

# THE COMPOSITE CHARACTER OF THE QUMRAN SECTARIAN LITERATURE AS AN INDICATION OF ITS DATE AND PROVENANCE

## *Summary*

The article draws the attention to a feature shared by three of cave 1 manuscripts: *IQS*, *IQH<sup>a</sup>* and *IQM*. They represent the fullest and most elaborate text among the respective copies of each work. For *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>* the fullest is also the oldest textual tradition. Partly this is true also for *IQM*. All three works were copied on manuscripts of large format, and *IQH<sup>a</sup>* and *IQM* were carefully executed. These data suggest that cave 1 copies were particularly respected by the Qumranites and may have served as the model copies for the major sectarian works. This explains why they were carefully placed in jars and hidden in cave 1.

## *Sommaire*

L'article attire l'attention sur le fait que trois manuscrits de la grotte 1 : *IQS*, *IQH<sup>a</sup>* et *IQM* partagent une caractéristique particulière. Chacun présente la tradition textuelle la plus élaborée parmi les exemplaires de l'œuvre qu'il contient. Pour *IQS* et *IQH<sup>a</sup>* cette tradition textuelle est aussi la plus ancienne, ce qui, en partie, est aussi le cas de *IQM*. L'article suggère que les trois manuscrits servaient des modèles respectés pour les membres de la communauté Qumrânienne. C'est la raison pour laquelle ils ont été mis en jars et cachés dans la grotte 1.

**T**HE practice during the first decades of Qumran research was to regard the literature found in the Qumran caves as a single entity. This reflected the view then prevailing that most if not all of the manuscripts discovered belonged to the particular community referred to in the first texts unearthed in cave 1, chiefly the *Rule of the Community (IQS)*, the *Pesher to Habakkuk*

(*IQpHab*), *Hodayot* (*IQH<sup>a</sup>*), and the *War Rule* (*IQM*). From this stance Frank Cross and Joseph Milik wrote the first, now classic, summaries of Qumran research in the decade following the initial discovery. (1) Since the bulk of cave 4 manuscripts were unknown at the time to the wider public, and even the handful of texts, mainly pesharim, published a few years later, (2) seemed to corroborate the understanding that most of the scrolls were sectarian, surveys continued to be written from this viewpoint. (3) This perception of the library became obsolete with the appearance of a full inventory list of the Qumran manuscripts at the beginning of the 1990s (4) and with the subsequent publication of all cave 4 texts. (5) It turned out that the Qumran library contained texts of distinct character and background, not necessarily sectarian. Especially noteworthy has been the emergence of a considerable body of compositions reworking the Bible without the particular terminology and content typical of the sectarian texts already known. (6) The distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts became requisite for any further discussion of Qumran texts.

In the light of this new and full picture of the Qumran collection, features peculiar to each group, sectarian and non-sectarian, are more sharply drawn. Among other things it is now clear that the first scrolls discovered in cave 1 provided a fairly representative sample of the sectarian literature but disclosed little about other types of texts stored in cave 4. The three major texts retrieved from cave 1, namely the *Rule of the Community* as represented by *IQS*, *Hodayot* as found in *IQH<sup>a</sup>*, and the *War Rule* as contained in *IQM*, portray the basic organizational and ideological framework of the

(1) Cf. F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961); J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (London: SCM Press, 1963).

(2) Cf. J.M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).

(3) This is still the basic understanding, for instance, of G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in perspective* (Cleveland: Collins, 1977).

(4) Cf. S.A. Reed, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press: 1994), available sometime earlier in a preliminary private edition.

(5) Preliminary editions of various unknown Qumran texts have been published during the last two decades. But the entire contents of the Qumran library became accessible in print only some three years ago, with the completion of the publication in the Oxford Press series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Cf. also the compact edition of D. W. Parry and E. Tov (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, vols. 1-6 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

(6) Cf. D. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in D. Dimant and L. Schiffman (eds.) *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (*STDJ* 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 23-58.

Qumran community. But cave 4 materials offer a new perspective on cave 1 exemplars for they yield fragmentary copies and texts closely related to three of the above texts. But these scrolls are not simple copies of cave 1 texts. They display textual variants, editorial interventions, and traces of different recensions. The presence among the Qumran scrolls of such a variety opens new vistas on the process through which major sectarian compositions came into being.

Yet cave 4 copies reveal another remarkable aspect of cave 1 three specimens. For *IQS*, *IQH<sup>a</sup>*, and *IQM* are the fullest and textually most developed representatives of the works they contain. Studies devoted to the three texts duly note the particular character of the cave 1 copy of the work under consideration, but this is always done only in the context of particular compositions. (7) What clearly emerges from such separate studies is that the full and elaborate character is shared by all three cave 1 copies. This cannot be through mere chance but must point to a phenomenon which goes beyond the individual cases. This circumstance has never been investigated as such. (8) In the following some observations are offered on this special aspect of cave 1 texts, the implications it carries, and the questions it raises. They show that in many respects the major sectarian works are still uncharted land, open to further exploration.

Let us first address the best researched case, namely the version of the *Rule of the Community* as it first came to be known in *IQS*.

(7) For the *Rule of the Community* see S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1997); P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998). For the *Hodayot* cf. E. Schuller, "427-432. 4QHodayot<sup>a-e</sup> and 4QpapHodayot<sup>f</sup>," in E. Chazon et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, part 2* (DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999) 69-432. For the *War Scroll* see J. Duhaime, "War Scroll," in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls, vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr-John Knox, 1995) 80-83.

(8) Recently Emanuel Tov attempted to show that cave 11 manuscripts share particular characteristics. He suggested that the large percentage of among cave 11 manuscripts of texts written in the Qumran scribal system and containing sectarian subject matter may point to the special character of the scrolls placed in this cave. Cf. E. Tov, "The Special Character of the Texts found in Qumran Cave 11," in E.G. Chazon, D. Satran and R. A. Clements (eds.), *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (SuppJSJ 89; Leiden-Boston 2004) 187-196. The present article addresses the special character of manuscripts in another cave, cave 1, albeit from a different perspective.

a. *The Rule of the Community*

The composite character of the *Rule of the Community* in the version of *IQS* was recognized long ago. (9) It is generally agreed that the *Rule* in *IQS* falls roughly into six sections, distinct in subject matter, style, and terminology: 1. Preamble and Renewal of the Covenant (I,1-III,13); 2. The dualistic structure of the world (III, 23-IV, 26); 3. The organization of the community (V,1- VI, 23); 4. Punishments for infringements of the community's rules (VI, 24-VII, 25); 5. The theological aims of the community (VIII, 1 to X, 8); 6. A concluding hymn of praise (X – XI). (10) Since this division is clearly conveyed by the literary and structural data, it is generally agreed. No consensus has been reached as to the process by which this complex entity came into being, nor is it agreed how these literary data are related to the history of Qumran community.

Besides its composite character, the *Rule* evidences various editorial and recensional stages, as is apparent already from *IQS* itself. In *IQS* a second scribe made many erasures and corrections, chiefly in columns VII and VIII. (11) Dated as it is to' around 100 BCE, *IQS* thus attests not only to the need to change and perhaps update an older version of the *Rule*, but also to the early date at which such a need arose. Yet most of these changes occur in passages related to the organizational framework of the community, a type of material which is apt to undergo adaptation to changing circumstances. (12)

The copies of the *Rule* from cave 4 produce further evidence of editorial activity, mainly on the material in sections parallel to columns V-VI of *IQS* – again related to the organization of the

(9) Cf. the summary of the various theories on the structure of the *Rule* in *IQS* by R.A.J. Gagnon, "How Did the Rule of the Community Obtain Its Final Shape? A Review of Scholarly Research," *JSP* 10 (1992) 61-72.

(10) This is already established by the analysis of P. Guilbert, "Le plan de la Règle de la Communauté", *RevQ* 1 (1959) 323-344, basically accepted by most subsequent studies. Cf. Gagnon, "The Rule of the Community" (n. 9 above) 64.

(11) The corrections and additions of the second scribe were investigated by Mesto, *Textual Development* (n. 7 above) 95-105.

(12) As pointed out by Alexander, "The Redaction-History of *Serekh Hayyahad*: A proposal", *RevQ* 17 (1996), 437-456 (esp. p. 440). The abundant corrections made by the scribe of *IQS* are well-known and earned him the description of a careless scribe. Cf. the description of E.C. Ulrich, "4QSamc: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14-15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hay-yahad* (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1879)1-25 (esp. 1-3). However, recently E. Tigchelaar has qualified this characterization in significant ways, Cf. E. Tigchelaar, "In Search of the Scribe of 1QS," in S. Paul et. al. (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003) 439-452. Cf. nn. 19, 20.

community. These passages are partly preserved in two cave 4 manuscripts,  $4QS^b(4Q256)$  and  $4QS^d(4Q258)$ . But these cave 4 copies attest to a shorter and more concise recension than that of *IQS*. This short edition, as found in  $4QS^d(4Q258)$ , does not include the material contained in the first four columns of *IQS*, namely the ceremony of entering the covenant and the exposition on cosmic dualism. (13) Sariana Metso has argued that the shorter recension represents the earlier version of the *Rule*, while the fuller text of *IQS* originates in a later, reworked and enlarged edition of it. (14) This hypothesis is rightly rejected by Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes, the editors of the final edition of the cave 4 copies. (15) For the fact that the two representatives of the shorter recension,  $4QS^b(=4Q256)$  and  $4QS^d(=4Q258)$ , were penned some seventy years after *IQS*, namely in the last quarter of the first century BCE, makes Metso's suggestion extremely dubious. (16) More plausible is the view that  $4QS^b(=4Q256)$  and  $4QS^d(=4Q258)$  represent a late abbreviated and perhaps selective version of the *Rule* rather than an older and more original edition of it. That the longer and fuller version of *IQS* may have been closer to the original form of the *Rule* is also indicated by the oldest cave 4 copy,  $4QS^a(=4Q255)$ . This papyrus manuscript dates to the second half of the second century BCE and contains material closer to the long recension of *IQS*. (17) Moreover, this oldest copy contains material related to the exposition on cosmic dualism in *IQS*, III-IV so this exposition cannot have

(13) This manuscript begins from column V. Cf. Metso, *Textual Development* (n. 7 above) 37; Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX* (n. 7 above) 85, 90; E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2004) 110.

(14) In this Metso follows Joseph Milik. Cf. J.T. Milik, "Recension of Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*", *RB* 67 (1960) 412; Metso, *Textual Development* (n. 7 above) 89-90, 106. However, Milik's own view was partly determined by the date he assigned to another witness of a short recension,  $4QS^e(4Q259)$ , a date earlier than that of *IQS*. Cf. J. Milik, "Le travail de l'édition des fragments des manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956) 60-61. Metso, *ibid.*, p. 48 upheld Milik's opinion although she was already aware of the correct date. Frank Cross dates  $4QS^e$  to 50-25 BCE, hence later than *IQS*. Cf. F.M. Cross, "The Paleographic Dates of the Manuscripts," in J. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1: *The Rule of the Community and Related Texts* (Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr-John Knox, 1994) 57.

(15) Cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX* (n. 7 above) 15. In more detail see Alexander, "The Redaction-History" (n. 12 above).

(16) Manuscript  $4QS^e$  may now also be added to the list of relatively late manuscripts with short recensions. Cf. n. 14.

(17) Cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX* (n. 7 above) 10. These writers hold that  $4QS^a$  "may contain an early draft of the *Community Rule*, possibly even the first draft."

been a late addition to the *Rule*, (18) nor of a late date. Dualism seems to have been part of the Qumran community's outlook from the initial phases of its existence.

That *IQS* contains the fuller, and apparently older, version of the *Rule* may be also suggested by the physical aspect of the manuscripts. *IQS* was copied in wide and long columns, and on a large scroll, perhaps indicating the special, even official, status of this manuscript. (19) Such a status may also be surmised from the fact that it was deemed necessary to correct some sections of it. By contrast, the cave 4 copies are sparingly corrected. (20) Moreover, *4QS<sup>d</sup>* (*4Q258*) with its short recension is written in narrow columns on a relatively short scroll, (21) perhaps copied for private use. (22)

Being an early exemplar of a full, elaborate, and perhaps official text, *IQS* should be examined as a single entity no less than as a compilation of distinct units. The publication of cave 4 evidence has enhanced the tendency in scholarship to emphasize the distinct literary sections of the *Rule* and its various recensions, although such an approach often misses the fundamental homogeneity of style, ideas, and structure of the *Rule* as a whole. Such homogeneity,

(18) As argued by Metso. Cf. eadem, *Textual Development* (n. 7 above) 145. The tendency to see the dualistic exposition as the latest part of *IQS* dominated earlier research. Cf. J. Duhaime, "Dualistic Reworking in Scrolls from Qumran," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 32-56 (esp. 36-41). However, cave 4 material shows that if it was a late part, it was attached to *IQS* at a very early stage. This consideration also applies to the various sections in *IQS* which Duhaime, *ibid.*, pp. 40-43, views as secondary additions.

(19) Cf. E. Tov, *Scribal Practices* (n. 13 above) 83, 87. In the opinion of Alexander *IQS* was an official text. See Alexander, "The Redaction-History" (n. 12 above), p. 438. Tigchelaar, "The Scribe of *IQS*" (n. 12 above) 452 arrives at similar conclusions. He shows that not all the corrections came from the pen of the this scribe, but some are due to later hands (*ibid.* p. 443). In addition, he suggests that some of the inconsistencies in orthography may have been due to Aramaic influence on his spoken language or to the texts he copied (*ibid.*, pp. 446, 450-452). Cf. nn. 12, 20.

(20) As noted by Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX* (n. 7 above) 7. Also to be noted is that in *IQS* I-IV, IX-XI relatively few corrections occur, comparing with *IQS* V-VIII. Tigchelaar, "The Scribe of *IQS*" (n. 12 above) 451 makes the following observation: "To a certain extent the scribe may have been less competent, but the accumulation of errors and corrections in specific sections may reflect a complicated textual tradition." Cf. nn. 12, 19.

(21) Cf. Metso, *Textual Development* (n. 7 above) 39; Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX* (n. 7 above), pp. 83-84. Tov, *Scribal Practices* (n. 13 above), p. 85, includes *4QS<sup>b,d,j,f</sup>* in his list of leather scrolls with small writings blocks.

(22) Especially small are *4QS<sup>f</sup>* (*4Q260*) and *4QS<sup>i</sup>* (*4Q264*). Cf. Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX* (n. 7 above) 154. They suggest that these copies "were designed to be carried around on the person" (*ibid.*, p. 5).

it should be remembered, is conveyed by several features of the *Rule*. First, all the components of *IQS* are represented in cave 4 copies, and in basically the same order. This attests to a stable textual tradition of one and the same collection. (23) Secondly, the differences which may be detected in the *Rule*'s various recensions or in its literary components fall within the perimeters of the basic sectarian concepts and ideological tenets. (24) They should therefore be viewed as variations on the same themes. Thirdly, despite the composite character of the *Rule* in the *IQS* version, it is by no means a random collection but a carefully assembled and edited compilation. (25) Even a cursory reading reveals the meaningful sequence in which the various *IQS* components are arranged. The sequence begins with the initial entering the covenant, goes on to survey the basic ideas of the community, passes to its organizational patterns and then its major aims, and concludes with a hymn of praise to the divine. Cave 4 manuscripts have shown that this basic sequence is reflected, sometimes partly, in all cave 4 copies. The existence of distinct sections, or even underlying sources, is not necessarily at odds with a single overall framework. Such a framework may have come from the hand of the initial compiler.

As has often been stressed, the manuscripts of the *Rule* attest to the centrality of the work in the life of the Qumran community and to a long literary history. But while the stages subsequent to *IQS* are to some measure traceable due to cave 4 texts, the prehistory of the *Rule*, and for that matter of *IQS*, remains shrouded in mystery. Nevertheless, it has not been sufficiently stressed that the complex version of *IQS* stands near the beginning rather than the end of the process which created it. It preserves a form of the *Rule* created during the early phases in the history of the community. Furthermore, it seems that the *Rule* achieved relative textual stability in that early period. (26)

(23) Cf. the synoptic table of the *Rule*'s manuscripts in Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX* (n. 7 above) 18-19.

(24) See for instance, the often quoted example of *מתנדבים/נדבים*. *נדבים* appears only in columns I-IV of *IQS*, and *מתנדבים* occurs only in columns V-XI of *IQS*. While this difference is an important marker of the various underlying literary sources, it should not cloud the fact that both terms stand for the same notion and are forms of the same root *נדר*.

(25) Thus Alexander, "The Redaction-History" (n. 12 above) 438, 447-448.

(26) A few fragments cannot be connected with any passage known from *IQS*. Such are fragment A of *4QS<sup>a</sup>* (*4Q255*) and fragment A of *4QS<sup>c</sup>* (*4Q257*). Fragments A-C of *4QS<sup>s</sup>* (*4Q261*) are too small for any identification. Fragments A-B of *4QS<sup>h</sup>* (*4Q262*) have no parallel in any of the Qumran scrolls and may not belong with the *Rule*.

Another aspect of the textual tradition of the *Rule* worth mentioning is the practice of copying other texts with it. The scribe of *IQS* copied the two eschatological rules of *IQSa* and *IQSb*, while some of the cave 4 copies supply different additions. (27) Also in this respect *IQS* additions may not be fortuitous but reflect the view that they belong with the *Rule*. However, all the additional pieces copied with the *Rule* do not alter the picture of the basic single compilation as it appears in *IQS*. Executed on a large manuscript, copied together with *IQSa* and *IQSb* as it is, preserving a full text close to the original, and corrected where needed, *IQS* seemed to have enjoyed a special status, perhaps of a model copy. It appears that precisely for this reason it was hidden in cave 1, well protected in a special jar.

The early date of the *Rule of the Community* as found in *IQS*, and perhaps in *4QS<sup>a</sup>*, points to the great age of the full version, but equally to the antiquity of the sources underlying it. They all must date to the second half of the second century BCE at the latest. Yet even at this early point these sources are already elaborate and use an evolved terminology. In the formulation of Philip Alèxander, “*IQS* is allusive and selective: it presupposes prior knowledge of the community”. (28) These features attest to a well established and developed literature. To whom in the community the *Rule* was addressed will perhaps never be known. (29) But it certainly presents an already advanced stage of development, which implies a long prehistory behind it. To the mind of the present author these are the marks of an ancient tradition, some sources of which may have been produced well before the Qumran community appeared on the historical scene, and which the Qumranites inherited rather than created.

#### b. *Hodayot* (*IQH<sup>a</sup>*)

The large *Hodayot* manuscript from cave 1, *IQH<sup>a</sup>*, presents a case different from *IQS* in literary fabric and structure, but analogical in textual character and in position among other copies of the

(27) Additional texts, not *IQSa* or *IQSb*, were probably copied in *4QS<sup>b</sup>* (*4Q256*) and *4QS<sup>c</sup>* (*4Q259*).

(28) Cf. Alexander, “The Redaction-History” (n. 12 above) 439. In fact, this characterization holds good for the entire sectarian literature, except for the halakhic letter contained in *4QMMT*. However, this exception only confirms the rule, and shows that the *4QMMT* was indeed addressed to a recipient outside the community.

(29) Alexander, *ibid.*, concludes from these characteristics that the *Rule* served as a manual for the Maskil.

*Hodayot*. *IQH<sup>a</sup>* is a collection of psalm-like units, modeled on biblical thanksgiving psalms. These elaborate various themes of the sectarian ideology are known from other compositions of the Qumran community, and are written in the peculiar terminology and style typical of the sectarian writings. Early on, the psalms contained in *IQH<sup>a</sup>* were divided into two distinct literary groups: psalms in first-person style that spoke of personal experience were attributed to the leader of the community, the Teacher of Righteousness. Other psalms with more general formulations were connected with the community as a whole. This analysis was performed on the text of *IQH<sup>a</sup>* produced in the posthumous edition of Eliezer Sukenik. (30) However, an amended order of columns was independently offered by Émile Puech and Hartmut Stegemann. (31) One of the chief changes in the new sequence relegates Sukenik's columns I, II, and III to columns IX, X, and XI, while placing Sukenik's columns XVII and XVIII at the beginning. (32) This change, together with others, clusters the Psalms of the Community in the first and last thirds of *IQH<sup>a</sup>*, while the Psalms of the Teacher are located in the middle. (33)

Six copies of the *Hodayot* were identified among the scrolls of cave 4. In her edition of them, Eileen Schuller accepts the classification of Psalms of the Teacher as distinct from the Psalms of the Community. She concludes that one copy, *4QH<sup>a</sup>* (4Q427), probably included only Psalms of the Community in an order differing from *IQH<sup>a</sup>*. She proposes that another manuscript, *4QH<sup>f</sup>* (4Q432), and perhaps also *4QH<sup>c</sup>* (4Q429), may have contained only the second part of the Psalms of the Teacher. (34) Schuller notes that since these two manuscripts date to the third quarter of the first century BCE, they suggest that at that stage copies of the *Hodayot* were produced which contain only some sections of the great collection in *IQH<sup>a</sup>*. In passing it is interesting to observe that had only these two manuscripts survived, the scholarly conclusion would have been that they represent shorter and earlier editions of the collection contained in the later, Herodian manuscript of *IQH<sup>a</sup>*. However, the oldest *Hodayot* copy, *4QH<sup>b</sup>* (4Q428), is identical to *IQH<sup>a</sup>* in content

(30) Cf. E. Sukenik (ed. by N. Avigad), *Otzar Ha-Megilot Ha-Genuzoth* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955).

(31) Cf. É. Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymns (IQH)," *JJS* 39 (1988) 38-55; H. Stegemann, "The Reconstruction of the Cave I Hodayot Scroll," in L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after their Discovery* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society & the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000) 272-284.

(32) Cf. the list comparing Sukenik's sequence with his own arrangement, published by Stegemann, "The Reconstruction" (n. 31 above) 280.

(33) Cf. E. Schuller, "427-432" (n. 7 above) 74.

(34) Cf. Schuller, "427-432" (n. 7 above) 86-87, 212.

and order of the psalmodic units. Dated to the first half of the first century BCE as it is, *4QH<sup>b</sup>* attests to the early origin of the collection copied in the Herodian manuscript of *IQH<sup>a</sup>*. (35) It shows that the sequence followed by *IQH<sup>a</sup>* is an old one. Moreover, it suggests that *IQH<sup>a</sup>* itself was copied from an earlier model.

Émile Puech concurs with this dating of the *Hodayot* compilation, but on a number of points advances a different assessment of these sectarian psalms. From the presence of a *Hodayot*-like psalm in *IQS XI*, itself dated to 100 BCE, he infers that *Hodayot* already existed at that time. He therefore assigns the composition of the *Hodayot* to an early date, namely the second half of the second century BCE. Such a date permits him to uphold the view that it was the Teacher of Righteousness or his followers who composed the *Hodayot*. However, Puech is of the opinion that the Teacher wrote both the Psalms of the Teacher and the Psalms of the Community, for we should grant so eminent a personality as the Teacher mastery of the communal style, as well as the personal. (36) As for evidence of cave 4 manuscripts Puech states, "it is far from proven that *4QHod<sup>c</sup>* contained only the Hymns of the Teacher ...and the same also holds for *4QHod<sup>b</sup>*". (37)

Be that as it may, some of the later manuscripts obviously contain *Hodayot* in an order different from *IQH<sup>a</sup>* while the oldest exemplars maintain it. Still, the major difference among the various exemplars is seen to lie in the order of the hymns, not in their textual form. (38) This points to a version established early on and to a relatively stable textual transmission.

Such a textual situation is similar to that of the copies of the *Rule*. In both groups the shorter collections are copied in later manuscripts, whereas the older manuscripts set forth the full version. The two groups are also similar in their physical aspect. *IQS* is clearly the most sizable exemplar among the copies of the *Rule*. The same is true of *IQH<sup>a</sup>* in relation to other copies of *Hodayot*. The late cave 4 copies of the *Hodayot* are mostly written in smaller format and on shorter scrolls. This is particularly manifest in *4QH<sup>c</sup>*, which according to Schuller may have contained only the Psalms of the Teacher. (39) By contrast, the full collection of the *Hodayot* in *IQH<sup>a</sup>* is copied in beautiful calligraphy and on a magnificent scroll. Emanuel Tov defined it as "a deluxe manuscript" of particular

(35) Cf. Schuller, "427-432" (n. 7 above) 75.

(36) Cf. É. Puech, "Hodayot," *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: University Press, 2000) 366.

(37) *ibid.*

(38) Cf. Schuller, "427-432" (n. 7 above) 74.

(39) Cf. Schuller, "427-432" (n. 7 above) 177.

attentive and painstaking preparation similar to certain biblical manuscripts, and of apparently authoritative standing in the community. (40) From Émile Puech *IQH<sup>a</sup>* elicited the following description: "The impeccable material crafting of the scroll, which to our knowledge is unique among the manuscripts that have been found, would itself show the great esteem and importance the scribe-copyist accorded to this text, on a level with the great biblical manuscripts". (41)

Thus, in their full versions from the second century BCE, and in their particularly large format, *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>* stand out from other copies, and from many other scrolls from Qumran. As both *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>* contain collections compiled during the second half of the second century BCE, one may ask when their underlying sources were composed. (42) The considerations advanced above for the *Rule of the Community* are valid for *Hodayot* too. The elaborate and distinctive style and the full-blown sectarian terminology make the *Hodayot* the heir of a well-established literary and conceptual tradition, not its origin. In the case of *Hodayot* such an argument is of particular relevance since we know that hymns and psalms based on the biblical models continued to be composed outside the canonical collection, as attested by the Qumran scrolls and other contemporary Jewish writings.

### c. The War Rule (*IQM*)

The third cave 1 scroll discussed here, *IQM*, presents yet another case with several features in common with *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>*. In literary character and aim *IQM* differs from both, yet it is strikingly similar in textual character and in its position within Qumran War literature.

*IQM* contains a rule which lays down the military regulations enforced and prayers offered during the final eschatological war. However, unlike the relatively stable textual traditions of *Rule of the Community* and the *Hodayot*, the textual and literary tradition related to the eschatological war appears to have been much more fluid. This is already evident in *IQM*. As early research recognized, it constitutes a compilation of loosely connected units dealing with various aspects of the final struggle between the forces of Light and

(40) Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices* (n. 13 above) 90-91. Cf. his list on p. 91, which includes *IQH<sup>a</sup>*.

(41) Cf. Puech, "Hodayot" (n. 36 above) 365-366.

(42) The use of disparate sources comes across also through the fact that *IQH<sup>a</sup>* displays different orthography in different sections, as noted by Schuller, "427-432" (n. 7 above) 86.

the camp of Evil. After an introduction, which places the entire collection in an apocalyptic context, columns II-IX describe organizational and tactical procedures of battle. Columns X to XIV assemble prayers to be recited during different phases of the war. Columns XV to XIX present priestly speeches to be delivered at various points in the battles. (43)

A number of texts related to the eschatological war and to *IQM* turned up in cave 4. But unlike the situation regarding *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>*, the relationship of these cave 4 texts to *IQM* is more complex. While the first editor, Maurice Baillet, took cave 4 texts to be six copies of the work written in *IQM*, (44) subsequent research emphasized the textual differences observed between them. The most recent attempt to describe this complex textual situation in terms of recensional activity was undertaken by Jean Duhaime. He classified cave 4 texts according to their degree of similarity to *IQM*. Under the heading "Copies of a Similar Recension" he groups four texts which in his view display a close similarity to *IQM*: *4QM<sup>b</sup>* (4Q492), *4QM<sup>d</sup>* (4Q494), *4QM<sup>e</sup>* (4Q495), and *4QM<sup>f</sup>* (4Q496). Under the heading "Copies of Other Recensions" Duhaime lists *4QM<sup>a</sup>* (4Q491) and *4QM<sup>c</sup>* (4Q493), which differ considerably from *IQM*. (45) Yet even the texts judged to be close to *IQM* display small variants of it. Moreover, the first three texts, *4QM<sup>b</sup>* (4Q492), *4QM<sup>d</sup>* (4Q494), and *4QM<sup>e</sup>* (4Q495), are represented by very few or single pieces, so caution is called for in forming judgment on their textual character. The same is true of the fourth manuscript in this group, *4QM<sup>f</sup>* (4Q496), a badly preserved papyrus scroll, on the verso of which the War material is copied. Even more problematic is the state of the manuscripts in the second group, *4QM<sup>a</sup>* (4Q491) and *4QM<sup>c</sup>* (4Q493). The character of *4QM<sup>a</sup>* (4Q491) is disputed. For while Baillet saw a single manuscript, (46) Martin Abegg, followed

(43) For a survey of *IQM*'s various parts and scholarly opinions on them, cf. J. Duhaime, *The War Texts: IQM and Related Texts (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls* 6; London-New York: T & T Clark-Continuum, 2004) 13-20; 43-49.

(44) Cf. M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 16-38.

(45) Cf. Duhaime, *The War Texts* (n. 43 above) 20-31. For Martin Abegg *4Q491a*, *4Q492*, *4Q494* and *4Q495* are very close to *IQM*, while *4Q491b*, *4Q493* and *4Q496* stem from "two or more editions or recensions of the War Scroll." Cf. idem, "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?" in J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen (eds.), *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (*Supp JSOT* 184; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1994) 136-147 (esp. p. 137).

(46) Cf. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III* (n. 44 above) 12-44.

by Duhaime, split it into three different manuscripts. (47) Even though not all the details of such a tripartite division are convincing, some pieces assigned by Baillet to *4QM<sup>a</sup>* (*4Q491*) are certainly misplaced. This is undoubtedly the case of the so-called Self-Glorification Hymn, numbered in Baillet's edition as fragments 11-12 of this same manuscript, namely *4Q491*. It exists in two recensions. One is represented by Baillet's fragment, the other by three *Hodayot* texts (*IQH<sup>a</sup>* XXVI, 6-14; *4QH<sup>a</sup>* 7 i 6-17; *4QH<sup>e</sup>* [= *4Q471b*]). As noted by several scholars this poem is of a particular character, but the evidence suggests that it was incorporated at some stage into the *Hodayot* collection. (48) As for *4QM<sup>c</sup>* (*4Q493*), Duhaime notes that it cannot be matched with *IQM* and suggests that it stems from a different recension. (49)

From these observations it emerges that none of the cave 4 texts related to the War is a precise copy of *IQM*. This conclusion was explicitly formulated by Roni Yishai in a recent article. In a different assessment of the textual character of the War materials she notes that the similarity between the cave 4 texts and *IQM* is observed mainly in passages concerned with prayers and with descriptions of the eschatological battles. In her opinion, the similar formulaic and repetitive style of these units suggests that their models were already available in some form or other to the authors of the War texts. (50) If so, such literary models must have predated the actual compilation of *IQM*, as well as most of the cave 4 War materials.

The precise significance of the textual variety of scrolls related to the War remains to be understood, but the fluidity of this particular literary tradition may already be noted as a fact. This emerges not only from the variety of textual forms and units contained in *IQM* and the similar cave 4 texts, but also from the presence at Qumran of works clearly belonging to the War tradition, but not

(47) Cf. The summary of Abegg's conclusions by Duhaime, *The War Texts* (n. 43 above) 24-29.

(48) Cf. Schuller, "427-432" (n. 7 above) 101, 199 and the literature cited there.

(49) Cf. J. Duhaime, "War Scroll" (n. 7 above) 81.

(50) Cf. R. Yishai, "The Model of the Eschatological War Descriptions in Qumran Literature," *Meghillot* 4 (2006) 123-124, 137-138 (Hebrew). A case in point is the prayer about Jerusalem, found in three versions: *IQM* XII, 13-15; XIX, 5-8, and *4QM<sup>b</sup>* (= *4Q492*) 1 5-8. Yishai compared the larger context of the three (*IQM* XII, 7-16; *IQM* XIX, 1-8, and *4QM<sup>b</sup>* (= *4Q492*) 1 1-8. Cf. eadem, "The Prayers in the Literature of the Eschatological War at Qumran: *IQM*, *4Q491-4Q496*", *Meghillot* 5-6 (Hebrew) (in press). In the opinion of E. Eshel and H. Eshel the versions of this piece come from three different recensions. See their comments in "Recensions of the War Scroll," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (n. 31 above) 351-363.

identical with *IQM*. This is true of the text known as *Sefer ha-Milhamah*, extant in two copies, *4Q285* and *11Q14*. (51)

Yet on comparison of *IQM* with overlapping cave 4 passages, *IQM* often emerges as the fuller and more elaborate version. Given this situation, and the Herodian dating of *IQM*, one would be tempted to conclude that *IQM* is the outcome of a long literary process, a conclusion indeed put forward by several scholars. (52) Yet two considerations caution us against such a conclusion: a. The composite character of *IQM* indicates various underlying sources. In that case, these are earlier than the Herodian date of *IQM*. In fact, the parallel passages from cave 4 suggest that *IQM* itself is a copy rather than an autograph of the compilation preserved in it. b. In the cases of *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>* it is possible to establish that the full and elaborate version is the early one because we possess older manuscripts which attest to this fact. Unfortunately, we do not have a similar evidence with regards to the War literature. However, the analogical situation of *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>* point to the possibility of a similar situation.

That this may be indeed the case is suggested by several other texts related to the War literature. In this connection it is worth looking more closely at the parallel passages of *IQM*, XVI 13-XVII 5 and *4QM<sup>a</sup>* (=4Q491), 11 ii 12-18. Although both produce the same basic text, *4QM<sup>a</sup>* lacks the pericope of *IQM* XVII 2-3 dealing with the Sons of Aharon, Nadav and Avihu (cf. *Lev* 10:1-7), and the eternal priestly covenant bestowed on the Aharonides (cf. *Num* 25:12). In such a situation one may easily conclude that *IQM* preserves a later version, developing an earlier textual form of the type preserved in *4QM<sup>a</sup>*. (53) However, the short text of *4QM<sup>a</sup>* has

(51) Cf. P. Alexander and G. Vermes, "285. 4QSefer ha-Milhamah", in P. Alexander et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Miscellanea, part 1* (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000) 228-246; F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar and A. van der Woude (eds.), *Qumran Cave 11.II* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) 243-251. Two other texts which have been connected with *IQM* do not bear out such a connection. The first, *4Q497*, now labelled *War Scroll-like Text A*, was published by Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III* (n. 44 above) 69-72. Its tiny remains and disparate words do not evince any particular connection to the distinctive vocabulary of *IQM*. As for *4Q471*, the so-called *War Scroll-like Text B*, although it has some similarity to *IQM* I it is insufficient to constitute a different recension of *IQM*, as argued by the editors E. Eshel and H. Eshel, "471.4QWar Scroll-like Text B", in Alexander et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI*, 439-449. Cf. the critique of M. Abegg, "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?" (n. 45 above) 143.

(52) Cf. Duhaime, "War Scroll" (n. 7 above) 80. See also his survey of scholarly opinion on *IQM* in Duhaime, *The War Texts* (n. 43 above) 12-20.

(53) As indeed surmised Duhaime, "Dualistic Rewriting" (n. 18 above) 49-51.

been shown to contain allusions to both episodes. (54) Thus, *4QM<sup>a</sup>* may be viewed as an abbreviation of *IQM* textual form rather than its earlier and shorter precedent.

Also another consideration suggests an early date for some of *IQM* sections. For while no clear recensional lines of development emerge from the comparison between *IQM* and cave 4 texts, as may be drawn in the cases of the *Rule of the Community* and of the *Hodayot*, some of *IQM* underlying sources may nevertheless point to an early date of composition. The use made by *IQM* columns I-II of *Daniel* chapters 11-12, which treat Seleucid and Ptolemaic history in the second century BCE, implies that the same historical circumstance were still relevant for the author of this Qumran document. This observation ties in well with the understanding of the sobriquet “the Kittim of Assur” (כְּתִי־אֲשׁוּר) in *IQM* I, 2 as a reference to the Hellenistic Seleucid kingdom. (55) If so, these columns must have been composed before the conquest of Eretz-Israel by the Romans in 63 BCE. An even earlier date is put forward by recent studies, which show that the weaponry and tactics described in *IQM* reflect those of the Roman army in the second century BCE rather than those used by that army at the end of the first century BCE. (56) So despite the relatively late date of the manuscript of *IQM*, at least some of the sources underlying the compilation copied therein must go back a century earlier. (57) Consequently, the question arising in relation to *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>* is also pertinent to *IQM*. Is the elaborate and developed character of many of *IQM* segments the final result of the creative process, or is it placed near the beginning of it?

In any event, like *IQS* and *IQH<sup>a</sup>*, *IQM* also certainly enjoyed special status in the Qumran community since it too is a copy executed with particular care, written on a well-prepared and large scroll, (58) and hidden carefully in a jar in cave 1.

(54) Cf. B. Nitzan, “The development of Sectarian Texts at Qumran,” *Beit Mikra* 40 (1995) 232-248 (esp. pp. 232-242) (Hebrew).

(55) Scholarly opinion has been divided between regarding the reference as an allusion to the Seleucids or to the Romans. See the survey of Duhaime, *The War Texts* (n. 43 above) 77-81.

(56) Chiefly R. Gmirkin, “The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered,” *DSD* 3 (1996) 89-129. See also I. Shatzman, “On the Army in the Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light in the Sons of Darkness,” in A. Oppenheimer, Y. Gafni and D. Schwartz (eds.), *The Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menachem Stern* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Shazar, 1996) 105-131 (Hebrew). See the survey of Duhaime, *The War Texts* (n. 43 above) 95.

(57) Similarly Duhaime, *The War Texts* (n. 43 above) 98.

(58) Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices* (n. 13 above) 126-127. Tov lists *IQM* among the manuscripts he labeled “de Luxe” editions, mainly according to their large top and bottom margins.

The foregoing survey has shown that the well-developed versions of *IQS*, *IQH<sup>a</sup>*, and *IQM* were not fortuitous, nor were they the final outcome of their editorial process. They originated in the early phase of the Qumran group. Later copies appear to be abbreviations, often made for personal use. By virtue of their ancient and full versions, these cave 1 specimens appear to have been manuscripts of special importance, perhaps the venerated copies of earlier authoritative models of the major sectarian works. (59) This would account for their particularly large format and the meticulous preparation and copying of *IQH<sup>a</sup>* and *IQM*. It would also explain the repeated corrections of the *IQS* text, serving as the model exemplar for the community's collection of rules, as it probably did. These three manuscripts may have been consigned to cave 1 with special care, perhaps in their makers' hope of returning and retrieving them, a hope never to be fulfilled. These manuscripts may have been placed in the cave at a late date, in the final years of the community, but they preserve much older sources related to the life and practices of the community that cherished them.

Devorah DIMANT.

(59) Hartmut Stegemann suggested that these scrolls themselves served as esteemed models for other copies. Cf. idem, *The Library of Qumran* (Grand Rapids, Mich.-Leiden: Eerdmans - Brill, 1998) 80-81. However, penned in the last part of the first quarter of the first century BCE, *IQH<sup>a</sup>* and *IQM* could not have served as models for earlier texts. They must have been copies of earlier models already in existence. Cf. above for a similar argument advanced by Puech in relation to *Hodayot*.

# TOILETS AT QUMRAN, THE ESSENES, AND THE SCROLLS: NEW ANTHROPOLOGICAL DATA AND OLD THEORIES\*

## *Abstract*

Discovered in and around Qumran, the Dead Sea Scrolls have not only shed light on early Judaism and Christian Origins but have also provided vital insight into the lifestyle of the sect responsible for the writings, including an intriguing portrait of its unique toilet practices. While many religious groups in antiquity were concerned with what enters the body, the Qumran sect, known for its strict observance of ritual purity, was especially concerned with what eventually exits. Recent parasitological evidence of these toilet practices at Qumran, as it turns out, supplies an exceptional anthropological indicator for correlating this Jewish sect with the group referred to by Josephus as the Essenes. (1) This important new evidence bolsters the Essene hypothesis by corroborating the descriptions of this distinctive toilet regimen in both the Scrolls and Josephus.

## **Introduction**

**A**LTHOUGH little is known about latrines and the personal toilet practices of many religious groups in antiquity, such is not the case with the group that wrote the Scrolls and the Essenes. In fact, we are privileged to have detailed descriptions of

(\*) Our thanks to The Foundation for Biblical Archaeology ([www.tfba.org](http://www.tfba.org)) for their sponsorship of the scientific tests involved in this research and to Chad Day (graduate student at UNC Charlotte) for editing and format assistance. Also thanks to Jean-Baptiste Humbert from the École Biblique for permission to publish the photograph of the hatchet (Photo 1). Please address responses and inquiries to Joe Zias ([joezias@yahoo.com](mailto:joezias@yahoo.com)).

(1) Josephus, *J.W.* 2.119 (Thackeray, LCL).

