Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls

John Collins at Seventy

VOLUME 1

Edited by

Joel Baden
Hindy Najman
Eibert Tigchelaar

With the assistance of

Laura Carlson
James Nati
Olivia Stewart
Shlomo Zuckier

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

VOLUME 1

Publications of John J. Collins XV

List of Contributors XLI

Introduction 1

Between Athens and Jerusalem, on the Wings of a Dove? 4

Susan Ackerman

The Social Location of the Scribe in the Second Temple Period 22

Samuel L. Adams

Heraclitus's *Homeric Problems* and Midrash *Genesis Rabbah*: Comparisons and Contrasts 38

Philip Alexander

The Identification of the "Wicked Priest" Reconsidered: The Case for Hyrcanus II 68

Kenneth Atkinson

What's in a Name? Naming the Unnameable in Philo and John 85

Harold W. Attridge

Redactor or Rabbenu? Revisiting an Old Question of Identity 96

Joel S. Baden

Old Testament Ethics: Story or Style? 113

John Barton

Future Food and Future Feasting: Tracing the Idea of the Meal in the World to Come in Qumran Literature 127

Claudia D. Bergmann

Casting Lots and Distributing Territories: The Hellenistic Background of the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* 148

Katell Berthelot

- Authority and Propaganda—The Case of the *Potter's Oracle*** 167
Stefan Beyerle
- How Jesus Became Uncreated** 185
Gabriele Boccaccini
- Thrēskeia* in 4 Maccabees** 209
Daniel Boyarin
- The Visualisation of the Sacred at Qumran** 225
George J. Brooke
- The Wisdom of the Nations and the Law of Israel: Genealogies of Ethnic Difference in Ben Sira and the *Mekhilta*** 241
Joshua Ezra Burns
- Zechariah, Zerubbabel, and *Zemah*: Ideological Development in Early Postexilic Judah** 261
Laura Carlson
- The Divine Assembly in Genesis 1–11** 276
Richard J. Clifford
- The Enochs of Genesis 4 and 5 and the Emergence of the Apocalyptic Enoch Tradition** 293
John Day
- Genre Analysis and Early Christian Martyrdom Narratives: A Proposal** 314
Michal Beth Dinkler
- The Disappearing God in Ezekiel the Tragedian** 337
Robert Doran
- Scent of a Woman: The Influence of Lady Wisdom on 2 Maccabees 7:20–29** 352
Antonios Finitsis
- Preserving the Cult of YHWH in Judean Garrisons: Continuity from Pharaonic to Ptolemaic Times** 375
Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley

**“If a Case is Too Baffling for You to Decide . . .” (Deuteronomy 17:8–13):
Between Constraining and Expanding Judicial Autonomy in the Temple
Scroll and Early Rabbinic Scriptural Interpretation** 409

Steven D. Fraade

**Of Doves, Fish, and Goddesses: Reflections on the Literary, Religious, and
Historical Background of the Book of Jonah** 432

Eckart Frahm

**Fire and Water? Apocalyptic Imagination and Hellenistic Worldview in
2 Peter** 451

Jörg Frey

Where’s Enoch? The Mythic Geography of the Qumran *Book of Giants* 472

Matthew Goff

Josephus and Jewish Ethnicity 489

Erich S. Gruen

**Cutting the Cord with the Familiar: What Makes 4Q265 *Miscellaneous Rules*
Tick?** 509

Charlotte Hempel

**The Dream of a Perfect Text: Textual Criticism and Biblical Inerrancy in
Early Modern Europe** 517

Ronald Hendel

“I Am the Judge”: Judgment in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 542

Matthias Henze

**Mother Zion in Baruch 4:5–5:9 and 2 *Baruch* 1–12: A Study of Different
Models of Intertextuality** 558

Karina Martin Hogan

Scribal Innovation and the Book of Tobit: A Long Overdue Discussion 579

Naomi S. S. Jacobs

**What is “*Serekh ha-Yahad* (S)”? Thinking About Ancient Manuscripts as
Information Processing** 611

Jutta Jokiranta

Deity and Divine in the Hebrew Bible and in the Dead Sea Scrolls 636*Reinhard G. Kratz***Simeon and Levi's Attack on Shechem, or: The Mystery of MS C of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 655***James Kugel***What Really Troubled Andronikos? A Note on *P.Polit.Iud.* 1 673***Rob Kugler***Who were the Advisers of the King? A Comparative Study of Royal Consultants in Mesopotamia and in Israel 688***Helge S. Kvanvig***Solomon in the Garden of Eden: Autonomous Wisdom and the Danger of Discernment 714***Peter T. Lanfer***VOLUME 2****Inner- and Extra-Jewish Polemics: The Parting of the Way Once Again 727***Armin Lange***"Ask What You Wish": The Intersection between Economic Freedom and Cosmopolitanism in 1 Esdras 747***Kyong-Jin Lee***The Place of the Early Printed Editions of Josephus's *Antiquities* and *War* (1470–1534) in the Latin Textual Tradition 765***David B. Levenson and Thomas R. Martin***Conceptualizing Spirit: Supernatural Meteorology and Winds of Distress in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East 826***Ingrid E. Lilly***Covenantal Nomism and the Hebrew Bible 845***Timothy H. Lim***From Zedekiah to the Messiah: A Glimpse at the Early Reception of the Sprout 857***Christl M. Maier*

- Ethnicity and Essentialism in and about Ezekiel's Tragedy** 874
Stewart Moore
- Perfecting Translation: The Greek Scriptures in Philo of Alexandria** 897
Hindy Najman and Benjamin G. Wright
- The Community Rule or Rules for the Communities?* Contextualizing the Qumran *Serakhim*** 916
James Nati
- The Thanksgiving Hymns of 1QH^a and the Construction of the Ideal Sage through Liturgical Performance** 940
Judith H. Newman
- Beautiful Theories: Approaching Deut 21:1–9 as Ritual Performance and Narrative Medium** 958
Susan Niditch
- Desires Crossing Boundaries: Romance and History in Josephus's *Antiquities*** 973
Maren R. Niehoff
- Lost Historical Traditions: Between Josephus and the Rabbis** 991
Vered Noam
- Defects, Holiness, and Pollution in Biblical Cultic Texts** 1018
Saul M. Olyan
- Anthropology, Pneumatology, and Demonology in Early Judaism: The *Two Spirits Treatise* (1QS 3:13–4:26) and Other Texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls** 1029
Mladen Popović
- Les Esséniens et la croyance à la résurrection : de l'eschatologie zoroastrienne aux notices de Josèphe et d'Hippolyte** 1068
Émile Puech
- Metacritical Thoughts on "Transcendence" and the Definition of Apocalypse** 1096
Rebecca Raphael

The Passive *Qal* in the Hebrew of the Second Temple Period, especially as Found in the Wisdom of Ben Sira 1110

Eric D. Reymond

A Twentieth-Century Irishman's First Century Palestine: George Moore's *The Brook Kerith* 1128

Zuleika Rodgers

Blake, Enoch, and Emerging Biblical Criticism 1145

Christopher Rowland

The Origins of the Book of Isaiah 1166

Konrad Schmid

The Poetics of Abjection in Psalm 44 1187

Carolyn J. Sharp

The End of Military Campaigns: Gamala and Masada in *The Jewish War* of Josephus 1217

Gregory E. Sterling

"I Will Speak . . . with My Whole Person in Ecstasy": Instrumentality and Independence in the *Sibylline Oracles* 1232

Olivia Stewart

Airing the High Priest's Dirty Laundry: Understanding the Imagery and Message of Zechariah 3:1–7 1247

Ryan E. Stokes

Thrice Nahum 3:8–10: MT, LXX, and 4Q385a 17 ii—New Proposals 1265

Eibert Tigchelaar

Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture in the 20th Century 1278

Emanuel Tov

The Role of Charity in the *Testament of Job* 1298

Jonathan R. Trotter

The Samaritan and Masoretic Pentateuch: Text and Interpretation(s) 1314

Eugene Ulrich

- Masada World Heritage Site: Josephus the Narrator Defeated** 1330
Jan Willem van Henten
- Mastema in the Qumran Literature and the Book of Jubilees** 1346
James C. VanderKam
- Women, Worship, Wilderness, and War: Celibacy and the Constructions of Identity in the Dead Sea Scrolls** 1361
Cecilia Wassen
- Resonances of Jeremiah in Daniel 9** 1386
Robert R. Wilson
- The Angel's Self-Revelation in Tobit 12** 1399
Géza G. Xeravits
- Peace from the Ashes: Commemorating the Wars in the East, the Centre, and the West of the Roman Empire during the "Long Year of the Four Emperors" (68–70 CE)** 1418
Jürgen K. Zangenberg
- Hu Ezra Alah mi-Bavel*: Ezra as an Exemplar of Babylonian Superiority in Rabbinic Literature** 1453
Shlomo Zuckier
- Index** 1473

What is “*Serekh ha-Yahad* (S)”?

Thinking About Ancient Manuscripts as Information Processing

Jutta Jokiranta

1 Introduction

In his study of the different forms of communities represented in the Dead Sea Scrolls rule texts, John Collins has successfully challenged the Qumran-centered view of the Scrolls movement, arguing for multiple communities reflected in the material.¹ In his *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Collins revisits many old questions and is not satisfied with previous assumptions, for example, regarding the reasons behind the emergence of the movement, the relationship between the *Damascus Document* (D) and the *Serekh ha-Yahad* (S), and the question of a possible schism within the movement. My focus here is not on the historical reconstruction of the movement behind D or S, but on manuscript variation as such and how to perceive it in its historical context. The perception of manuscript variation is, however, methodologically relevant to any study of the history and understanding of this movement: how textual variation is connected to social variation and/or intellectual and ideological variation is an ongoing question present in any study of the changes within the movement. This study will focus on S.

Serekh ha-yahad (S) is both an ancient expression *and* a modern construct. On the one hand, the expression occurs in a few places in a few manuscripts, possibly also in titular usage (see below). On the other hand, we as modern scholars of Qumran texts and editors of the Dead Sea Scrolls label certain manuscripts with the tag “S” (1QS, 4QS^{a-j}, 5QS),² and, additionally, speak of a literary

1 John J. Collins, “Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. S. M. Paul, et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003); idem, “The Yahad and ‘the Qumran Community,’” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission* (ed. C. Hempel and J. M. Lieu; JSJSup 111; Leiden: Brill, 2006); idem, “Beyond the Qumran Community: Social Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 16 (2009): 351–69; idem, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009).

2 See the editions by James H. Charlesworth with F. M. Cross et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994); Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes,

work as “*Serekh ha-Yahad*” or “*Community Rule*.” We do not consider the phrase “סרך היחד” to be only a genitive construct occurring in a few places in texts, but a name, referring to a particular type of rule literature, the *Community Rule* of the *yahad*. These all are different ways of using the concept S. This article seeks to investigate the ways in which our modern conceptualizations of S work in light of the ancient evidence of S. To what extent, and on which grounds, can we presume that there was such a thing as “S” in ancient perception? What makes “S” in our minds?

What S is or is not is by no means clear when the manuscript evidence is examined carefully. Manuscript variation is often downplayed by taking, for practical or other reasons, the (almost) completely preserved manuscript, 1QS, as the main representative of S. In this way, manuscript variation is also twisted towards perceiving “completeness” as a guiding principle of what S is.

Manuscript variation is, furthermore, often approached from the perspective of textual history: which manuscripts preserve the most original readings and which are later forms? The issue in the case of S is complicated by the fact that the paleographical manuscript datings and the assumed patterns of textual change do not necessarily form matching lines of development.³ The investigation of the textual history, as shown by the existing manuscripts, is a

Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); Jozef T. Milik, “5Q11. Règle de la Communauté,” in *Les ‘petites grottes’ de Qumrân: Exploration de la faïence Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q Le rouleau de cuivre* (ed. M. Baillet et al.; DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 180–81. Devorah Dimant, *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies* (FAT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 41, mentions 11Q29 and 4Q589 together with 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB.

- 3 For the discussion on textual history, see especially Geza Vermes, “Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 42 (1991): 250–55; Philip S. Alexander, “The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–56; Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Devorah Dimant, “The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance,” *RevQ* 22 (2006): 615–30; Charlotte Hempel, “The Literary Development of the S Tradition—A New Paradigm,” *RevQ* 22 (2006): 389–401; Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009); Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 60–65. Controversy exists as to whether the oldest manuscripts (1QS, 4QpapS^{a,c}) can also be regarded as witnesses of the oldest textual form. According to Alexander and Dimant, this is the case, but according to Vermes, Metso, Hempel, Schofield, and Collins it is not. The situation is of course familiar from the study of “biblical” manuscripts: ms datings are not (necessarily) the same as the dating of the textual forms. For textual plurality in both the rule traditions and the attested biblical traditions, see Charlotte Hempel, “Pluralism and Authoritativeness: The Case of the S Tradition,” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. M. Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 193–208; Molly M. Zahn, “Torah for ‘The Age

completely valid enterprise, but it does not provide us with the entire picture. The issue at stake here is not only the labeling of the manuscripts,⁴ or our editorial principles (how to represent the manuscript evidence in the best possible ways for various needs), or the best model to explain interdependencies between the manuscripts. The issue is *conceptual* and *analogous*: how do we think about ancient manuscript variation and ancient manuscripts in the first place? There is a need to examine the ways in which both ancient scribes and modern scholars perceive conceptual categories that organize their view of the world and the information available to them.

There is a considerable new wave of scholarship that is critically considering which editorial principles we should follow; what we mean by our concepts such as “text,” “document,” “work”; and what it means to study an individual manuscript or a literary work.⁵ I hope to contribute to this discussion, in some small part, by investigating what S is as regards the following topics: the title “סרך היחד”; manuscript variation within the S category and with borderline cases; the question of whether 1QS is a special case of S—and if so, why?

2 The Title “(Sefer) Serekh ha-Yahad”

Let us start with the label. Are there grounds to say that all of the twelve or so manuscripts, designated by modern scholars as “S,” were labeled in ancient times with the title “סרך היחד”?⁶ The simple answer is “no”—simply due to poor preservation of many manuscripts, but also for other reasons. Let us consider the occurrences of the title on the *recto* (the writing side of the scroll). The expression “סרך היחד” occurs only *once* in its complete form in a possible titular usage: it is found in one of the oldest manuscripts (end of the second

of Wickedness’: The Authority of the Damascus and Serekh Texts in Light of Biblical and Rewritten Traditions,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 410–32.

4 See Hindy Najman and Eibert Tigchelaar, “A Preparatory Study of Nomenclature and Text Designation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *RevQ* 26 (2014): 305–25, for a discussion on varying naming principles in different DJD editions.

5 The field of study known as “New Material Philology” has been introduced in the study of pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially by Liv Ingeborg Lied; see idem and Hugo Lundhaug, eds., *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology* (De Gruyter, forthcoming).

6 Najman and Tigchelaar, “Nomenclature and Text Designation,” discuss different ways of naming the scrolls, one being based on preserved ancient Hebrew titles. They note the variation in different titles in S manuscripts.

century BCE), papyrus manuscript 4QpapS^a (4Q255). After a lacuna and some lost words, the first line preserves the words:⁷

ם[ל[ח]יז ספר סרכ היחד []m for his li[f]e(?), the book of the *Serekh*
of the *Yahad* (4Q255 1 1)

The manuscript 4QpapS^a has only four small fragments preserved. Two fragments out of the four (frag. A and B = 3 and 4) have no direct parallel in 1QS or elsewhere.⁸ Unfortunately, there is no certainty about how large the original scroll was; its clear parallels to 1QS are only from the beginning columns of 1QS (1QS 1 and 3).⁹

It is also noteworthy that the manuscript is an opisthograph: the other side (*recto* according to Tov) preserves 4Qpap Hodayot-Like Text B.¹⁰ The DJD editors Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes state: “The fact that [4QpapS^a] is written so roughly on the back of another text suggests that it may be an early draft or personal copy of S.”¹¹ Charlotte Hempel goes a little further and suggests that 4QpapS^a may have contained one of the earliest drafts of the *opening* columns of S, not yet as extensive in form as later attested.¹²

7 In 4QpapS^a, the final *kaf* is no different from medial *kaf*. Underlining is mine.

8 According to Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 27, the manuscript 4Q255 has four fragments: 1, 2, A and B. Before the DJD edition, Metso, *The Textual Development*, 18, numbered these fragments as 1, 2, 3, and 4.

9 Fragment 1 of 4QpapS^a preserves a parallel to 1QS 1:1–5 and fragment 2 preserves a parallel to 1QS 3:7–12, the section that tells how a person can become purified and atoned and join the covenant. In fragment 3 (or A), similar terminology to the discourse on the two spirits as known from 1QS has been identified, but there is no certainty that this was a similar discourse to one in 1QS. According to Eibert Tigchelaar, “These are the Names of the Spirits of . . . A Preliminary Edition of 4QCatalogue of Spirits (4Q230) and New Manuscript Evidence for the Two Spirits Treatise (4Q257 and 1Q29a),” *RevQ* 21 (2004): 529–47, at 546, the manuscript may “witness an alternative version of the first section of the Two Spirits Treatise.” For example, the expression רִחוּתֵי בְנֵי אִישׁ (4QpapS^a 3 4) is not found anywhere else, so there is clearly at least something unique to this manuscript.

10 Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 71.

11 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 30.

12 Charlotte Hempel, “The Long Text of the Serekh as Crisis Literature,” *RevQ* 27 (2015): 3–24—in contrast to Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 30, who think that the preserved title “suggests that 4QpapS^a was a ‘complete’ copy of S.” Cf. also Metso, *The Textual Development*, 18. Note that 4QpapS^c likewise preserves material parallel to 1QS 1–4 only and was copied at the same time as 1QS.

Fragment 1 of 4QpapS^a has a clear parallel to the opening lines of 1QS. Therefore, the title is also reconstructed at the beginning of 1QS (1:1), which is a reasonable suggestion.¹³ Noteworthy, however, is that 1QS too preserves about 21–22 letter spaces before the title:¹⁴

ל[...].שים לחיו [ספר סר]ך היחד לדרוש [] sym for his life, [the book
of the Sere]kh of the Yahad, to
study ... (1QS 1:1)¹⁵

If the manuscript started with some other type of the title or introduction, including the addressee, such as למשכיל,¹⁶ it means that the words ספר סרך היחד were not the only words used as a heading for the full manuscript, or that the words were not necessarily in titular usage here. This is not the place to study the term סרך in full. As is known from several studies, the term has its primary usage in military contexts, where it is about ordering people and divisions, often in written lists.¹⁷ The term is used in the Qumran corpus for

13 Note, however, that there is no room for anything else (such as a preposition) in the lacuna. The title is also reconstructed at the beginning of 4QpapS^c 1:1 and the handle sheet of 1QS (see below).

14 4QpapS^a probably had slightly fewer letter spaces than 1QS, Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 32.

15 Emanuel Tov and Donald W. Parry translate: “[] to live according to [the book of] the Yahad’s [Ru]le. (He is to teach them) to seek ...” (1QS 1:1) (Emanuel Tov and Donald W. Parry, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library: Texts and Images* [Leiden: Brill, 2006], hereafter “DSSEL”). Chad Martin Stauber, *Prophetic Scribalism: A Semantic, Textual and Hypertextual Study of the Serek Texts* (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2013), 68, considers here the translation of סרך as “list of instruction,” see below.

16 See the discussion on the beginning by Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 32.

17 Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 60–68; Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus 2; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1986); Charlotte Hempel, “סרך serek,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* (eds. H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen; 3 vols.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013), 2:111–17; Dimant, *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation*, 72–73. Note also critical remarks by Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters’ Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context* (STDJ 97; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 45, on Weinfeld’s understanding of the term as a self-designation of the sect. Most recently, Stauber, *Prophetic Scribalism*, 81–82, suggests that the semantic range of the term סרך covers four categories: spatial, hierarchical, martial, and procedural. He maintains that the core connotation of the term was “arrangement” rather than “rule.”

other (legal) lists of rules as well, often introducing subsections of rules, both in S and in other documents.¹⁸ For its titular usage within S, noteworthy are the beginning of the new section of 1QS 5: ... זה הסרך לאנשי היחד המתנדבים לשוב ... (1QS 5:1, but unparalleled in 4QS^d; see below) and the start of a subsection in 6:8: זה הסרך למושב הרבים “This is the rule for the session of the *rabbim*. . . .” The text of 1QSa starts with the term, clearly in titular form: זה הסרך לכול עדת ישראל “This is the rule for all the congregation of Israel” (1QSa 1:1; cf. 1:6).

So, do the words סרך היחד in 4QpapS^a 11 and 1QS 1:[1] refer to the (full) contents of these particular scrolls? If so, clearly the contents of the two would have been different. Alternatively, the words סרך היחד could refer to the manner of *ordering and organizing the people* volunteering for God. סרך היחד is certainly connected with the *hierarchical order* of the *yahad*, into which one publicly enters: 1QS 1:16 is the only other place where סרך היחד occurs precisely in this form, just before the covenant renewal ceremony.¹⁹

18 All in all, according to the DSSEL, the term סרך occurs, in explicit form, eight times in 1QS, four times in 1QSa, 19 times in 1QM, and 10 times in D. In the *War Scroll*, the term introduces subsections: 1QM 3:13, 4:9 (rule of the banners); 5:3, 9:10 (rule for ordering the divisions and rule for changing their order). Sometimes the term סדר is used besides סרך, and סרך seems to be in titular use. In the *Damascus Document* too, סרך introduces subsections of rules: CD 10:4 (rule for the judges), 12:19 (rule for assembly in cities), 12:22 (rule for assembly in camps), 13:7 (rule for the overseer of camp), 14:3 (rule for assembly in camps), 14:12 (rule for the *rabbim*). In contrast, the *halakhot* in the *Damascus Document* are introduced by the preposition על, (CD 9:8; 10:14). It may be that, at some stage, such laws could also be considered as rules, as shown by the statement in CD after the Sabbath laws, rules concerning the Gentiles, and food laws: “The rule for the sessions of the cities of Israel, dealing with these regulations to separate unclean from clean and to discriminate between holy and profane. *vacat*” (CD 12:19–20). CD 7:6–8 also refers to “the rule of the land” (בסרך הארץ), according to which people may live in camps, marry and beget children and then follow “the rule of the Torah” (בסרך התורה), which in the passage refers to vows in particular (Num 30).

19 Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, 64, considers this passage as referring to the name of the sect—but does it? Rather, the expression here refers to the hierarchical order of the *yahad*, or the annual assembly in covenant renewal and its inscribing of the people in their place.

וכול הבאים בסרך היחד יעבורו בברית
לפני אל לעשות ככול אשר צוה
All who enter the *Yahad's serekh* shall be initiated into the Covenant before God, agreeing to act according to all that He has commanded ... (1QS 1:16–17)

The members will enter the hierarchical order, and will also be enrolled/registered (כתב) in their place (cf. 1QS 1:20–21; 5:23; 6:22). From this perspective, the words סרך היחד, reconstructed in 1QS 1:1, are by no means used as an unambiguous name or label for the entire scroll.²⁰

However, the words סר[ך] היחד ומן are also reconstructed on the *verso* of the handle sheet, which most probably was originally stitched to 1QS.²¹ Both Jozef Milik and Metso consider the first words, סרך היחד, as referring to 1QS, and the title beginning with the preposition מן as referring to the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) and the *Rule of Blessing* (1QSB).²² Based on the more frag-

20 Note, however, that the (reconstructed) inclusion of the term ספר in 1QS 1:1 possibly highlights the written nature of the movement's organizing rules. Unfortunately, it is not clear whether ספר is the object in the sentence, begins a new sentence, or belongs to a subordinate remark in the sentence. According to Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Memory and Manuscript: Books, Scrolls, and the Tradition of the Qumran Texts,” in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005* (ed. E. G. Chazon and B. Halpern-Amaru; STDJ 88; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 133–50, this term was mostly used for “biblical” documents and sometimes for collections of *serakhim*. Very seldom is the term מגלה “scroll” used in the Qumran corpus.

21 J. T. Milik, “28. Annexes à la Règle de la Communauté (1QS),” in *Qumran Cave 1* (ed. D. Barthélemy et al.; DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 107–8, Pl. 28. However, Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 110, also reconstructs the word ספר: סר[ך] היחד ומן. If the handle sheet fragment is to be placed in the way Milik describes—i.e., to the right from the middle of Column 1 of 1QS, matching the horizontal break in the leather in the middle of 1QS 1 with Milik's handwritten vertical line in the photograph of the title (DJD 1: Plate 28)—then there certainly is room for such a restoration. The title on the *verso* would have been read from the bottom to the top of the scroll, the bottom of the letters pointing towards the outer edge of the scroll. For the attestation of a few titles on the back of handle sheets or on the back of the first or second sheet of scrolls, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 120–21, and note also the discussion of a possible title on the *verso* of the second sheet of 4Qpaps^c.

22 Milik, “28. Annexes,” 107; Metso, *The Textual Development*, 13–14. According to Metso, 1QSa and 1QSB “were copied on the same scroll by the same scribe” (13). On the preposition מן in titular usage, see 4Q174 (4QFlor 1–2 i 14): מדרש מאשרי [ה]איש (on Ps 1:1). However, the use of the preposition מן would have been somewhat different, and this usage is not attested elsewhere.

mentary state of preservation of 1QSa and 1QSB, these scrolls were probably rolled on the *outer* layers of the 1QS-1QSa-1QSB, and the beginning of 1QS was on the inside.²³ Considering the reading direction, the scrolls were rolled so that the end was at the beginning and the beginning at the end. In this state—in which the scrolls were put in Cave 1—the handle sheet title did not serve any purpose in identifying the scrolls.

However, it has not been ascertained whether or not 1QS and 1QSa were stitched together. Emanuel Tov refutes Milik's claim that they were stitched together.²⁴ If they were not stitched together, it makes it less likely in my mind that a title written on 1QS would have referred to other writings not physically part of the same scroll. However, Charlotte Hempel has reported, in a personal communication, having found in 2014 clear photographic evidence of stitching at the end of 1QS 11.²⁵ If this is so, and the stitching matches with 1QSa, the handle sheet title needs to be read accordingly, as referring not only to 1QS but also to 1QSa and 1QSB, and the common perception of 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB as clearly separate works also needs to be reconsidered.²⁶ There remains the possibility that the words סרך היחד may have referred to some smaller section within 1QS,²⁷ or that they could have functioned as a catchword in general

-
- 23 Metso, *The Textual Development*, 13: "The scroll was rolled with the beginning of the text in the inner layers." If one wanted to start reading from the beginning, one needed to re-roll the scroll(s).
- 24 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 111 n. 49. According to Tov, the handle sheet of 1QSa has marks of stitching, but the end of 1QS does not. Milik, "28. Annexes," 107, argues that 1QS and 1QSa were rolled together: the pattern of defects (rat bites, according to Milik) at the bottom of 1QSa appears to continue the same pattern as the one in 1QS. He also considers it "likely" that the two were stitched together since there seem to be two small needle holes visible at the end of 1QS—but he regrets that the photographs published by the American School (ASOR) do not let the matter be confirmed.
- 25 Exact details are in the process of being published. I wish to thank Dr. Hempel for sharing this piece of information with me.
- 26 1QS has an empty space at the end of column 11, suggesting that a new section or a new work began after this. Similarly, 1QSa has an empty space in column 2. Yet it makes a difference to talk about 1QS as a literary work, as if it were attested as such in multiple manuscripts, and to talk about 1QS-1QSa-1QSB as a unique manuscript, and the 4QS evidence as differently representing *parts* of 1QS.
- 27 Metso, *The Textual Development*, 14 n. 4, discusses Stegemann's view that the words "סרך היחד," written on the verso of 1QS, refer only to 1QS 1:1–3:12. She rejects this because no gap exists between this and the following section. But it should be noted that no gap exists between 1QS 4 and 5 either, although 1QS 5 clearly starts a new section. The possibility that "סרך היחד" refers to 1QS 1:1–3:12 could be supported by the fact that 4QpapS^a too may contain only material parallel to 1QS 1–3 (and possibly 4).

for identifying the scroll that included material about ordering and governing the people of the *yahad*. Therefore, סרך היחד may primarily refer to collective organizing rules, not fixed scrolls themselves, and ספר סרך היחד may refer to rules in inscribed form, or to the documented writing activity concerned with the ordering of people.

3 S as Made Up of Parallels

The titles and beginnings of the other scrolls known as “S” have not been preserved—except for 4QS^d, which starts with the words מדרש למשכיל על אנשי התורה “*Midrash for the maskil concerning the men of the Torah*” (cf. 1QS 5:1 above). The grounds for considering these other scrolls as representing “S” then naturally come from their *parallels* to other S manuscripts, most notably 1QS, which is the best preserved.²⁸ But how much parallel material is required and how much variation is allowed for a manuscript to “qualify” as “S”? For anyone who has ever taken a look at what the Cave 4 S-manuscripts are like, it comes as no surprise that they are different sorts of manuscripts, from different periods, in different materials (papyrus, leather), preserved in different lengths, written in different scripts and layout, and preserving different sections and different textual forms.²⁹

*There is no single manuscript, labelled as “S,” that is identical to another S manuscript, neither as regards textual form nor inclusion and preservation of the same textual sections.*³⁰ Of course, we have only fragmentary evi-

28 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 1, state: “The *Community Rule* or *Serekh ha-Yahad* (S), known also as the *Manual of Discipline*, is attested by one, almost complete, scroll from cave 1 (1QS) and by numerous fragments from cave 4 (4QS^{a-j}).” Often, they speak of “copies” of the *Community Rule* (8, 9, e.g.). Similarly, the editors Elisha Qimron and James H. Charlesworth, “Cave IV Fragments Related to the Rule of the Community (4Q255–265 = 4QS MSS A–J),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. James H. Charlesworth, et al.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994), 53–103, state at 53: “Twelve copies of the *Rule of the Community* have been identified in the Qumran Caves.”

29 Thus, for example, Sarianna Metso, “Constitutional Rules at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 186–210 at 193, rightly notes: “No standard collection of texts existed . . . In fact, there seems to have been considerable variation as to which works or sections of works could have been copied on the same scroll.” For variation in the physical features, see Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 18–19.

30 This is downplayed by Dimant, “The Composite Character,” at 621, who emphasizes that the 4QS manuscripts, when taken together, have all the sections of 1QS represented in

dence, but for this very reason it is all the more important to talk about what we have.

Easiest to criticize for the labeling of manuscripts as “S” are the single-fragment “manuscripts,” such as 4QS^{ij} (4Q263, 4Q264) and 5QS (5Q11). For example, the single fragment of 4QSⁱ preserves a parallel to the end of the final hymn of 1QS (1QS 11:13–22). This fragment has stitching to the left, suggesting that this manuscript did not end where 1QS ends (1QS 11:22).³¹ Some other label might give a better impression of what the manuscript is about, such as “4QS-Hymn,” given that no rule material is preserved.

A further example of a poorly-preserved manuscript is 4QS^h (4Q262). This manuscript preserves three fragments, although the inclusion of the third fragment with this manuscript has been questioned.³² Two of the three fragments of 4QS^h have no parallel in 1QS or elsewhere. Fragment 1 preserves a parallel to 1QS 3:4–5, from the section discussing a person who cannot be purified if he refuses to enter (the covenant?). Should this manuscript be considered as “S” and on what grounds? Indeed, Metso considers it even likely that the manuscript is a copy of some other work, “quoting a phrase from the Community Rule.”³³ This view seems to be based on the *amount* of shared material, which is too little to create an impression that we are dealing with the same literary work, and also on the fact that *what* is shared (i.e., par. to 1QS 3:4–5) could be a “floating” quotation, since it is also found in another manuscript/work, 5Q13.³⁴ The DJD editors Alexander and Vermes, on the other hand, state: “This scroll may not have been a complete copy of S but a miscellany which included some S material.”³⁵ But why do they not consider it as a complete copy of S?

them, and that the differences are merely “variations on the same themes.” I am not denying any of the similarities but rather emphasizing that each manuscript is unique and that the uniqueness of 1QS ought to be properly acknowledged.

- 31 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 202, consider the possibility that 1QSa followed, but conclude that it is impossible to say what the following text was. The stitching may also be evidence of a handle sheet, not a sheet with writing.
- 32 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 11. If the fragment does not belong here, two fragments remain, and only one has a parallel to 1QS. In the edition by Qimron and Charlesworth, “Cave IV Fragments (4Q255–265 = 4QS MSS A–J),” 98–99, the manuscript has only one fragment, the one that is parallel to 1QS 3:4–6.
- 33 Metso, *The Textual Development*, 61; idem, *The Serekh Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 5.
- 34 Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 62, also proposes the possibility that 4QS^h is a copy of 5Q13 (= not S, according to present editions).
- 35 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 11. Cf. also *ibid.*, 190: 4QS^h is not a “full copy of S, but an anthology of different texts which contained some S material.”

Quite obviously it *is not* a complete copy of S since the manuscript is not *preserved* completely. However, the editors seem to be implying that there was such a thing as “complete S” (a thing that is finished, superior, and final), which 4QS^h was not.³⁶ What is this complete S? It is either 1QS, as the completely preserved manuscript represents (for them) the (most) complete form of S, or some other manuscript that is considered as representing the final textual form of the work “S.”³⁷ I will return to 1QS below, but let us first discuss what completeness in this scenario might entail.

Scholars agree that manuscript variation is the very essence of most manuscript cultures. Recently some scholars, like Eva Mroczek and Francis Borchardt, have started to seek useful analogies for ancient manuscript cultures in the contemporary digital culture that display similarities in fluctuation and the never-ending processes of changes.³⁸ In open-source programs (such as Wiki-databases, Linux, Mozilla Firefox Internet Browser), “the products are by their very design adaptable” for anyone who has access to the code and is able to improve its properties or adapt its functions for his or her needs.³⁹ Yet this is not everybody’s business: a very small minority—now and then—is and was literate and skilled enough to operate with such programs and scrolls. Furthermore, such processes result in variant versions, used simultaneously, and often with no linear evolution. *Every product is complete (for the one who uses it), and no product is complete*: the success of the products depends on the user communities adopting them and further adjusting

36 Contra Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 154: “On the basis of comparison between the manuscripts of the Community Rule found in Caves 1, 4 and 5 it is clear that there never existed a single, legitimate and up-to-date version of the Community Rule.” Similarly, Hempel, “Pluralism and Authoritativeness,” 193–208, esp. 208, insists that the final, authoritative “*Endtext*” of the Rule cannot be established.

37 Alexander, “The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yahad,” thinks that 4QS^e represents the youngest and thus most final textual form, whereas Metso, *The Textual Development*, thinks that 1QS represents the most final, expanded textual form. It is to be noted that the latter view does not claim that 1QS was an expanded edition of 4QS^{b,d} but that 1QS is a more expanded edition than 4QS^{b,d}.

38 Francis Borchardt, “The Open Source Bible: The Court Tales of the Book of Daniel as Source Code” (paper presented at the SBL Annual Meeting, Chicago, 2012); Eva Mroczek, “Thinking Digitally About the Dead Sea Scrolls: Book History Before and Beyond the Book,” *Book History* 14 (2011): 241–69. I thank Dr. Borchardt for sharing his paper in written form with me.

39 Borchardt, “Open Source Bible.”

them, and authorship is irrelevant to the users.⁴⁰ From this perspective, the focus is not on one rule tradition that was then expanded or abbreviated, split into different traditions, or standardized, but on multiple representatives of information regarded as necessary and helpful in a given situation and for a given group of people.

But we must not mix two different levels of analysis. At the one level, it is still often worthwhile to try and reconstruct at least the broad textures of textual history, both on the basis of existing manuscript evidence (which variant readings might represent earlier forms? can we identify a continuous tradition of change? are the directions of change consistent in comparing one manuscript to another?) and on the basis of source-/literary-critical method (which sections of texts probably existed independently? what has been added? what is repeated? which sections might represent earlier or later traditions?).⁴¹ Concerning S, this may result in messy lines of interdependence if looked at in detail.

The other level of analysis is one in which scholars ask what scrolls and manuscripts and rules are for their users, and how each individual product is both unique and a carrier of traditions or knowledge—boundless and ever-revealing information. Rather than completeness or difference, what becomes interesting is the information in each individual form of its existence (even in fragmentary form but without assuming prior “completeness” as a measure), and the information that *persists* and the ways in which it is transmitted over and over again. We should be pondering why certain sections and traditions are transmitted in the first place. I think part of the answer, in this material at least, has to do with the fact that the earlier information is a template on which to hang new items. There were different templates that gave different results (“search results” or “windows” into the rules traditions). As regards the S material, the “coming together” rules (i.e., rules about assemblies and their activities) may have been one set of rule material that was naturally attached

40 Borchardt, “Open Source Bible.” Mroczek, “Thinking Digitally,” 252, speaks of a scribe as “an inspired performer.”

41 In my view, the work by Metso, *The Textual Development*, largely operates in making sense of the existing manuscript evidence and their relationships, whereas the work by Charlotte Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies* (TSAJ 154; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), seeks to look into the different traditions beyond the attestation in manuscript evidence, and also across D and S.

to rules about how to join the movement, whom to expel, and which behaviors to punish.⁴²

If the idea of completeness (understood as the most final textual form, or even the best preserved form) is given up, then the modern category of S must be opened toward other categories and seen as having fuzzy boundaries.⁴³ One good candidate to be considered in this regard is 5Q13, which is not labeled as “S” but becomes pertinent because of its relationship to the S material. The manuscript is entitled *5QCiting the Community Rule*⁴⁴ or *5Q(Sectarian) Rule*,⁴⁵ since only one of its over twenty small fragments has a clear parallel to other known S material.⁴⁶ Explicit parallels to 1QS/4QS/5QS exist in 5Q13 fragment 4: these are about covenant renewal material (cf. 1QS 2:19; 3:4–9 // 4QpapS^a 2 // 4QpapS^c 1a iii, 2a–g // 4QSh^h 1 // 5QS [5Q11]), but the order of themes is slightly different from 1QS.⁴⁷ The material before this, in 5Q13 fragments 1–3, is about recounting God’s great works in the past, and the text mentions at least Enoch,

42 This may be supported by the fact that in 1QS columns 5–8 are corrected most by the scribe or secondary scribe/reader; this is the most complex tradition that already had a transmission history through several hands.

43 Most prominently, S has been compared to D, and these two clearly create partially overlapping categories; see especially the work of Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*. More often, comparisons are socio-historical in nature; see Cecilia Wassen and Jutta Jokiranta, “Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. D. J. Chalcraft; London: Equinox, 2007), 205–45; Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 54–60.

44 Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 61.

45 J. T. Milik, “5Q13. Une Règle de la secte,” in DJD 3, 181–83; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Sectarian Rule (5Q13),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. James H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994), 132–43.

46 Most of the fragments of 5Q13 contain only a few words or letters, which has to be taken into account if the amount of shared material is significant in determining the nature of the manuscript: many fragments cannot be identified properly, and the belonging of all fragments to the same scroll has also been questioned; see Schiffman, “Sectarian Rule (5Q13),” 132–43; Menahem Kister, “5Q13 and the ‘Avodah: A Historical Survey and Its Significance,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 136–48.

47 For example, the rule of following the practice annually is mentioned only after the rule about purification; Schiffman, “Sectarian Rule (5Q13),” 137. Schiffman notes that the examination before the *mevaqquer* resembles CD 15:11 rather than 1QS where the examination takes place before the *paqid* (1QS 6:13–15). In the other fragments, further parallels to 1QS exist in 5Q13: the theme of confession in 5Q13 22 (cf. 1QS 1:25) and the annual cycle in 5Q13 28 (cf. 1QS 2:19, 5:24).

Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and Levi.⁴⁸ Menahem Kister reconstructs fragments 1 and 2 of 5Q13 as part of the same column, so that it is explicitly the priests who pronounce these hidden things: “What is described here is God’s election of human beings in narrowing circles: Creation—[Adam]—Enoch (?)—Noah—Abraham—Isaac—Jacob—Levi—Aaron. Aaron’s functions (in other words, the priestly functions) are smoothly connected with the annual renewal of the covenant, a ceremony in which priests played a significant role.”⁴⁹ Even without such a reconstruction, the manuscript is the kind of material that very well fits the action referred to in the covenant renewal ceremony of 1QS 1:21–22: “The priests are to rehearse God’s gracious acts made manifest by mighty deeds, heralding His loving mercies on Israel’s behalf.”⁵⁰ Therefore, 5Q13 has much greater potential to be seen as S-type material than first appears on the basis of the existence of strict parallels.⁵¹

Table 1 demonstrates that none of the 4QS manuscripts contains material from all the sections of 1QS. Even the most comprehensive 4QS manuscript with regard to different types of sections preserved, that is 4QS^b (4Q256), lacks several sections that are part of 1QS.⁵² Therefore, at this point we should be

-
- 48 The theme and vocabulary are reminiscent of psalms where God is praised for remembering and keeping his covenant with the ancestors, e.g., Ps 105:8–10.
- 49 Kister, “5Q13 and the ‘Avodah.’” Kister further discusses the similarities of 5Q13 to the later poetic surveys of ancestral history in the Day of Atonement liturgy.
- 50 Cf. 4QS^b frgs. 2a–c lines 5–6. See also Devorah Dimant, “The Flood as a Preamble to the Lives of the Patriarchs: The Perspective of Qumran Hebrew Texts,” in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. D. Dimant and R. G. Kratz; BZAW 439; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 101–34.
- 51 This is also what Schiffman, “Sectarian Rule (5Q13),” 133, states “... may function as a *serekh*, a rule, for the conduct of the covenant renewal and the mustering ceremony of the Qumran sect.” The liturgical elements in 5Q13 point towards another set of manuscripts, the *Berakhot* (4Q286–290), which likewise include a combination of rules and liturgical material connected to the covenant ritual. Should parts of S be seen as *Berakhot* or the other way around? Or should one be seen as an embryonic form of the other? Here again fuzzy boundaries exist.
- 52 See further discussion, also on whether the manuscript included the discourse of the two spirits or perhaps something else and possibilities of material reconstruction, by Metso, *The Textual Development*, 61; Jutta Jokiranta and Hanna Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of the S and M Documents,” in *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism* (ed. M. S. Pajunen and H. Tervanotko; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 108; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015), 11–60. Another manuscript, 4QS^d (4Q258), which together with 4QS^b represents the shorter textual form and which does not contain material from 1QS 1–4, probably included, according to the material reconstruction by

PENAL CODE	COMMUNITY PRINCIPLES & COMING TOGETHER:	MASKIL'S TEACHING ON THE TWO SPIRITS	ANNUAL PRACTICE; REFUSING MEMBER	COVENANT RENEWAL CEREMONY	COMMUNITY INTRODUCTION:
(1 QS 6:24–7:25)	how to turn to the Law and separate from wickedness; Eating, praying, sharing counsel; Rabbim sessions; Admission (1 QS 5:1–13a, 13b-25a; 5:25b–6:8a; 6:8a–23)	(1 QS 3:13–19a; 3:19b–4:1; 4:2–8, 9–14, 15–26)	(1 QS 2:19–3:12)	(1 QS 1:21–2:10; 2:1–18)	love what God loves and hate what God hates (1 QS 1:1–20)
		?4QpapS ^a (1 QS 3:20–25?)	4QpapS ^a (1 QS 3:7–12)		4QpapS ^a (1 QS 1:1–5)
	4QS ^b (1 QS 5:1–20; 6:10–13, 16–18)			4QS ^b (1 QS 1:21–23; 2:4–11)	4QS ^b (1 QS 1:16–19)
4QS ^d (1 QS 7:13)	(1 QS 5:1–6:12 [LACKS 1 QS 1–4])				
4QS ^g (1 QS 6:24–7:3; 7:9–18)	4QS ^g (1 QS 5:22–24; 6:2–5, 22)				
4QS ^e (1 QS 7:8–15, 20–25)					
		4QpapS ^c (1 QS 4:4–10, 13–15, 23–25)	4QpapS ^c (1 QS 2:26–3:10)	4QpapS ^c (1 QS 2:4–11)	4QpapS ^c (1 QS 1:2–3)
?11Q29 (1 QS 7:18–19?)	4QS ⁱ (1 QS 5:26–6:4)	?1Q29a (1 QS 4:7, 9, 10?)	4QS ^h (1 QS 3:4–5) 5Q13 (1 QS 3:4–9)	5Q11 (1 QS 2:4–7, 12–14?)	

TABLE 1 Different IQS sections as preserved and represented by “S” or “S-like” manuscripts. Note that the table does not include the non-parallels to IQS that many of these manuscripts also contain. Read from right to left.

RULE OF BLESSING	RULE OF CONGREGATION	HYMN FOR MASKIL	RULES FOR MASKIL	ATONEMENT & SEPARATION	TWELVE MEN AND THREE PRIESTS; ATONEMENT & SEPARATION;
(1 QSb)	(1 QSa)	in 1st person (1 QS 10:5b–11:15a; 11:15b–22)	(1 QS 9:12–19a; 9:19b–10:5a)	until prophet and two Messiahs (1 QS 9:3–5a, 5b–11)	DEVIA NT MEMBER & RIGHT TO REJOIN (1 QS 8:1–4a, 4b–19; 8:20–9:2)
4Qpap cryptA Serekh ha-’Edah ^{a,i}					
		4Q ^{Sb} (1 QS 10:5–8, 13–18; 11:22 + ?)	4Q ^{Sb} (1 QS 9:17–223; 10:3–5)		
		4Q ^{Sd} (1 QS 10:5–18; 11:14–15)	4Q ^{Sd} (1 QS 9:15–10:5)	4Q ^{Sd} (1 QS 9:3–10)	4Q ^{Sd} (1 QS 8:6–17, 19, 21; 8:24–9:2)
		4Q ^{Sf} (1 QS 10:9–11, 15–24)	4Q ^{Se} (1 QS 9:12–24) + (4Q319=4QOtot)	4Q ^{Se} (1 QS 8:1–15 [LACKS 1 QS 8:16–9:11])	
		4Q ^{Si} (1 QS 11:13–22 + ?)	4Q ^{Sf} (1 QS 9:23–24; 10:1–5?)		

ready to say that S materially means different things, and that there should be no clear and firm boundaries on what could or could not be considered to constitute S. Nevertheless, there is a strong tradition in scholarship that considers 1QS as one of the main texts of the movement and a standard copy of S. Let us last turn to 1QS as a category exemplar of S.

4 Priority of 1QS?

Several arguments have been made that suggest that 1QS is, in some sense, a special manuscript, and I shall discuss these four:

1. 1QS is large-sized and preserved better than others
2. 1QS was corrected
3. 4QS mss were corrected according to 1QS
4. (Carefully outlined) contents; scheme that makes it a literary work

1. 1QS is almost entirely intact, in large format, and well-preserved due to its placement in a jar. The large format and the nice layout, with sophisticated scribal marks in the margins, have indicated to many scholars evidence of a special status for the manuscript.⁵³ However, public use is not necessarily an indication that it stood as an “official” or “model” copy within the movement. At least, we do not have the evidence to suggest that 1QS *was* a model copy for other copies—*there is no scroll identical to 1QS*.

Tov does not include 1QS in his list of *deluxe* editions, but does include 1QSa as a possible case. The writing blocks of 1QS are large, but not “very large” according to Tov’s categorization.⁵⁴ The use of *vacats* in the first two columns (1QS 1:21; 2:11; 2:19) and *paragraphos* signs in the margins nicely cohere with the “amen, amen” responses ending sections in the covenant renewal ceremony. Also, in columns 3–6 and 9–11 the scribal *paragraphos* signs, often but not always reinforced by the use of *vacats* (either at the beginning of the line and/or in the end/middle of the previous line), indicate where the distinct sections

Metso, *The Textual Development*, 40, material parallel to 1QS 6:12–8:6 but in shorter form (1/5 shorter). On the other hand, its section on keeping away from the people of injustice is some lines *longer* than in 1QS (4QS^d 7); see Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, 101.

53 Eibert Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” in *Emanuel*, 439–52, esp. 451; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 91; Dimant, “The Composite Character,” esp. 620, 622.

54 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 87, 125–29.

of the text were perceived to be (for oral recitation? for study purposes?).⁵⁵ In columns 7–8, this is much messier, and column 7 lacks the *paragraphos* signs altogether, except for the paleo-Hebrew sign at the bottom.⁵⁶ Furthermore, column 11 is written on a separate sheet in tighter line spacing, suggesting even the possibility that this sheet was inserted secondarily or replaced by a new one (however, the text is continuous from the previous column). What does all this mean? The layout and the scribal system speak for some public or educational “inventory” use, but the unevenness in the quality does not mark it as an ideal manuscript for any “official” use, at least in columns 7–8. The question of whether this scroll was used continuously and handled more frequently than the other scrolls is difficult to answer when we cannot analyze the number of fingerprints on the scroll. Some other manuscripts, especially 4QSB, while not having as large writing blocks as 1QS, are equally well-prepared and have fairly large margins.⁵⁷

2. It is well known that 1QS is not a very carefully-prepared manuscript, since it contains many scribal errors and corrections, and its syntax too may be unclear.⁵⁸ However, some scholars have suggested that the corrections in 1QS indicate that this manuscript was especially carefully corrected in order to serve as a model of the *Community Rule*. According to Eibert Tigchelaar, “The series of subsequent corrections, and the almost perfect preservation of the scroll, suggests that this scroll was kept in honour, perhaps even as the model scroll of the Rule of Community.”⁵⁹ The scribe of 1QS was less trained, but according to Tigchelaar this was not just because of his clumsiness: the scribe was influenced by the weakening of gutturals and by Aramaisms.⁶⁰ Tigchelaar

55 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 180–85. See also 151 for agreement and disagreement in the section divisions between 1QS and some 4QS mss.

56 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 207, 11. Paleo-Hebrew letter signs occur in 1QS 5:1 (*waw*), bottom of 1QS 7 and 1QS 9:3 (composite signs). These could indicate major (sub)divisions in the text.

57 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 18.

58 Thus Qimron and Charlesworth, “Cave IV Fragments Related to the Rule of the Community (4Q255–265 = 4QS MSS A–J),” 53, even note: “It is unwise to assume it [1QS] is the final or best version of this important collection of rules.” Yet, at the same time, they follow what could be called a maximalist principle in editing 4QS manuscripts: 4QS texts are reconstructed according to 1QS where possible (54). See also Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 15–16.

59 Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” 451.

60 Many corrections have to do with gutturals. The number of corrections is “extremely high” in 1QS 5–8, “relatively small” in 1QS 1–3 and 8:15–9:11 (Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” 451). Paul Garnet, “Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5.1–7: Towards a Serek Text History,” *JSP* 8 (1997): 67–78, suggests that 1QS was written from dictation, causing many phonetic

compares 1QS to 4Q*Testimonia* (4Q175), which is thought to have been written by the same scribe.⁶¹ According to Tigchelaar, the scribe was *more* consistent in orthography and morphology in writing 1QS than in writing 4Q*Testimonia*, which is a one-sheet collection of biblical traditions on the promised prophet, royal and priestly messiahs, and on cursing the one who rebuilds a ruined city.⁶² This too would speak for the special attention paid to writing 1QS. Moreover, there is a clear ideological correspondence between 4Q*Testimonia* and 1QS 9:11, which mentions the expectation of the prophet and messiahs of Aaron and Israel. Tigchelaar goes on to suggest that the scribe of 1QS compiled the biblical quotations in 4Q*Testimonia*, or, alternatively, used these quotations to compose a section in 1QS 9:3–11, which clearly is an independent section within 1QS (the whole section of 8:15b–9:11 is missing in 4QSe). Tigchelaar writes:

Perhaps the scribe of 1QS composed this duplicate [i.e., 9:3–11] and inserted it together with the penal code material in his scroll. If that is the case, the scribe may have been one of the leaders of the Community, entitled to insert his scriptural interpretation in the Community's Rulebook. This might explain why someone who was “careless” and “less competent” as a scribe was nonetheless entrusted to copy the 1QS scroll, and why this scroll was preserved so well.⁶³

This is an intriguing idea: an innovative theologian/exegete was perhaps not the best possible scribe, and in order to have the authority to make such an insertion, one had to have some position of power. However, I am not yet fully convinced. First, as noted by Tigchelaar too, the inconsistencies in orthography and morphology in 4Q*Testimonia* are at least partly due to following the different orthographies and morphologies of the “biblical” source manuscripts. The difference of “less inconsistency” in 1QS might therefore not be that great,

mistakes. Garnet thinks 1QS was *one* of the official copies, dictated in a session (explaining the phonetic mistakes made by the scribe); such a session “only becomes worthwhile when several copies are being made at the same time” (77).

- 61 It is often held that 1QS was written by the same scribe who wrote 1QSa, 1QSB, 4QSam^c, 4Q*Testimonia* (4Q175) and corrections in 1QIsa^a. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 23; Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” 439–52.
- 62 For the recent discussion on the meaning of 4Q175, see David Katzin, “The Use of Scripture in 4Q175,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 200–236.
- 63 Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” 452. Note, however, that this section is present also in 4QSD, so the interpolation was not known by the scribe of 1QS only, but was also transmitted elsewhere. For 1QS 9:3–11 being a secondary duplicate of 1QS 8:1–15, see Metso, *The Textual Development*, 61.

although it is important to note the “undisciplined script” in *4QTestimonia*, which to Tigchelaar suggests a private use.⁶⁴

Secondly, the possible exegetical activity by the scribe does not yet show that this particular scribe was in a leading position and that *other scribes* of S manuscripts were not, or that the other innovations present in other manuscripts would not have been as important. If the presence of extensive corrections indicates a model copy, are we ready to ascribe that similar notion to other corrected manuscripts?⁶⁵

From the perspective of those who used the scroll, it seems that whoever produced or ordered the production of 1QS(-1QSa-1Qsb) was not satisfied with the end result. Such a large scroll was not inexpensive—if it was badly produced, there was need to ascertain some quality in the way of its reception (or performance?), and it may have, at one point in time, been too costly to produce a new, equally extensive manuscript.

3. In the case where 1QS would have worked as a model copy, we should be able to see other manuscripts being corrected towards it. Some evidence for this has been suggested. For example, in 4QpapS^c (4Q257) 5:4, the scribe has written the words זרע ופְּרִי, “fruitfulness of the seed,” in the margin. Tigchelaar proposes: “In view of the likelihood that in other cases 4Q257 v had a different and sometimes shorter text than 1QS IV, one may also consider a different possibility, namely that the scribe copied an alternative and shorter form of the Two Spirits Treatise, and later added some pluses which we know from 1QS.”⁶⁶ These cases need further attention. However, cases for the reverse also exist: the corrections in 1QS, if real corrections towards known readings and not just interpolations by a later scribe,⁶⁷ must have derived from other existing copies, and some corrections of 1QS can be shown to exist at least in 4QS versions (but not to derive from them, considering the ms age of most of them).⁶⁸ It seems that, in columns 1QS 1–4, a relatively stable textual form existed, and in columns 1QS 5–8 the situation was much messier. In general, the superiority of any one manuscript cannot be determined on the basis of linear evolution or corrections towards a single manuscript.⁶⁹

64 Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” 451.

65 For scribal corrections in the DSS, See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 87, 125–29. See also Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 18.

66 Tigchelaar, “These are the Names of the Spirits of . . .,” 542.

67 See Metso, *The Textual Development*, 61, for the corrections.

68 See Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*; Metso, *The Textual Development*, 61.

69 It is clear that there is no one direction of dependence between 1QS and 4QS. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, 93–94, has presented at least *some* convincing cases where

4. Lastly, 1QS can be thought of as a model on the basis of content. Devorah Dimant is perhaps the strongest voice in seeing 1QS as having a “fundamental homogeneity of style, ideas, and structure” and a “carefully assembled and edited sequence.”⁷⁰ But even if one does not see such coherence in the document, it is illuminating to think about what makes S a prototype in our minds and what could have marked it as such in ancient times. The combination of information that 1QS conveys is memorable, *sticky*. The discourse on the two spirits and the understanding of the community as a temple, in particular—elements that are lacking in D—might make it a powerful and sustaining concept and subsequently influence the perception of the other material for those who had an acquaintance with it.⁷¹ Once you have heard the two spirits’ paths and cosmic divisions, your world would probably not be the same: you would see things differently if you accepted such information.

To me, 1QS has not been convincingly shown to have been the primary model copy for the other S manuscripts, based on material considerations. Whether it was a powerful model for the movement in the oral tradition or whether it remained an experiment that did not win a wide audience is another puzzle, and perhaps one that can never be completely solved.

5 Conclusions

So what is S? First and foremost, it is our scholarly construct for labeling the material remains of a handful of manuscripts—but, at this level, the construct inevitably has its flaws and shortcomings. There never existed “twelve copies of S”—instead, there now exist remains of *more* than twelve manuscripts, which have various types of parallels, as well as non-parallels at the same time, between them, and which often have parallels to other non-S manuscripts as well (such as to D, 5Q13, 4Q265, *Berakhot*, 4Q275 *Communal Ceremony*,

4QS mss preserve secondary readings in comparison to 1QS: for example, 4QS^d 2:6 (כול הנמצא איש את רעהו) does not make sense but 1QS 6:2 (כול הנמצא את רעהו) does, and 4QS^d 2:3, 4 preserve longer, probably additional readings where 1QS 5:23, 24 lacks the reading of “Torah.”

70 Dimant, “The Composite Character,” at 620, 621.

71 Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), skillfully discusses this aspect of 1QS in analyzing how it creates the “sectarian self”. Another example of sticky ideas, or “noisy” references could be the “sons of Zadok”; see further Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 211–227.

4Q279*Four lots*, etc.).⁷² The use of the S-label indeed often misleads us to think of something similar to or as “complete” as 1QS, and draws unwarranted distinctions between those S and non-S manuscripts that might otherwise be seen on the same continuum or at least on overlapping or tangential paths. If 1QS is used as a standard, then all other S manuscripts should, to be precise, be labeled as *1QS-like manuscripts* and we might also include under this label borderline cases such as 5Q13.

What matters, of course, is if the ancients perceived all our S manuscripts (and only these twelve) as “S,” and, to me, it appears that no compelling evidence to argue this point exists, as the study of the great variation and preservation of different sections in 4QS manuscripts and the possible titular usage of the term “סרך היחד” also indicates. ספר סרך היחד, if understood as referring to the complete contents of the scrolls in question, may have been a valid identification for the oldest S-papyrus (4QpapS^a) and for 1QS, but then it meant different things; most likely these manuscripts did not include an identical text of similar length. The text of 4QS^d is clearly a *midrash* for the *maskil*.

On the other hand, if we allow that 1QS is just one exemplar of rule collections, perhaps a “collected volume” of rules, then we might use “S” for the sake of convenience as a *family resemblance* concept⁷³ that marks these manuscripts as related, but also allows that different sorts of relatives might also exist outside the S category. We know this is not unproblematic either. For example, even the סרך היחד or יחד terminology does not occur in every case

72 For a short list of parallels between 1QS and other manuscripts, see Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26, 3. Comparisons to different manuscript groups should not only take heed of similar traditions and themes but also start to look at individual manuscript features and their respective paleographic dates. For example, concerning D, the ms evidence should be related to S more closely: only 4Q266 and 4Q271 are Hasmonean (4Q271 late Hasmonean or early Herodian) according to Ada Yardeni, *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy & Design* (London/New Castle: The British Library/Oak Knoll Press, 2002), and the rest are Herodian. 4Q266 is semi-cursive. According to Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–4Q273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 2, 4Q266 is “either an early draft, or more likely, a copy written for personal rather than public use.” It is interesting though that this ms seems to preserve the widest range of material; others preserve less material (as if the pattern were the same as in S: early large mss, and then later, shorter ones?). Noteworthy too is that some mss (4Q272, 4Q273) do not preserve any material from the Admonition.

73 In using the term “family resemblance” here I am drawing attention to those mss that share similarities in some features, but lack a single, unifying theme. Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 1, too, speaks of the rule texts as members of the same family.

within S: 4QS^{h,i,j} do not preserve these terms, so this family does not have an equally representative surname for all its members.⁷⁴

Moving from material remains towards a slightly higher level of abstraction and searching for possibilities of ancient perception, another way to think of S is to think of *prototypicality*: what is the most prototypical S material that differentiates these pieces from other classes of information? Considering the meanings of both the *serekh* and the *yahad*, the most prototypical S rules should be foremost rules for collective activities, for assembling and transmitting the purpose and the manner of organizing the decision-making of the movement (this also includes the annual gathering). The least prototypical S material from this perspective might be the discourse on the two spirits and the other teaching sections for the *maskil*, or his hymn, or the calendar section 4QOtot.⁷⁵ Notably, this approach is different from past scholarship, where the most prototypical piece of information for many scholars was the teaching of the two spirits.

Yet a third way to think of what S is is to think of what makes it memorable and cognitively persistent. From this perspective, S may be made up of a unique combination of pieces of information that alone would not be regarded similarly. What then did persist? On the basis of the extant evidence, it seems that 1QS was one of the earliest attempts to bring very different material together. Columns 1–4 were put together and perhaps for the first time added to columns 5–9, which already had a longer textual history, resulting in a not-so-coherent form containing duplicates, corrections, and expansions. The beginning (cols. 1–4) and the final hymn at the end (cols. 10–11) created a liturgical framework for the rules in the middle.⁷⁶ Furthermore, 1QSa and 1QSB, if sewn together with 1QS, are an integral part of what makes this combination

74 However, in 4QSⁱ, the *yahad* and the “council” terminology are quite likely since the ms contains a passage on communal gatherings.

75 The calendar section of course differs from the teaching section in that it prescribes and gives the foundation for behavior at correct times, but the section does not refer to itself as *serekh*; rather it is closer to halakhic traditions. For the function of 4QOtot, see Robert Kugler, “Of Calendars, Community Rules, and Common Knowledge: Understanding 4QS-e-4QOtot, with Help from Ritual Studies,” in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. M. L. Grossman; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 215–28.

76 Scholars have suggested that this whole collection would have served in the covenant renewal ceremony, e.g., Russell C. D. Arnold, *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community* (STDJ 60; Leiden: Brill, 2006). However tempting this idea may be, the evidence clearly points, in my opinion, towards recording information and traditions rather than an actual liturgical work used in one ritual setting.

unique. Whether this whole presents itself as a nicely structured literary work or a more loose collection may depend on the eye of the reader, both ancient and modern.

Recently, Hempel has highlighted the significance of Columns 1–4, to the extent that she distinguishes between the “long text” of S and “short text” of S, the “long” here meaning the inclusion of material from 1QS 1–4. Thus it is not 1QS against other (shorter) 4QS versions but rather 4QpapS^a, 4QpapS^c, 1QS, and 4QS^b against the rest of the manuscripts, that is, the short or uncertain cases that either begin in 1QS 5 (4QS^d) or preserve only material from certain middle or final sections of 1QS (4QS^{g,e,f}).⁷⁷ However, it should be borne in mind that 4QpapS^{a,c} are somewhat uncertain with regard to what exactly they contained from 1QS 1–4 and how large they were.

It is useful to think about what happens when material such as extensive teaching sections (e.g., on the two spirits) or hymns are attached to the rule material. The new information gains a structured and organized sense: this hymn or teaching belongs to a rational, well-grounded and functional movement. It is always a two-way path: hymns and teaching are there to motivate the following of the rules, and rules are there to justify and structure the in-depth teaching.

However, *this compiled (educational? liturgical? archival? documentary?) collection did not persist*, as far as we can tell, or persisted only loosely; 4QS^b is the only manuscript preserving material from the beginning columns (but without preserved evidence of the two spirits teaching) *and* the other columns. Why is it then that the 1QS version did not persist? Joan Taylor’s theory of Cave 1 as a scroll burial place brings forward a new possibility.⁷⁸ Perhaps the manuscript was eventually disregarded, not because it was not valued but because there were new, perhaps more user-friendly ones, better-quality and lasting, or non-liturgical manuscripts being produced and available.

Any manuscript copying is both an act of transmitting earlier information and introducing new material, even by way of modifying or structuring the earlier information. All the extant S and related manuscripts are exemplars of the kind of information that persisted, was being used, and affected the

77 Hempel, “The Long Text of the Serekh as Crisis Literature.” Hempel suggests that some features in the long version of S could be interpreted as reflecting a response to a crisis situation or commitment problems in the movement. She does not tie this long text to the community’s possible move to the settlement at Qumran but does associate it with the same stage in the history of the movement.

78 Joan E. Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

perception of existing information. There is a need to think of real manuscript variation not only as different editions of the same literary work or as regards to textual history but also as representing the rule traditions in multiple ways and organizing the existing information in each case uniquely.

So far, this perspective has not been prominent. In dealing with textual history, scholars are in a way compelled to regard the manuscripts as timeless testimonies of evolving traditions, and no distinction is made with regard to the individual features of the scrolls. This is especially true when late manuscripts are taken as evidence of earlier textual forms.⁷⁹ On the other hand, when late manuscripts are interpreted as representing secondary textual developments (often abbreviations of the long version), the explanations have a tendency to marginalize these manuscripts as private or somehow inferior to the longer, more "complete" versions. Scholars are somewhat more attentive to the manuscript features (especially paleographic datings) when studying social changes in the setup or organization of the movement. However, a perspective that centers on ongoing information processing, forms of its representation, and access to knowledge ought to suggest increased focus on the information that remains the same and succeeds in being transmitted.

Eventually we need three forms of understanding in order to make sense of what S is: (1) work on the textual history of a literary work (or multiple works) on the basis of existing textual witnesses and theories of literary editing; (2) study and appreciation of each manuscript on its own, for the purpose of understanding not only the textual history but also the representation of knowledge that the particular manuscript transmits; and (3) explanation of why certain blocks of information were represented in a certain time in that certain form and others were not, that is, a combination of our knowledge of possible textual histories and our understanding of individual manuscript exemplars in a certain time and place.

79 Yet, Kugler, "Of Calendars, Community Rules, and Common Knowledge," 227, who regards 4QSc-4QOTot as preserving an earlier textual form than 1QS, asks why this outdated manuscript continued to be copied and explains that it was needed in order to record the evidence of the calendar, perhaps for new members. A different perspective would say that none of the existing manuscripts is outdated, at least for the period of time in which they existed, and that all manuscripts are "records" of some sort. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, 273–281, appreciates the variation in time and place by considering the possibility of semi-independent developments.