like Text B.” *DJD* 36:439–445.
- _____. “Recensions of the *War Scroll*.” Pages 351–63 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.
- _____. “Two Notes on Column 2 of the *War Scroll* (1QM).” Pages 85–98 in *Exploring the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeology and Literature of the Qumran Caves*. Edited by Shani Tzoref and Barnea Levi Selavan. *JAJSup* 18. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. “Priests at Qumran: A Reassessment.” Pages 243–62 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel. *STDJ* 90. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran.” Pages 201–17 in *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologi des Alten, Ersten Testaments: Festschrift für Erich Zenger*. Edited by Frank Lothar Hossfeld and Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger. *HBS* 44. Freiburg: Herder, 2004.

- Falk, Daniel K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- _____. "High Priests." *EDSS* 1:362.
- _____. "Liturgical Texts." *CDSS*, 423–34.
- _____. "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, Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Feldman, Ariel. "4Q47 (4QJosh^a): An Abbreviated Text?" Pages 152–63 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 Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioatâ, and Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- _____. *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*. BZAW 438. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- _____. *Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Steve Mason. Volume 3. Leiden, Brill, 2000.
- Fields, Weston W. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History: Volume One: 1947–1960*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10." Pages 31–47 in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. Chicago: Priory Press, 1968.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Flight, John W. "The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament." *JBL* 42 (1923): 158–226.
- Flusser, David. *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: Volume 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism*. Translated by Azzan Yadin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Jerusalem: Magness Press; Jerusalem: Jerusalem Perspective, 2007.
- Fraade, Steven D. *The Damascus Document*. OCDSS. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- _____. "Hagu, Book of." *EDSS* 1:327.
- _____. "'They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob': Priests, Scribes, and Sages in Second Temple Times." Unpublished paper. <https://www.academia.edu/301787>.
- Frennesson, Björn. *"In a Common Rejoicing": Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran*. SSU 14. Uppsala: University of Uppsala Press, 1999.
- Frevel, Christian. "Practicing Rituals in a Textual World: Ritual and Innovation in the Book of Numbers." Pages 129–50 in *Ritual Innovation and the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism*. Edited by Nathan MacDonald. BZAW 468. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.
- Frey, Jörg. "Apocalyptic Dualism." Pages 271–94 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- _____. "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History." Pages 275–335 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- Frymer-Kensky, Tikva. "Pollution, Purification, and Purgation in Biblical Israel." Pages 399–414 in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by Carol L. Myers and M. O'Connor. American Schools of Oriental Research Special Volume Series 1. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- Furstenberg, Yair. "Controlling Impurity: The Natures of Impurity in the Second Temple Debates." *Dine Israel* 30 (2015): 163–96.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Book of Joshua." Pages 97–109 in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange. CBET 57. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- _____. "L'Interprétation de la Torah d'Ézéchiél dans les mss. de Qumran." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 441–52.
- _____. "Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple." Pages 77–93 in *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 64. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Julio Treballe Barrera. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- García-Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- García-Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude. "11QSefer ha-Milhamah." *DJD* 23:243–51.
- _____. "11QShirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat." *DJD* 23:259–304.
- Gaster, Theodor H. *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
- Gera, Deborah Levine. *Judith*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Gilliver, Catherine M. "Chapter 4: Battle." Pages 122–57 in *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, Volume II: Rome from the Late Republic to the Late Empire*. Edited by Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees, and Michael Whitby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Ginsburskaya, Mila. "The Right of Council and the Idea of Purity in the Rule of the Community (1QS) and the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa)." Pages 77–90 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings from the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. Translated by Patrick Gregory. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Glessmer, Uwe. "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 213–78 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999. Repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019.
- Gmirkin, Russell. "Historical Allusion in the War Scroll." *DSD* 5 (1998): 172–214.
- _____. "The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered." *DSD* 3 (1996): 89–129.
- Goff, Matthew J. *4QInstruction*. WLAW 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Golb, Norman. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* New York: Scribner, 1995.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *I Maccabees: A New Translation, with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.

- _____. *2 Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Goldsworthy, Adrian Keith. *The Roman Army at War: 100 BC–AD 200*. OCM. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Goody, Jack. *The Power of the Written Tradition*. SSEI. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.
- Gordon, Benjamin D. *Land and Temple: Field Sacralization and the Agrarian Priesthood of Second Temple Judaism*. SJ 87. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021.
- Gorman, Frank H. *Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology*. JSOTSup 91. Sheffield: JOST Press, 1990.
- _____. “Ritual Studies and Biblical Studies: Assessment of the Past; Prospects for the Future.” *Semeia* 67 (1994): 13–36.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-Historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- _____. “Warfare: Eschatological Warfare.” *EDSS* 2:961–65.
- Greenberg, Moshe. “HEREM.” *EncJud* 9:10.
- Grossman, Maxine L. “Priesthood as Authority: Interpretive Competition in First-Century Judaism and Christianity.” Pages 117–31 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*. Edited by James R. Davila. STDJ 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*. STDJ 45. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Haber, Susan. “*They Shall Purify Themselves*”: *Essays on Purity in Early Judaism*. Edited by Adele Reinhartz. EJL 24. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Habermann, A. M. *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda: The Scrolls from the Judean Desert*. Jerusalem: Machbaroth Lesifruth Publishing, 1959.
- Haigh, Rebekah. “Oral Aspects: A Performative Approach to 1QM.” *DSD* 26 (2019): 189–219.
- Haran, Menahem. *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985.
- Harding, G. Lankester. “Introductory, The Discovery, The Excavation, Minor Finds.” DJD 1:3–7
- Harrington, Hannah K. *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations*. SBLDS. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- _____. “Purity.” *EDSS* 2:724–28.
- _____. *The Purity Texts*. CQS 5. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Hawk, L. Daniel. *Joshua*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Hayward, C. T. R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*. TSAJ 183. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- _____. “Consider Ourselves in Charge: Self-Assertion Sons of Zadok Style.” Pages 211–27 in *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*. TSAJ 154. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- _____. “Curated Communities: Refracted Realities at Qumran and on Social Media.” Pages 335–57 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Ancient Media Culture*. Edited by Travis B. Williams, Chris Keith, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. STDJ 144. Leiden: Brill, 2023.
- _____. “Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If So was it Mutual?” *RevQ* 24 (2009): 135–53.
- _____. “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa.” *DSD* 3 (1996): 253–69.

- _____. *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction*. STDJ 29. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- _____. “The Literary Development of the S Tradition – A New Paradigm.” *RevQ* 22 (2006): 389–401.
- _____. “The Long Text of the *Serekh* as Crisis Literature.” *RevQ* 27 (2015): 3–23.
- _____. *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*. TSAJ 154. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- _____. “Rules.” CDSS, 405–12.
- _____. “סָרֵךְ *særæk*.” ThWQ 2:1111–17.
- _____. “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, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- _____. “A Tale of Two Scribes: Encounters with an Avant-Garde Manuscript of the Community Rules (4Q259).” Pages 115–28 in *Hokhmat Sopher: Mélanges offerts au Professeur Émile Puech en l'honneur de son quatre-vingtième anniversaire*. Edited by Jean-Sébastien Rey et Martin Staszak. Études Bibliques. Nouvelle Série 88. Leuven: Peeters, 2021.
- Hempel, Charlotte and Michael DeVries. “Rules and Rule Scrolls in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion. Forthcoming.
- Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*. Translated by J. S. Bowden. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. “Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512.” *DSD* 8 (2001): 9–37.
- _____. “Sexual Relations and Purity in the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees.” *DSD* 6 (1999): 11–36.
- Holladay, Jr., John S. “The Day(s) the Moon Stood Still.” *JBL* 87 (1968): 166–78.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. ATDan 2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus, 1960.
- Holtz, Gudrun. “Purity Conceptions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: ‘Ritual-Physical’ and ‘Moral’ Purity in a Diachronic Perspective.” Pages 519–36 in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan. DHR 3. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Horgan, Maurya P. “Psalm Peshar 1 (4Q171 = 4QpPs^a = 4QpPs37 and 45).” PTDSSP 6B:6–23.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusion and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. STDJ 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Humbert, Paul. “La Logique de la perspective nomade chez Osée et l’unité d’Osée 2, 4–22.” Pages 158–66 in *Vom Alten Testament: Karl Marti zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Edited by Karl Budde. BZAW 41. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925.
- _____. “Osée, le prophète Bedouin.” *RHPR* 1 (1921): 97–118.
- Hunzinger, Claus-Hanno. “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches *Milhamah* aus Höhle 4 von Qumrân.” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51.
- Hurvitz, Avi. “The Description of the Clothes of Aaron and his Sons according to the War Scroll (1QM 7:9–10).” Pages 139–44 in *Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East: Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Yitzhak Avishur and Joshua Blau. Jerusalem: Rubenstein Publishing House, 1978. [Hebrew]
- Imes, Carmen Joy. “Between Two Worlds: The Functional and Symbolic Significance of the High Priestly Regalia.” Pages 29–62 in *Dress and Clothing in the Hebrew Bible: “For*

- All Her Household are Clothed in Crimson.* Edited by Antonios Finitzis. LHBOTS 679. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Jackson, Kent P. "The Language of the Mesha Inscription." Pages 96–130 in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Edited by Andrew Dearman. ABS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Jacobs, Jarod. "אָמַד 'amad." ThWQ 3:146–50.
- Jacobus, Helen R. "Calendars." CDSS, 435–48.
- Janzen, David. *The Social Meanings of Sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible: A Study of Four Writings*. BZAW 344. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
- Jassen, Alex P. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Violence: Sectarian Formation and Eschatological Imagination." *BibInt* 17 (2009): 12–44.
- _____. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Violence: Sectarian Formation and Eschatological Imagination." Pages 13–44 in *Violence, Scripture, and Textual Practice in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Ra'anana S. Boustany, Alex P. Jassen, and Calvin J. Roetzel. Leiden: Brill: 2010).
- _____. "Prophecy, Power, and Politics in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism." Pages 171–98 in *Divination, Politics, and Ancient Near Eastern Empires*. Edited by Alan Lenzi and Jonathan Stökl. ANEM. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- _____. "Violent Imaginaries and Practical Violence in the *War Scroll*." Pages 174–203 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, Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- _____. "War and Violence." CDSS, 568–76.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "Rituals as Media: Shared, Embodied, and Extended Knowledge Mediation in Rituals." Pages 385–414 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Ancient Media Culture*. Edited by Travis B. Williams, Chris Keith, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. STDJ 144. Leiden: Brill, 2023.
- _____. *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement*. STDJ 105. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Jokiranta, Jutta and Hanna Vanonen. "Multiple Copies of Rule Texts of Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of 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. PFES 108. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015.
- Jones, James W. *Blood That Cries Out from the Earth: The Psychology of Religious Terrorism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Jongeling, Bastiaan. *Le Rouleau de la Guerre des manuscrits de Qumrân*. SSN 4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 13 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark. *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*. 4th ed. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2017.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark and Margo Kitts, eds. *Princeton Readings in Religion and Violence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

- Juergensmeyer, Mark, Margo Kitts, and Michael Jerryson, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Violence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Justnes, Årstein. "4Q215A (*Time of Righteousness*) in Context." Pages 141–61 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. "Divine Violence and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 178–93 in *Encountering Violence in the Bible*. Edited by Markus Zehnder and Hallvard Hagelia. BMW 55. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013.
- Kang, Sa-Moon. *Divine War in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East*. BZAW 177. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1989.
- Kazen, Thomas. "Concern, Custom, and Common Sense: Discharge, Handwashing and Graded Purification." *JSHJ* 13 (2015): 150–87.
- _____. "Dirt and Disgust: Body and Morality in Biblical Purity Laws." Pages 43–64 in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*. Edited by Baruch J. Schwartz, David P. Wright, Jeffrey Stackert, and Naphthali S. Meschel. LHBOTS 474. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- _____. "Disgust in Body, Mind, and Language: The Case of Impurity in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 97–115 in *Mixed Feelings and Vexed Passions: Exploring Emotions in Biblical Literature*. Edited by F. Scott Spencer. RBS 90. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- _____. *Emotions in Biblical Law: A Cognitive Science Approach*. HBM 36. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011.
- _____. *Impurity and Purification in Early Judaism and the Jesus Tradition*. RBS 98. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021.
- _____. *Issues of Impurity in Early Judaism*. ConBNT 45. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- _____. "Levels of Explanation for Ideas of Impurity: Why Structuralist and Symbolic Models Often Fail While Evolutionary and Cognitive Models Succeed." *JAJ* 9 (2018): 74–99.
- _____. "The Role of Disgust in Priestly Purity Law: Insights from Conceptual Metaphor and Blending Theories." *JLRS* 3 (2014): 62–92.
- _____. "Who Touched Whom? On Graded Impurity and First-Day Ablutions in 4Q274." *DSD* 17 (2010): 53–87.
- Kelle, Brad E. "Postwar Rituals of Return and Reintegration." Pages 205–41 in *Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts*. Edited by Brad E. Kelle, Frank Ritche Ames, and Jacob L. Wright. AIL 18. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. "Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls." OHDSS, 377–402.
- _____. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Klingbeil, Gerald A. *Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible*. BBR 1. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Knibb, Michael A. "Exile." *EDSS* 1:276–77.
- _____. "Exile in the Damascus Document." *JSOT* 25 (1983): 99–117.
- _____. *The Qumran Community*. CCWJCW 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

- Knoppers, Gary N. "Jerusalem at War in Chronicles." Pages 57–76 in *Zion, City of Our God*. Edited by Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Kohn, Risa Levitt and Rebecca Moore. "Rethinking Sectarian Judaism: The Centrality of the Priesthood in the Second Temple Period." Pages 195–213 in *Sacred History, Sacred Literature: Essays on Ancient Israel, the Bible, and Religion in Honor of R. E. Friedman on his Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by Shawna Dolansky. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Kottsieper, Ingo. "Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture." CDSS, 167–77.
- Krause, Andrew R. "Apotropaic Means and Methods in the Rules of the Trumpets and Banners (1QM 3–4)." *Henoch* 42 (2020): 117–35.
- _____. "Performing the Eschaton: Apotropaic Performance in the Liturgy of the War Scroll." *RevQ* 30 (2018): 27–46.
- Krieg, Matthias. "Mo'ed Naqam—ein Kulturdrama aus Qumrân: Beobachtungen an der Kriegerrolle." *TZ* 41 (1985): 3–30.
- Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. EJL 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- _____. "Priesthood at Qumran." Pages 93–116 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999. Repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019.
- _____. "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.
- _____. "Priests." *EDSS* 2:688–93.
- Kvasnica, Brian. "Shifts in Israelite War Ethics and Early Judaism Historiography of Plundering." Pages 175–96 in *Writing and Reading War: Rhetoric, Gender, and Ethics on Biblical and Modern Contexts*. Edited by Brad E. Kelle and Frank Ritzel Ames, SBLSymS 42. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Lange, Armin and Matthias Weigold. *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*. JAJSup 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Lawrence, Jonathan D. *Washing in Water: Trajectories of Ritual Bathing in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Leaney, A. R. C. *The Rule of the Qumran and Its Meaning*. NTL. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Lemos, T. M. "Where There is Dirt, Is There System? Revisiting Biblical Purity Constructions." *JSOT* 37 (2013): 265–94.
- Leuchter, Mark and Jeremy M. Hutton, eds. *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*. AIL 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Levine, Baruch A. *Leviticus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- _____. *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 4. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- _____. *Numbers 21–36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 4A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Licht, Jacob. "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll." *IEJ* 6 (1956): 1–13, 89–101.
- _____. מגילת הסרכים ממגילת מדבר יהודה. Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1965.

- Lied, Liv Ingeborg. "Text–Work–Manuscript: What Is an 'Old Testament Pseudepigraphon'?" *JSP* 25 (2015): 150–65.
- Lim, Timothy H. *The Earliest Commentary on the Prophecy of Habakkuk*. OCDSS. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- _____. *Pesharim*. CQS 3. London: T&T Clark, 2002.
- Lind, Millard C. *Yahweh is a Warrior: The Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1980.
- Liver, Jacob. *Chapters in the History of the Priests and Levites: Studies in the Lists of Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah*. Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1968.
- _____. "The 'Sons of Zadok the Priests' in the Dead Sea Sect." *RevQ* 6 (1967): 3–30.
- Loader, William. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Lohfink, Nils. "Der „heilige Krieg“ und der „Bann“ in der Bibel." *IKZ* 89 (1989): 104–12.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "ḥāram, ḥērem." *TDOT* 5:180–99.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Die Texte aus Qumran hebräisch und deutsch*. München: Kösel Verlag, 1971.
- 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 J. "Clarifications Concerning 4Q285 and 11Q14 Arising from *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 23." *DSD* 6 (1999): 37–43.
- _____. "Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and Eschatological Victory." *DSD* 3 (1996): 130–51.
- Mach, Michael. "Angels." *EDSS* 1:24–27.
- _____. "Demons." *EDSS* 1:189–92.
- Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021.
- _____. "'They Shall See the Glory of the Lord' (Isa 35:2): Eschatological Perfection and Purity at Qumran and in Jesus' Movement." *JSHJ* 14 (2016): 99–119.
- _____. "Toilet Practices, Purity Concerns, and Sectarianism in the Late Second Temple Period." Pages 51–70 in *Jewish Identity and Politics between Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*. Edited by Benedikt Eckhardt. JSJSup 155. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- _____. "Were Sacrifices Offered at Qumran? The Animal Bone Deposits Reconsidered." *JAJ* 7 (2016): 5–34.
- Maier, J. *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*. 2 vols. Munich: E. Reinhardt, 1960.
- Malul, M. "Taboo." Pages 824–27 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Mattingly, Gerald L. "Moabite Religion and the Mesha Inscription." Pages 211–38 in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Edited by Andrew Dearman. ABS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 8. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- McGann, Jerome J. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.

- Meer, Michaël N. van der. *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses*. VTSup 102. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. “Sound the Trumpet!” Redaction and Reception of Joshua 6:2–25.” Pages 19–43 in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort*. Edited by Jacques van Ruiten and J. Cornelius de Vos. VTSup 124. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Mertens, Alfred. *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*. SBM 12. Stuttgart: Echter, 1971.
- Merwe, Christo H. J. van der, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. BLH 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Metso, Sarianna. “The Redaction of the Community Rule.” Pages 377–84 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.
- _____. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Milgrom, Jacob. “4QTohorot^a: An Unpublished Qumran Text on Purities.” Pages 59–68 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman. STDJ 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- _____. “First Day Ablution in Qumran.” Pages 561–70 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebelle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- _____. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- _____. *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- _____. *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.
- _____. “The Paradox of the Red Cow (Num XIX).” *VT* 31 (1981): 62–72.
- _____. “Studies in the Temple Scroll.” *JBL* 97 (1978): 501–23.
- Milik, J. T. “5Q9. Ouvrage avec toponymes.” *DJD* 3:179–80.
- _____. “*Milkî-šedeq* et *Milkî-reša* ‘ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens.” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144.
- _____. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Translated by John Strugnell. SBT 26. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Miller, Patrick D. *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*. HSM 5. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- _____. *The Religion of Ancient Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.
- Monroe, Lauren A. S. *Josiah’s Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Moore, Carey A. *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 40B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- _____. *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew*. Leuven: Peeters, 2020.
- Murphy-O’Connor, Jerome. “An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14–VI, 1.” *RB* 77 (1970), 201–29.

- Nati, James. “The Rolling Corpus: Materiality and Pluriformity at Qumran, with Special Consideration of the *Serekh ha-Yahad*.” *DSD* 27 (2020): 161–201.
- Najman, Hindy. “Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism.” *DSD* 13 (2006): 99–113.
- Nelson, Richard D. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- _____. “*Herem* and the Deuteronomic Social Conscience.” Pages 39–54 in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature: Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans*. Edited by Marc Vervenne and Johan Lust. BETL 133. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997.
- _____. *Joshua: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- _____. *Raising Up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale University, 1988.
- Newsom, Carol A. “4Q378–379. 4QApocryphon of Josh^{a-b}.” *DJD* 22:237–88.
- _____. “‘He Has Established for Himself Priests’: Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Sabbath *Shirot*.” Pages 101–20 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- _____. “*Shirot* ‘Olat HaShabbat.” *DJD* 11:173–401.
- Newsom, Carol A., James H. Charlesworth, With Brent A. Strawn and Henry W. L. Rietz. “Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400–4Q407, 11Q17, Mas1k).” *PTSDSSP* 4B:1–189.
- Newton, Michael. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Nichols, Stephen G. “Introduction: Philology in a Manuscript Culture.” *Speculum* 65 (1990): 1–10.
- _____. “What is a Manuscript Culture? Technologies and the Manuscript Matrix.” Pages 34–59 in *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*. Edited by Michael Robert Johnson and Michael Van Dussen. CSML. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Niditch, Susan. *Judges: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
- _____. “A Messy Business: Ritual Violence after the War.” Pages 187–204 in *Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts*. Edited by Brad E. Kelle, Frank Ritche Ames, and Jacob L. Wright. AIL 18. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- _____. *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Nielsen, Edward. “La guerre considérée comme une religion et la religion comme une guerre.” *ST* 15 (1961): 93–112.
- Nitzan, Billah. “4QBerakhot^a.” *DJD* 11:7–48.
- _____. “The Laws of Reproof in 4QBerakhot (4Q286–290) in Light of their Parallels in the *Damascus Covenant* and Other Texts from Qumran.” Pages 149–65 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- Noam, Vered. “Corpse-Blood Impurity: A Lost Biblical Reading?” *JBL* 128 (2009): 243–51.
 _____. “Halakhah.” CDSS, 395–404.
 _____. “Stringency in Qumran: A Reassessment.” *JSJ* 40 (2009): 1–14.
- Noam, Vered and Elisha Qimron. “A Qumran Composition of Sabbath Laws and Its Contribution to the Study of Early Halakah.” *DSD* 16 (2009): 55–96.
- Noort, E. “De val van de grote stad Jericho: Kanttekeningen bi synchronische en diachronische benaderigen.” *NedTT* 50 (1996): 265–79.
- North, Robert. “‘Kittim’ War or ‘Sectaries’ Liturgy?” *Bib* 39 (1958): 84–93.
- Norton, Jonathan. “Observations on the Official Material Reconstruction of *Sefer ha-Milḥamah* (11Q14 and 4Q285).” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 3–28.
- Noth, Martin. *Das Buch Josua*. HAT 7. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.
- Olyan, Saul M. “The Exegetical Dimensions of Restrictions on the Blind and the Lame in the Texts from Qumran.” *DSD* 8 (2001): 38–50.
 _____. *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of Cult*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
 _____. *Social Inequality in the World of the Text: The Significance of Ritual and Social Distinctions in the Hebrew Bible*. JAJSup 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Olyan, Saul M. and Gary A. Anderson, eds. *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*. LHBOTS 125. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der. *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*. SUNT 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Pakkala, Juha. *Ezra the Scribe: The Development of Ezra 7–10 and Nehemiah 8*. BZAW 347. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- Pajunen, Mika S. *The Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381*. JAJSup 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Park, Hyung Dae. *Finding Herem? A Study of Luke-Acts in Light of Herem*. LNTS 357. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Parry, Donald W. and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Pena, Joabson Xavier. “Wearing the Cosmos: The High Priestly Attire in Josephus’ *Judean Antiquities*.” *JSJ* 52 (2021): 359–87.
- Perri, Carmela. “On Alluding.” *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289–307.
- Perrin, Andrew B. *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*. JAJSup 19. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
 _____. “Redrafting the Architecture of Daniel Traditions in the Hebrew Scriptures and Dead Sea Scrolls.” *JTS* 72 (2021): 44–71.
- Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson, et al. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1953.
- Ploeg, J. van der. “La composition littéraire de la Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân.” Pages 13–19 in vol. 2 of *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*. Edited by J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and É. Massaux. BETL 13 Gembloux: Duculot, 1959.
 _____. “La guerre sainte dans la Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân.” Pages 326–33 in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l’honneur de André Robert*. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957.
 _____. “La Règle de la Guerre: Traduction et notes.” *VT* 5 (1955): 373–420.

- _____. *Le Rouleau de la Guerre, traduit et annoté avec une introduction*. STDJ 2. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.
- Puech, Émile. “4Q522. 4QProphétie de Josué (4QapocrJosué?).” DJD 25:39–74.
- _____. “Review of *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*, par Maurice Baillet (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII).” *RB* 95 (1988): 404–16.
- Qimron, Elisha. “Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectarians.” Pages 287–94 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- _____. מגילות מדבר יהודה. Vol. 1. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010.
- Quine, Cat. *Casting Down the Hosts of Heaven: The Rhetoric of Ritual Failure in the Polemic Against the Host of Heaven*. *OtSt* 78. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Rabin, Chaim. “The Literary Structure of the War Scroll.” Pages 31–47 in *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of E. L. Sukenik*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Hekal haSefer, 1961.
- _____. *Qumran Studies*. Scripta Judaica 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- _____. *The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition II. The Laws*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac. “‘Āz Followed by Imperfect Verb-Form in Preterite Contexts: A Redactional Device in Biblical Hebrew.” *VT* 34 (1984): 53–62.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Translated by Dorothea Barton. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.
- _____. *Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel*. ATANT 20. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1951.
- _____. *Holy War in Ancient Israel*. Translated and edited by Marva J. Dawn, with an introduction by Ben C. Ollenburger and bibliography by Judith E. Samuelson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Rappaport, Roy A. *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion*. Richmond, CA: North Atlantic Books, 1979.
- _____. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Reed, Stephen A. and Marilyn J. Lundberg. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue: Documents, Photographs and Museum Inventory Numbers*. SBLRBS 32. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Regev, Eyal. “Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran.” *DSD* 10 (2003): 243–78.
- _____. “Non-Priestly Purity and Its Religious Aspects according to Historical Sources and Archaeological Findings.” Pages 223–44 in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*. Edited by Marcel J. H. M. Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz. JCPS 2. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- _____. “Pure Individualism: The Idea of Non-priestly Purity in Ancient Judaism.” *JSJ* 31 (2000): 176–202.
- _____. *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. RS 45. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Reymond, Eric D. *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*. RBS 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.
- Rooke, Deborah W. *Zadok’s Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Roth, Jonathan P. *The Logistics of the Roman Army at War (264 BC – AD 235)*. CSCT 23. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- _____. *Roman Warfare*. CIRC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Rösel, Hartmut N. *Joshua*. HCOT. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Rowley, H. H. “The Kittim in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *PEQ* 88 (1956): 92–102.
- Sabin, Philip, Hans van Wees, and Michael Whitby, eds. *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, Volume 1: Greece, Hellenistic World and the Rise of Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Samuel, A. Y. “The Purchase of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *BA* 12 (1949): 26–31.
- _____. *Treasure from Qumran: My Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.
- Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- Sawyer, John F. A. “Joshua 10:12–14 and the Solar Eclipse of 30 September 1131 B.C.” *PEQ* 104 (1972): 139–46.
- Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Christa. “Bedeutung und Funktion von *Herem* in biblisch-hebräischen Texten.” *BZ* 38 (1994): 270–75.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. “1 Maccabees.” Pages 2769–831 in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2013.
- _____. “Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community’s Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple.” Pages 267–84 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel, Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalem Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- _____. *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- _____. “The Deuteronomic Paraphrase of the Temple Scroll.” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 543–67.
- _____. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. SJLA 16. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- _____. “The Impurity of the Dead in the Temple Scroll.” Pages 135–56 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- _____. “The Relationship of the Zadokite Fragments to the Temple Scroll.” Pages 133–45 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Schofield, Alison. “An Altar in the Desert? A Response to Jodi Magness, ‘Were Sacrifices Offered at Qumran?’” <https://www.academia.edu/30247242>.
- _____. “Forms of the Community.” CDSS, 533–46.
- _____. “Re-Placing Priestly Space: The Wilderness as Heterotopia in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 469–90 in vol. 1 of *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by Eric Mason, Samuel I. Thomas, Alison Schofield, and Eugene Ulrich. JSJSup 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

- _____. "Wilderness." EDEJ, 1337–38.
- _____. "The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 37–53 in *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Kenneth E. Pomykala. TBN 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Schröder, Ingo W. and Bettina E. Schmidt. "Introduction: Violent Imaginaries and Violent Practices." Pages 1–24 in *Anthropology of Violence and Conflict*. Edited by Bettina E. Schmidt and Ingo W. Schröder. EASA. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "4QNon-Canonical Psalms A." DJD 11:75–85.
- _____. "4QNon-Canonical Psalms B." DJD 11:87–172.
- _____. *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran*. HSS 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- _____. "Qumran Pseudepigraphic Psalms (4Q380 and 4Q381)." PTSDSSP 4A:1–39.
- Schultz, Brian. "Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM)." Pages 153–64 in *Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings from the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*. STDJ 76. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "The Naval Battle in the Qumran War Texts." Pages 204–14 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, Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A. D. 135)*. Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black. Rev. ed. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979.
- Schwartz, Baruch J. "The Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood in Leviticus 17." Pages 34–66 in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*. Edited by Saul M. Olyan and Gary A. Anderson. JSOTSup 125. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. *1 Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2022.
- _____. "On Two Aspects of a Priestly View of Descent at Qumran." Pages 157–79 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Seidel, Hans. "Horn and Trompete im alten Israel unter Berücksichtigung der Kriegsrolle von Qumram." *WZ* 6 (1957): 589–99.
- Sharon, Nadav. "The *Kittim* and the Significance of the Roman Conquest for the Qumran Community." Pages 171–207 in *Judea Under Roman Domination: The First Generation of Statelessness and Its Legacy*. EJM 46. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Shemesh, Aharon. "Halakhah between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature." OHDSS, 595–616.
- _____. "'The Holy Angels are in their Council': The Exclusion of Deformed Persons from Holy Places in Qumranic and Rabbinic Literature." *DSD* 4 (1997): 179–206.
- Sidebottom, Harry. "International Relations." Pages 3–29 in *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, Volume 2: Rome from the Late Republic to the Late Empire*. Edited by Philip Sabin, Hans van Wees, and Michael Whitby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- Skehan, Patrick W., Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson. "4QpaleoParaJosh." DJD 9:201–3.
- Skyler, Jay. *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions*. HBM 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015.
- 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 Hanna Juusola, Juha Laulainen, and Heikki Palva. StOr 99. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2004.
- Spijkerman, P. A. "Chronique du Musée de la Flagellation." *SBFLA* 12 (1961–62): 324–25.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. "The Cultic Status of the Levites in the *Temple Scroll*: Between History and Hermeneutics." Pages 199–214 in *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*. Edited by Mark Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton. AIL 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Staal, Frits. *Rules Without Meaning: Ritual Mantras and the Human Sciences*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Stadter, Philip A. "The *Ars Tactica* of Arrian: Tradition and Originality." *CP* 73 (1978): 117–28.
- Stallman, Robert C. "Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *JSP* 10 (1992): 163–89.
- _____. "Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 164–90 in *Qumran Questions*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. BibSem 36. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn: Privately printed, 1971.
- _____. "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments." Pages 189–220 in *Archaeology and History of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- _____. "Die Risse in der Kriegerrolle von Qumrân." *TLZ* 81 (1956): 205–10.
- Stephenson, Barry. *Ritual: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- _____. "Ritualization and Ritual Invention." Pages 18–37 in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Ritual*. Edited by Risto Uro, Juliette J. Day, Richard E. Demaris, and Rikard Roitto. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Stern, Sacha. "Qumran Calendars and Sectarianism." OHDSS, 232–53.
- Stern, Philip D. *The Biblical Herem: A Window on Israel's Religious Experience*. BJS 211. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Studel, Annette. "Assembling and Reconstructing Manuscripts." Pages 526–34 in vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998. Repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2019.
- _____. "Reading and Reconstructing Manuscripts." CDSS, 186–91.
- _____. "Scroll Reconstruction." *EDSS* 2:842–44.
- Stratton, Kimberly B. "The Eschatological Arena: Reinscribing Roman Violence in Fantasies of the End Times." *BibInt* 17 (2009): 45–76.
- Strugnell, John. "Notes en marge du volume V des Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan." *RevQ* 7 (1970): 211–18.
- Strugnell, John and Daniel J. Harrington. "4QInstruction^b." DJD 34:73–141.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Eschatology and the Sacred Past in Serekh ha-Milhamah." Pages 245–63 in *The Religious Worldviews Reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea*

- Scrolls and Associated Literature, 28–30 May 2013*. Edited by Ruth A. Clements, Menahem Kister, and Michael Segal. STDJ 127. Brill: Leiden, 2018), 245–63.
- Sukenik, E. L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955 (Hebrew, 1954).
- _____. *Megilloth Genuzoth I*. Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948.
- _____. *Megilloth Genuzoth II*. Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1950.
- Tacitus*. Translated by Clifford H. Moore and John Jackson. 4 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925–1937.
- Taggar-Cohen, Ada. “Between *Herem*, Ownership, and Ritual: Biblical and Hittite Perspectives.” Pages 419–34 in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*. Edited by Roy E. Gagne and Ada Taggar-Cohen. RBS 82. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert.” Pages 162–99 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. 2nd ed. ScrHier 4. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965.
- _____. “The ‘Desert Motif’ in the Bible and in Qumran Literature.” Pages 31–63 in *Biblical Motifs, Origins and Transformations*. Edited by Alexander Altmann. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966. Repr., Pages 216–54 in *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible: Form and Content*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993.
- _____. “Hebrew Fragments from Masada: (b) Mas 1039-211, Joshua Apocryphon (MasapocrJosh).” Pages 105–16 in *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–65: Final Reports*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, With the assistance of Jonathan Ben-Dov. “Introduction.” DJD 21:8–13.
- Taylor, J. Glen. *Yahweh and the Sun: Biblical and Archaeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel*. JSOTSup 111. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Tertullian*. Translated by T. R. Glover. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Thomas, Günter. “Communication.” Pages 321–43 in *Theorizing Rituals: Issues, Topics, Approaches, Concepts*. Edited by Jens Kreinath, Jan Snoek, and Michael Stausberg. SHR 114-1. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- 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 Grossman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. “The Dead Sea Scrolls.” EDEJ, 163–80.
- _____. “Proposals for the Critical Editing of Scrolls Compositions.” Paper presented at SBL Annual Meeting 2012. Chicago, IL, 18 November 2012.
- _____. *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. STDJ 44. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- _____. “Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels).” Pages 99–126 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Armin Lange. BETL 159. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.

- _____. "Working with Few Data: The Relation between 4Q285 and 11Q14." *DSD* 7 (2000): 49–56.
- Tov, Emanuel. "4QJosh^b." *DJD* 14:153–60.
- _____. "Joshua, Book of." *EDSS* 1:431–34.
- _____. *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts from the Judean Desert*. *STDJ* 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Trampedach, Kai. "The Wars of the Hasmoneans." Pages 61–70 in *Dying for the Faith, Killing for the Faith: Old-Testament Faith-Warriors (1 and 2 Maccabees) in Historical Perspective*. Edited by Gabriela Signori. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 206. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Trever, John C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- _____. "The Discovery of the Scrolls." *BA* 11 (1948): 46–68.
- _____. *The Untold Story of Qumran*. Westwood, NJ: Fleming H Revell, 1965.
- Turner, Victor. *Process, Performance, and Pilgrimage: A Study in Comparative Symbolology*. *RAS* 1. New Delhi: Concept, 1979.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "4QJosh^a." *DJD* 14:143–52.
- _____. "4QJoshua^a and Joshua's First Altar in the Promised Land." Pages 89–104 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. *STDJ* 15. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. *SDSSRL*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Vainstub, Daniel, Hezi Yizhaq, and Uzi Avner. "The Miracle of the Sun and Moon in Joshua 10 as a Solar Eclipse." *VT* 70 (2020): 722–51.
- VanderKam, James C. *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- _____. *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2004.
- _____. "The Judean Desert and the Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 159–71 in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold, and Annette Steudel. *BZNW* 97. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- Vanonen, Hanna. "Stable and Fluid War Traditions: Re-Thinking the War Text Material from Qumran." PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2017.
- _____. "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 Martilla. *BZAW* 419. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- _____. *War Traditions from Qumran: Re-thinking Textual Stability and Fluidity in the War Text Manuscripts*. *STDJ* 139. Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- Vaux, Roland de. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- _____. *Ancient Israel, Volume 1: Social Institutions*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- _____. *Ancient Israel, Volume 2: Religious Institutions*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 7th ed. New York: Penguin, 2012.

- _____. “The Leadership of the Qumran Community: Sons of Zadok—Priests—Congregation.” Pages 375–84 in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion and Martin G. Abegg. *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four, Fascicle Two*. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1992.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O’Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Walton, John H. “Joshua 10:12–15 and the Mesopotamian Celestial Omen Texts.” Pages 181–90 in *Faith, Tradition and History*. Edited by Alan R. Millard, James K. Hoffmeier, and David W. Baker. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- 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. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- _____. “Angels and Humans: Boundaries and Synergies.” Pages 523–39 in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Baek. EJS 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- _____. “Do You Have to be Pure in a Metaphorical Temple? Sanctuary Metaphors and Construction of Sacred Space in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul’s Letters.” Pages 55–86 in *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*. Edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen Schuller. WUNT 305. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- _____. “Purity and Holiness.” CDSS, 511–20.
- _____. “What Do Angels Have against the Blind and the Deaf? Rules of Exclusion in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 115–29 in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*. Edited by Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.
- Wasserman, Emma. *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul*. AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.
- Watts, James W. *Leviticus 1–10*, HCOT. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- _____. *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus: From Sacrifice to Scripture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Wee, John Zhu-En. “A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns XV–XIX of the War Scroll (1QM).” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 263–83.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Weissenberg, Hanne von. “God(s), Angels and Demons.” CDSS, 490–95.
- Weitzman, Steven. “Fighting with the Angels: On How to Build up a Celestial Army.” Pages 369–84 in *With the Loyal You Show Yourself Loyal: Essays on Relationships in the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Saul M. Olyan*. Edited by T. M. Lemos, Jordan D. Rosenblum, Karen B. Stern, and Debra Scoggins Ballentine. AIL 42. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021.
- _____. “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.
- Werrett, Ian C. *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 72. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Werrett, Ian and Stephen Parker. "Purity in War: What is it Good For?" Pages 295–316 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, Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Weyde, Karl William. "Holy War, Divine War, and YHWH War—and Ethics: On Central Issue in Recent Research in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 235–52 in *Encountering Violence in the Bible*. Edited by Markus Zehnder and Hallvard Hagelia. BMW 55. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra, Nehemiah*. WBC 16. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985.
- _____. "The Origins of the Twenty-Four Priestly Courses: A Study of 1 Chronicles XXIII–XXVII." Pages 251–68 in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. VTSup 30. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.
- Winter, Paul. "Twenty-Six Priestly Courses." *VT* 6 (1956): 215–17.
- Wise, Michael O. "The Teacher of Righteousness and the High Priest of the Intersacerdotium: Two Approaches." *RevQ* 56 (1990): 587–613.
- _____. *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*. JSPPSup 15. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Wright, David P. "Holiness (OT)." *ABD* 3:237–49.
- Wold, Benjamin. *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*. STDJ 123. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Woude, Adam S. van der. "Ein neuer Segenspruch 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.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. "Wisdom of Ben Sira." Pages 2208–352 in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2013.
- Wright, David P. "Purification from Corpse-Contamination in Numbers XXXI 19–24." *VT* 35 (1985): 213–23.
- _____. "Ritual Theory, Ritual Texts, and the Priestly-Holiness Writings of the Pentateuch." Pages 195–216 in *Social Theory and the Study of Israelite Religion: Essays in Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Saul M. Olyan. RBS 71. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Xeravits, Géza. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*. STDJ 47. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Message of the Scrolls*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1957.
- _____. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated by Batya and Chaim Rabin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962 [Hebrew, 1955].
- _____. *The Temple Scroll*. Rev. ed. 3 vols. and supplement. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983.
- Yshai, Rony. *ספרות המלחמה בפומראן*. PhD diss., University of Haifa, 2006.
- Younger, Jr., K. Lawson. *Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing*. JSOTSup 98. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

- Zehnder, Markus. "The Annihilation of the Canaanites: Reassessing the Brutality of the Biblical Witness." Pages 263–90 in *Encountering Violence in the Bible*. Edited by Markus Zehnder and Hallvard Hagelia. BMW 55. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1–24*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Klaus Baltzer. Translated by Ronald E. Clements. Hermeneia 26A. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Zissu, Boaz and David Amit. "A Classification of the Second Temple Period Judean Miqwa'ot (Ritual Immersion Baths)." Pages 246–61 in *Speleology and Speleology: To the Centenary of A. V. Ryumin's Birth: Proceedings of the V International Scientific Correspondence Conference*. Naberezhnye Chelny, 2014.
- _____. "Common Judaism, Common Purity, and the Second Temple Period Judean Miqwa'ot (Ritual Immersion Baths)." Pages 47–62 in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*. Edited by Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.
- Zumthor, Paul. *Essai de poétique médiévale*. Collection Poétique. Paris: Seuil, 1972.
- _____. *Toward a Medieval Poetics*. Translated by Philip Bennett. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Distribution of the Root חרם in the MT¹

Location	Verbal Form	Nominal Form	Context
Exodus (1) 22:19 (22:20)	יחרם		Punitive
Leviticus (6) 27:21 27:28 (3) 27:29 (2)	יחרם יחרם	החרם כלי־חרם (2) כלי־חרם	Cultic Cultic Cultic
Numbers (4) 18:14 21:2 21:3 21:3	והחרמתי ויחרם	כלי־חרם חרמה	Cultic Warfare Warfare (Proper noun)
Deuteronomy (11) 2:34 3:6 (2) 7:2 (2) 7:26 (2) 13:16 (13:15) 13:18 (13:17) 20:17 (2)	ונחרם ונחרם, החרם החרם תחרים החרם החרם תחרימם	חרם (2) החרם	Warfare Warfare Warfare Sancta Punitive Sancta Warfare
Joshua (27) 2:10 6:17 6:18 (4) 6:21 7:1 (2) 7:11 7:12 (2) 7:13 (2) 7:15 8:26 10:1 10:28 10:35 10:37 10:39 10:40 11:11 11:12	החרמתם תחרימו ויחרימו החרים ויחרימה החרם החרים ויחרמו ויחרימו החרים החרם החרים ויחרמו החרים החרם החרים	חרם החרם, לחרם (2) בחרם, החרם החרם לחרם, החרם חרם, החרם בחרם	Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Sancta Sancta Sancta Sancta Sancta Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare

¹ The lexical analysis presented here is my own based upon the Biblia Hebraica tagged text *Hebrew Masoretic Text with Westminster Hebrew Morphology* (HMT-W4) utilizing Accordance. This analysis focuses specifically upon what has been commonly referred to as *herem* I occurrences as opposed to occurrences of *herem* II, rendered “net,” which occurs nine times in the Hebrew Bible and exclusively in poetic contexts (four times in Ezekiel, once in Micah, three times in Habakkuk, and once in Ecclesiastes).

11:20 11:21 22:20	החרימם החרימם	בחרם	Warfare Warfare Sancta
Judges (2) 1:17 21:11	ויהרימו תחרימו		Warfare Punitive
Samuel (8) 1 Sam 15:3 1 Sam 15:8 1 Sam 15:9 (2) 1 Sam 15:15 1 Sam 15:18 1 Sam 15:20 1 Sam 15:21	והחרמתם החרם החרימם, החרימו החרמנו והחרמתה החרסתי	החרם	Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Sancta
Kings (3) 1 Kgs 9:21 1 Kgs 20:42 2 Kgs 19:11	לההרימם לההרימם	את־איש־חרמי	Warfare Warfare Warfare
Isaiah (5) 11:15 34:2 34:5 37:11 43:28	והחרים החרימם לההרימם	ועל־עם חרמי למשפט לחרם	Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare
Jeremiah (4) 25:9 50:21 50:26 51:3	והחרמתים והחרם והחרימוה החרימו		Warfare Warfare Warfare Warfare
Ezekiel (1) 44:29		כל־חרם	Cultic
Micah (1) 4:13	והחרמתי		(Warfare, Cultic?)
Zechariah (1) 14:11		וחרם	(Warfare?)
Malachi (1) 3:24 (4:6)		חרם	(Warfare?)
Daniel (1) 11:44	ולהחרים		Warfare
Ezra (1) 10:8	יחרם		Punitive
Chronicles (4) 1 Chr 2:7 1 Chr 4:41 2 Chr 20:23 2 Chr 32:14	ויהרימם להחרים החרימו	בחרם	Sancta Warfare Warfare Warfare

Appendix 2 – Greek Equivalents in the LXX for the Root חרם in the MT²

LXX Equivalent	Translation	Location
ἀνάθεμα – 20	<i>that which or he who has been consigned by cursing to destruction; that which has been dedicated</i>	Lev 27:28 (2); Num 21:3 ³ ; Deut 13:16 (13:15); 13:18 (13:17); 20:17; Josh 6:17; 18 (3); 7:1 (2), 11, 12 (2), 13 (2); 22:20; Zech 14:11; 1 Chr 2:7
ἀνάθημα ⁴ – 2	<i>that which or he who has been consigned by cursing to destruction; that which has been dedicated</i>	Deut 7:26 (2)
ἀναθεματίζω ⁵ – 12	<i>to consign by cursing to destruction</i>	Num 18:14; 21:2, 3; Deut 13:16 (13:15); 20:17; Josh 6:21; Judg 1:17; 21:11; 1 Sam 15:3; 2 Kgs 19:11; Ezra 10:8; 1 Chr 4:41
ἐξολοθρεύω ⁶ – 25	<i>to destroy utterly, to suffer serious damage</i>	Deut 2:34; 3:6 (2); Josh 2:10; 10:1, 28, 37, 39, 40; 11:11, 12, 20, 21; Judg 1:17 (also JudgB 1:17); 1 Sam 15:3, 9 (2), 15, 18, 20; 1 Kgs 9:21; Jer 27:26 (50:26 MT); 2 Chr 20:23; 32:14
ἀνατίθημι – 3	<i>to dedicate</i>	Lev 27:28, 29; Mic 4:13
ἀπόλλυμι – 3	<i>to perish, to destroy</i>	Isa 34:2; 37:11; 43:28 ⁷
ἀφανίζω – 3	<i>to destroy</i>	Deut 7:2; Jer 27:21 (50:21 MT); 28:3 (51:3 MT)
ἀποκτείνω – 2	<i>to terminate the physical life of, kill</i>	1 Sam 15:3; Dan 11:44
ἀπώλεια – 1	<i>ruin, destruction</i>	Isa 34:5
ἄρδην – 1	<i>utterly, wholly</i>	Mal 3:24 (4:5)
ἀφανισμός – 1	<i>ruin, destruction, annihilation</i>	Deut 7:2 ⁸
ἀφορίζω – 1	<i>to set apart, separate</i>	Lev 27:21
ἀφόρισμα – 1	<i>act of setting apart; object set apart</i>	Ezek 44:29
ἐνθυμέομαι – 1	<i>to give serious thought to, to conceive mentally</i>	Josh 6:18 ⁹

² The lexical analysis presented here is my own based upon Rahlfs' *LXX Tagged Text (LXX1 and LXX2) with Apparatus* utilizing Accordance and T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).

³ The LXX employs the term ἀνάθεμα for the proper noun חֲרָמָה (“Hormah”) in Num 21:3.

⁴ The term ἀνάθημα occurs in Jdt 16:19; 2 Macc 2:13; 9:16; and 3 Macc 3:17. Also occurs in Sibyl 8.490; Let. Aris. 40; and Ps.-Hec. 6:18.

⁵ Likewise occurs in 1 Macc 5:5; DanTh 11:44; and 1 En. 6:4, 5, 6; 97:1.

⁶ Also occurs in Jdt 1:15; 3:8; 5:15, 18; 6:2, 8; 14:13; 1 Macc 3:8; 3 Macc 7:12; Sus 59; and Wis 12:8.

⁷ Note there is a noun/verb interchange in the LXX in Isa 43:28.

⁸ The infinitive absolute construction in Deut 7:2 (הַחֲרֵם תַּחֲרִים) is rendered in the LXX as ἀφανισμῷ ἀφανιεις, whereas in Deut 20:17 (הַחֲרֵם תַּחֲרִימם) it is rendered as ἀναθέματι ἀναθεματιετε in the LXX. Additionally, the hiphil חָרַם in Deut 13:16 (13:15) is also rendered ἀναθέματι ἀναθεματιετε in the LXX.

⁹ Dozeman suggests that the MT reads תַּחֲרִימוּ in order to emphasize the contagious nature of the objects devoted to destruction, whereas the LXX uses the verb ἐνθυμέομαι in order to internalize and psychologize the warning as a matter of pondering or “coveting.” See Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 312. Following the OG, Nelson suggests that the MT transposed the letters of תַּחֲמוּדוּ (“covet”) into תַּחֲרִימוּ (“devote to destruction”) misreading the *resh* for a *dalet* (cf. 7:21; Deut 7:25. See Nelson, *Joshua*, 87. Boling and Wright take the same position. See Boling and Wright, *Joshua*, 203.

ἐξερημόω – 1	<i>to leave destitute</i>	Jer 25:9
ἐξολεθρευμα – 1	<i>that which has been destroyed utterly</i>	1 Sam 15:21
ἐρημόω – 1	<i>to lay waste</i>	Isa 11:15
ὀλεθρεύω – 1	<i>to destroy</i>	Exod 22:20 (20:19)
ὀλέθριος – 1	<i>pertaining to destruction</i>	1 Kgs 21:42 (20:42 in MT)
φονέωω – 1	<i>to kill</i>	Josh 10:35