

CONCEPTUALIZING *GER* IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS¹

Jutta Jokiranta

Introduction

According to one lexical definition, גֵר, *ger*, is

a man who (alone or with his family) leaves village and tribe because of war 2S 4₃, famine Ru 1₁, epidemic, blood guilt etc. and seeks shelter and residence at another place, where his right of landed property, marriage and taking part in jurisdiction, cult and war has been curtailed: protected citizen, stranger.²

The classic work by sociologist Max Weber took the changes in the attitudes towards the strangers in the Hebrew Bible as one reflection of the development of the Israelite people into a separate confessional community where ‘ritualistic segregation was paralleled by the ready reception of proselytes’.³ Recent scholarship on foreigners and strangers has re-evaluated, specified, and further defined the differences in the Hebrew Bible law collections and illuminated the changed status of the *ger* as well as the changed circumstances in which these laws were created. The place of the *ger* is generally seen to transfer from an object of protection to a subject who was, to a certain degree, integrated into the covenant community and had religious obligations. In this process, it was not the ethnic descent that was determinative in the definition of the community but the cultic activities and symbolic signs construed as ethnic identity markers.

There are good reasons to say that *ger* in the Hebrew Bible legislation is not yet a ‘proselyte, convert’ in the later sense.⁴ However, the Septuagint translators render *ger* most of the time with προσήλυτος. It is debated whether this term has the wider meaning of a ‘newcomer, stranger, sojourner’, or whether it already sometimes takes the religious or cultural sense of one (‘proselyte’) who clearly ‘came over’ to the religiously defined community and had the same rights and duties fully as the ‘natives’.⁵

¹ With this contribution, I wish to warmly congratulate Anneli Aejmelaeus, with whom I am most privileged to work and now also cooperate to a growing degree in the Centre of Excellence Unit “Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions,” and from whom I have received great inspiration and encouragement.

² Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, Vol. 1* (trans. M.E.J. Richardson; Leiden, 1994), p. 201. Other translations: ‘sojourner’, ‘alien’. For the background and meaning of the term, see Jan Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26* (VTSup 67; Leiden, 1996), pp. 54–55.

³ Max Weber, *Ancient Judaism* (trans. Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale; New York, 1952), p. 362; on *gerim*: pp. 32–36; 336–355. For Weber, ‘confessionalism’ and religious segregation were linked to ‘ethical dualism’ (different rules for insider and outsider relations) and to the development of ‘other-worldly asceticism’ rather than ‘inner-worldly asceticism’ in Judaism (‘proving’ one’s piety in one’s daily work and business was less common in Judaism). For Weber’s analogy to the *metics* in Athens, see criticism by Christiana van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (JSOTSup 107; Sheffield, 1991), pp. 39–41. Recent scholarship has critically re-evaluated the thesis that the Israelite community could be described as purely ‘confessional’, demanding religious homogeneity of the people: the distinction between the native and the *ger* is not completely erased (see below).

⁴ The opposite view, that the *ger* was regarded as a proselyte already in some priestly legislation, is represented by D. Kellermann, ‘gūr, gēr, gērūth, m^gghūrīm’, in G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren (eds.), *TDOT Vol. 3, gillūlīm-hāras* (Grand Rapids, 1978), p. 446, and see literature referred to by Joosten, *People and Land*, pp. 55–56. But against this view, see Joosten, *People and Land*, pp. 63–70; Christophe Nihan, ‘Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation’, in Reinhard Achenbach, et al. (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ZABRBeih 14; Wiesbaden, 2011), pp. 113–116.

⁵ The term προσήλυτος seems to be the innovation of the LXX translators. As in the Hebrew *Vorlage*, the noun is often specified by a participle: ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ προσκεείμενος ἐν ὑμῖν, ‘stranger that abides among you’ (Lev 17:12). For the use of the term in LXX in places where the MT does not have *ger*, see Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law*, p. 181, n. 4. Other options for translating *ger* are πάροικος (Gen 15:13; 23:4; Exod 2:22; Deut 14:21; 23:8; 2 Sam 1:13; 1 Chr 29:15; Ps 39:13; Ps 119:19; Jer 14:8); γειώρας (Exod 12:19; Isa 14:1; rendering of the Aramaic ܘܓܝܪܝܢ); once ξένος (Job 31:32). For the theory that πάροικος is chosen when the meaning ‘proselyte’ is not possible, see Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law*, pp. 179–183; the exceptions show that the theory is not without problems. See also Stephen

If it is uncertain whether the idea of full religious conversion, in the sense found in a later rabbinic understanding of proselytism, is found in the texts of this era, or merely seeds for its emergence, what then is the place of the *ger* in the Qumran movement? Whereas the occurrences of the term *ger* in the Dead Sea Scrolls have been discussed in earlier scholarship,⁶ there is more to say about the proper conceptualization of the category and its sociological significance. This paper builds upon the observations on the *ger* in the Hebrew Bible in investigating the *ger* in the Qumran texts and identifying the sociological forces revealed by the attitudes towards the *ger*. Secondly, the unwarranted dichotomy between the *ger* and the proselyte calls for new conceptualizations, and new methodological perspective will be sought.

Ger in the Hebrew Bible

There is now ample literature on the strangers and foreigners in the biblical legislation.⁷ Many of the scholars emphasize that the differences between the law collections do not only have to do with different theologies and scribal expansions but ‘with the very different social and political challenges that the legislators had to cope with’, as Rainer Albertz puts it.⁸

The analysis of *gerim* in the Covenant Code (CC), in Deuteronomy (Deut), in the Priestly Code (P), and in the Holiness legislation (H) reveals a general turn from the primary *interest* in the *gerim* as *objects of protection* to the interest in seeing them as *subjects with (growing) religious obligations*. In the CC, the *gerim* are the marginal people who are paralleled, perhaps for the first time, with widows and the poor, whom the Israelites are not to oppress (Exod 22:20, 23:9). The law is motivated by the admonition to remember the people’s own time of distress in the Egyptian slavery.⁹

Deut continued in this tradition but specified the laws (e.g., Deut 14:28–29). Reinhard Achenbach notes that there is an attempt to create an ‘ethics of brotherhood’ which, to some extent, overrides the genealogical borders.¹⁰ Circumstances had changed so that the *ger* was no longer always described as ‘your strangers’, indicating direct patron-client relationship, but was referred to as people ‘in your gates’ who could work as day-labourers for different Israelite families.¹¹ Now the *gerim* were also integrated in two of the three annual festivals, the *Shavu’ot* and the *Sukkot*, but not the Passover (Deut 16).

The Sabbath became one crucial identity marker during the exile and, in the exilic redaction, the *gerim* were included in the groups for whom the Sabbath rest applied (Deut 5:14; Exod 20:10). In P, Abraham is depicted as

Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden, 2007), pp. 179–180.

⁶ Karl Georg Kuhn, ‘προσηλύτος’, in Gerhard Friedrich (ed.), *TDNTVol. 6* (Grand Rapids, 1968), pp. 735–736; Katell Berthelot, ‘La nation de גר dans les textes de Qumrân’, *RevQ* 74/19 (1999), pp. 171–215; Joseph M. Baumgarten, ‘Proselytes’, in Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. 2* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 700–701; Ulrich Dahmen, ‘גֵרִי gîr’, in Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen eds.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten. Band 1*; Stuttgart, 2011), pp. 592–594.

⁷ I am especially indebted to the work of scholars in Reinhard Achenbach, Jakob Wöhrle, and Rainer Albertz (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ZABRBeih 14; Wiesbaden, 2011). See also Markus Philipp Zehnder, *Umgang mit Fremden in Israel und Assyrien: Ein Beitrag zur Anthropologie des “Fremden” im Licht antiker Quellen* (BWNT 9/8; Stuttgart 2005).

⁸ Rainer Albertz, ‘From Aliens to Proselytes: Non-Priestly and Priestly Legislation Concerning Strangers’, in Achenbach, et al. (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law*, p. 66.

⁹ The law is set in the 8th or 7th century when the Assyrian invasion caused an increase in the number of landless people, whether from the North or elsewhere, Reinhard Achenbach, ‘gêr – nâkhrî – tôshav – zâr: Legal and Sacral Distinctions on Foreigners in the Pentateuch’, in Achenbach, et al. (eds.), *The Foreigner and the Law*, p. 30.

¹⁰ Achenbach, ‘gêr’, p. 32.

¹¹ Albertz, ‘From Aliens to Proselytes’, p. 56.

a stranger and a resident (Gen 23:4). In the latest layers of Deut, we find the new command to *love* the stranger (Deut 10:18). A new need for the integration of strangers emerged after the return to the land. Noteworthy is the expansion in Deut 29:10b–12 where all people stand to renew the covenant and where the stranger ‘from your woodchopper to your water drawer’ is added.¹²

In H, the theology of God who owns the land justified the fact that Israelites were not the real owners of their land in the situation of a foreign regime. This also led to the perception of the Israelites as strangers in their land. However, they are not slaves and should not be sold as slaves. In these laws, changed circumstances may again be observed: strangers could be so wealthy that there was a risk of Israelites being impoverished and sold into slavery to foreigners (Lev 25:47–54). A wealthy status is also shown by their ability to offer sacrifices, even expensive burnt offerings, and by the fact that they could celebrate the Passover as heads of a household with their own dependents (Exod 12:48–49).¹³ However, land ownership remained outside of their rights.

Even though not always wealthy (Lev 19:9–10; 23:22), the non-Judean minority probably had gained a considerable status, provided by the foreign overlords, and its integration presented a challenge. The concern of H was not so much the social protection or even religious integration but the fear that non-Judeans might profane the sanctuary or pollute the land.¹⁴ Therefore, specific laws were added for ascertaining that the sacrifices were not blemished, whether brought by an Israelite or a *ger* (Lev 22:18–20).¹⁵ Circumcision was extended to *gerim* if these wanted to participate in the Passover (Exod 12:48–49). *Gerim* too must abstain from blood (Lev 17:10–12, 13–16), and observe the purity law on not eating ‘what dies of itself’ and sexual laws (Lev 17:15–16; 18:24–28).¹⁶ They should not blaspheme the name of the Lord (Lev 24:16) nor sacrifice to Molech (Lev 20:1–5).¹⁷

Despite the differences, the law collections do not speak of two completely different types of groups or two different sets of problems to be solved. First, the later law collections do not abandon the laws of social protection, so there always seems to be the need to legislate social protection (Lev 19:33–35; 23:22). Second, an interest in a new kind of integration of non-native Judeans made an appearance, but already in Deut there existed the idea of religious integration: the Moab covenant ceremony every seventh year in Deut 29 gathered the *gerim*, including them in a learning process about the covenant which, *as time passed*, would have integrated them more fully. Therefore, social protection and religious integration were not mutually exclusive interests in the law collections.¹⁸

However, the content of the term as regards to socio-economic status does not remain quite the same. Occasionally in H, the *ger* has an economically independent position, and the term תושב, *toshav*, comes to denote in the priestly texts the earlier sense of *gerim* as ‘dependents’, people who rely on the ‘natives’ for their livelihood.¹⁹ Understanding the *ger* in the full sense as a ‘proselyte’ in H does not seem justified, as argued by

¹² Achenbach, ‘gêr’, pp. 35–36.

¹³ Nihan, ‘Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation’, pp. 117–118, 123.

¹⁴ Nihan, ‘Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation’, p. 130.

¹⁵ *Nākhri* could only *send* his sacrifices, Achenbach, ‘gêr’, p. 38. Achenbach explains that the author of Isa 56:6–7 wanted to integrate even the non-resident aliens into the covenant, but there was opposition against this trend (Ezek 44:6–7).

¹⁶ The law of eating animals that died on their own is also found in *4QReworked Pentateuch^d* (4Q366) 5:4–5.

¹⁷ Albertz, ‘From Aliens to Proselytes’, p. 59.

¹⁸ Esp. Albertz, ‘From Aliens to Proselytes’, pp. 53–69.

¹⁹ Nihan, ‘Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation’, pp. 118–119.

Christophe Nihan: the *gerim* were integrated in *some* rituals but not fully as converts, and their legal rights in an ethnic community were restricted (especially for the right to own land).²⁰

For a full picture, it would be necessary to discuss other biblical books and extra-biblical evidence.²¹ Even if scholars have identified major driving forces in the legislation, this must be compared to priestly narratives in Ezra-Nehemiah and their ideal program for Israel without foreigners and mixed marriages, and without any explicit attempt to consider the *ger*.²² The possibility arises that such an idealized true Israel (“religious” Israel) created a new discourse. In contrast, the Chronicler, for whom there were no foreign peoples within the land of Israel, nevertheless—or because of this—portrays the *gerim* as integrated within Israel (2 Chr 2:16; 30:25).²³

If at least most of the Hebrew Bible evidence on the *ger* was interpreted without conceptualizing the phenomenon as one of ‘conversion’, what about the evidence in the Dead Sea Scrolls and elsewhere? To ask when the *gerim* were changed from resident aliens to proselytes may skew the question at the outset. Rather, we should look for other possible conceptualizations. I discuss the hypotheses of three scholars that may shed light on the issue.

Methodology: How to Conceptualize Ger and Proselytism/Conversion?

1. Steve Mason

In his article ‘Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History’, Steve Mason has made the argument that there was no system or religion of ‘Judaism’ in the Persian and Greco-Roman periods.²⁴ Especially important is his discussion of Ἰουδαϊσμός: observations concerning the rarity of this term and its meaning in the two most significant witnesses (2 Macc and 4 Macc). According to Mason, the term is used in a very specific context in these texts and signifies a certain kind of activity, a programme or countermeasure (‘Judaizing’), against another type of activity and ambition (‘Hellenizing’). If there was no -ism (Judaism) in the ancient world, how did these ancient people conceptualize themselves as religious believers and practisers?

The common term in Greek to identify the people, Ἰουδαῖος/ Ἰουδαῖοι, has been much discussed. Many scholars have pointed out the *ethnic* nature of this vocabulary.²⁵ Thus, *Ioudaios* indicates ‘a person from Judaea,

²⁰ Similarly, Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, p. 175, does not think that the latest Pentateuch legislation knows the *ger* as ‘proselyte’ since he has no obligation to celebrate the Passover, he only *may* do it. Joosten, *People and Land*, pp. 85–86, argues that, in H, the Israelite community had a firm ethnic identity; yet there was no ‘fanaticism’ about this since intermarriages were not prohibited.

²¹ In the apocrypha, the category is surprisingly rare. For the term προσήλυτος, see Tob 1:8, and outside the LXX, see Terence L. Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco, 2007), p. 486. In Jud 4:10, πάροικος is included in the repentant community of Israel. Sir 29:24–28 describes the unfortunate state of πάροικος, who has no status and permanent residency.

²² See Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, pp. 163–166.

²³ Sara Japhet, *1. and 2. Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, 1993), p. 956. Thus, the Chronicler portrays those remaining from the seven nations as *gerim*, cf. 2 Chr 2:16–17 and 2 Kgs 5:27–30; 9:20–23. See discussion by Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, pp. 181–182.

²⁴ Steve Mason, ‘Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History’, *JSJ* 38 (2007), pp. 457–512.

²⁵ E.g., Shaye J.D. Cohen, *The Beginning of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley, 1999). Arguing for the translation ‘Judaeans’ (but largely ignored by Mason) already is Philip F. Esler, *Galatians* (New Testament Readings; London, 1998), pp. 3–4; *ibid.*, ‘Palestinian Judaism in the First Century’, in Dan Cohn-Sherbok and John M. Court (eds.), *Religious Diversity in the Graeco-Roman World: A Survey of Recent Scholarship* (Sheffield, 2001), pp. 21–46; *ibid.*, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis, 2003), pp. 63–68. Recently, David Goodblatt, ‘Varieties of Identity in Late Second Temple Judah (200 BCE–135 CE)’, in Benedikt Eckhardt (ed.), *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba* (JSJSup 155; Leiden, 2012), pp. 11–27, confirms the thesis that the Palestinian Judeans normally referred to themselves in Hebrew as ‘Israel’. The use of *Ioudaioi* in the Greek-speaking world (and also the use of ‘Judaeans’ in the Aramaic speaking world of the Persians), however, affected this practise.

a Judaeon'. As any other ethnic category, it can also be used of people living outside the homeland but belonging to this *ethnos*. In this context, Mason discusses Philo's description of 'religious conversion' (*Virt.* 102–103) and states:

Philo's language includes the whole range of ethnic associations, from land, kin, and custom to the cult and its associated phenomena. Shocking though it may seem, we consistently find both *Ioudaioi* and outsiders understanding "conversion" as in fact a movement from one *ethnos* to another, a kind of citizenship. There was no "religion" to which one might convert... It was a change of ethnic-ancestral culture, the joining of other people.²⁶

Mason attacks Shaye Cohen's suggestion that the conversions forced by the Hasmonean expansionist politics marked the beginning of a changed understanding of identity from the Judaeon ethnic-geographic sense to a religious one. Rather, adopting Judaeon laws and customs 'involved a decisive shift from one *ethnos* to another', an option that was often despised by the ancients.²⁷ After denying the existence of 'Jewishness' and 'Judaism' at this time, Mason searches for the range of elements involved in what we now conceive as religion, such as cult, philosophy, domestic and political customs, magic, and the full complexity associated with being an *ethnos* (ancestral heritage, peculiar characteristics).²⁸

This can be compared to how Benedikt Eckhardt speaks about *ancestry* and *merit*: genealogical claims to ethnicity, on the one hand, and ritual practises and activities (such as circumcision), on the other hand, considered to be qualifying for membership in an *ethnos*. Eckhardt's distinction is revealing in showing that membership in an *ethnos* was a *contested* issue, and its various dimensions could be valued differently. For example, Antigonus claimed, according to Josephus (*A.J.* 14.403), that merit was not enough to make Herod a full *Ioudaios* and a valid leader.²⁹ However, this should not be generalized. Most often, people joined the people of Israel/*ethnos* of *Ioudaioi* by identifying themselves with it and its ancestry and by aligning themselves in its activities.

2. Terence Donaldson

Terence Donaldson has mapped the attitudes towards 'non-Jews' in the sources up until 135 CE.³⁰ He uses four categories to characterize Gentile affiliation or acceptance: sympathization, conversion, ethical monotheism, and eschatological participation. He has a particular purpose: to demonstrate the 'Jewish patterns of universalism', as opposed to the depiction of Christianity as the first universalistic religion. However, the work largely ignores the discussion of the Judaeon people as an *ethnos* and its implications to conceptualizing the phenomenon. This is especially problematic in the category of 'conversion'.³¹ Perhaps more helpful is his conceptualization of three axes of sympathization (monotheistic worship, association with Jewish community, adoption of practises prescribed by Jewish law),³² allowing for variety in the identity and social class of such sympathizers.³³ In this

²⁶ Mason, 'Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism', p. 491.

²⁷ Mason, 'Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism', pp. 494–495, 503–510.

²⁸ Mason, 'Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism', pp. 494–495, 480–488.

²⁹ Benedikt Eckhardt, "An Idumean, That Is, a Half-Jew": Hasmoneans and Herodians between Ancestry and Merit', in Eckhardt (ed.), *Jewish identity and Politics*, pp. 91–115, discusses the rhetoric in calling Herod a Half-Jew/Judaeon.

³⁰ Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*.

³¹ So, e.g., Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, pp. 215, 490, thinks that the *ger* is to be understood as a 'proselyte' at Qumran but that there were only 'hypothetical converts', not real ones.

³² These three axes actually align closely with conceptualizing *sectarianism* and its three elements: beliefs/discourse, social relations, and norms; see Jutta Jokiranta, 'Sociological Approaches to Qumran Sectarianism', in Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford, 2010), p. 218. My interpretation of this is that such dimensions work as a rough outline of

sense, conversion should be understood as a label given to a particular form (often connected in the sources to circumcision) of a spectrum of affiliations. Other forms, however, did not feature a qualitative difference.

3. Zeba Crook

Zeba Crook suggests approaching the phenomenon of conversion in the ancient Greco-Roman world in terms of patronage and clientage. This form of reciprocity in the ancient world meant the exchange of goods and services for honour, gratitude and loyalty between people of *unequal* status (as opposed to balanced reciprocity: exchange of gifts between two equal parties). Crook argues that, ‘in order to understand ancient conversion, one needs to understand ancient human interaction and relationships with gods. The experience of conversion is going to be an extension of the experience of exchange and of loyalty to the gods and to philosophers.’³⁴

According to Crook, ‘pre-common-era Palestine did not have a patron-client or a benefactor-client social structure,’ but he nevertheless acknowledges that this changed when ‘Judaism encountered the linguistic and cultural influence of Hellenism’³⁵— this certainly began prior to the Common Era. It is warranted, in my view, to explore whether conversion can be conceptualized in terms of patronage-clientage also in the Judaeans situation, since 1) scholars have used the language of patronage-clientage already in connection with the legislation in the Hebrew Bible on *ger*,³⁶ 2) in the era of the DSS, the language of patronage-clientage is already found in Hellenistic Jewish authors, as Crook shows,³⁷ and 3) the organization and terminology of the Qumran movement much resembles, or can be compared to, Greco-Roman associations where the patronage system was existing,³⁸ and 4) the Gentile newcomers would have been familiar with the patronage-clientage system.

To draw these suggestions together, I argue that it is necessary to keep an open mind for understanding the issues revolving around the category of *ger* as those of a) legal and cultic obligations and demands—integration or exclusion in *activities* of the *ethnos* of Israel/*Ioudaioi*,³⁹ b) *identity*—which was not a set of fixed categories but potentially overlapping categories (ethnic, religious, political, familial, local and other components), and expressing variety, depending on the context,⁴⁰ c) voluntary *associations* that created insider networks with a set

matters we today usually associate with ‘religion’ and can be used to estimate both the insiders’ and outsiders’ complex standing in each dimension.

³³ Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, pp. 471–473, 488.

³⁴ Zeba A. Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean* (ZNWBeih130; Berlin, 2004), p. 59.

³⁵ Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, pp. 79–80.

³⁶ Albertz, ‘From Aliens to Proselytes’, p. 56, sees the relationship between an Israelite and ‘your *ger*’ in the earliest legislation as one of a patron and client, but ‘it seems that the *gēr* of the late 7th and early 6th centuries, in many cases, was no longer a client of a certain patron but lived in a settlement, where he probably worked for different Judean families’. Also Nihan, ‘Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation’, pp. 111–134, speaks of Yhwh as Israel’s *patron*. However, there may be confusion with the use of the terms here: clientage should be viewed as different from direct dependence on the head of a household; it is a wider phenomenon where clients mostly are not dependent on a patron for livelihood (*contra* Albertz, p. 56, and Nihan, pp. 129–130).

³⁷ Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, pp. 80–88, 128–132, discusses some cases in the Septuagint Psalms but also in 2 Macc (4:2; 6:13; 9:26; 10:38), Wis (11:5, 13; 16:2, 11, 24), Josephus and Philo.

³⁸ For comparison between the *yahad* and the associations, see 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* (NTOA 2; Fribourg, 1986); Sandra Walker-Ramis, ‘Graeco-Roman Voluntary Associations and the Damascus Document: A Sociological Analysis’, in John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson (eds.), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (London, 1996), pp. 128–145; and now also acknowledging the basic family structure, Alexei M. Sivertsev, *Households, Sects, and the Origins of Rabbinic Judaism* (JSJSup 102; Leiden, 2005).

³⁹ No demands or beliefs on the *ger* are given either in the Hebrew Bible or the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, the issue may deserve further investigation, since, in the ritual contexts, the participants are expected to make confessional statements, read prayers and recite curses and blessings.

⁴⁰ *Contra* Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, p. 486, who seems to see the kinship identity as fixed and exclusivist: ‘The geographical and cultural boundary was somewhat permeable, but the genealogical boundary was not.’ However, genealogy could be contested, and there indeed was a way to cross this boundary (marriage, household structure, sufficient number of generations). Moreover, different identities were salient in different contexts and some could be overlapping rather than excluding each other: compare how Mason, ‘Jews, Judaeans,

of rules for meetings and commitments to patrons in such associations. Therefore, to conceptualize the matter as one of obligations/rights in *activities and participation, identity, and loyalty*, rather than conversion, is helpful in the period of our sources.⁴¹ I will now turn to the evidence in the Scrolls, with these perspectives informing and structuring the analysis.

Gerim in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Activities and participation

If at least some of the priestly authors in the Hebrew Bible had a special concern for integrating the *ger* within the community and safeguarding the idea of holiness in the land, what can be said about the priestly groups who authored and copied the Dead Sea Scrolls? A range of similar motifs on the *ger* can be found in the Scrolls, as was identified in the Hebrew Bible (protection, love, integration, obligations)—but not to the extent that could have been expected.

Thus: to what extent did the authors of the Qumran texts create more prescriptions and regulations for the *ger* in order to secure their holiness and bring the *ger* more fully into the covenant? In the *Temple Scroll*, it appears that one court of the temple area is reserved for the women and the *gerim*, but the fragmentary context does not permit certainty (if this was only after the third generation; cf. mention of the fourth generation in 11QT^a 39:5):⁴²

and you shall make a thi[r]d court [] [] and for their daughters and for the sojourners who were bor[n] in Israel (11QT^a [11Q19] 40:5–6).⁴³

Besides this, the *Temple Scroll* is silent about the *ger*, even in the celebration of the Passover (cf. Ex. 12 and 11QT^a 17:6–18:10).⁴⁴ It has been suggested that the redactor of the *Temple Scroll* intentionally passed over all the passages concerning *ger* and that the passage(s) where it appears are interpolations.⁴⁵ According to the *Temple Scroll*, then, there was no ‘resident alien’ with growing obligations, but (later?) the *ger* was allowed in the future temple.

However, the *ger* is given a new command in the *Damascus Document* (D). The hierarchical order of the movement is presented in the recording and renewal of the covenant relationship:

Judaizing, Judaism’, pp. 492–493, discusses the ‘dual nationality’ of the *Ioudaioi* as both Judaeans and Alexandrians in Josephus’ *Contra Apion*.

⁴¹ Cf. Shaye J. D. Cohen, ‘The Rabbinic Conversion Ceremony’, *JJS* 41/2 (1990), p. 193: ‘In pre-rabbinic times (i.e. before the second century CE), conversion to Judaism was entirely a private affair. There were no courts “authorized” to perform conversions, no central registry for converts, no set requirements that had to be met for a conversion to be considered valid, and no conversion ceremony. A convert was someone who followed Jewish practises, notably circumcision’.

⁴² See Baumgarten, ‘Proselytes’, pp. 700–701.

⁴³ Edition and translation by James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 7, Temple Scroll and Related Documents* (Tübingen, 2011), pp. 98–99; cf. Elisha Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (JDS; Jerusalem, 1996), pp. 56–57. Otherwise, I follow the translations of the DSS according to Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library: Texts and Images* (Partially based on *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, edited by Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov; Leiden, 2006).

⁴⁴ The regulation about eating a carcass mentions only selling it to a foreigner (11QT^a 48:5–6), not giving it to the *ger* (cf. Deut 14:21). However, it is possible that some wordings in 11QT^a rules might have room for the *ger*; the order of Passover celebration is to every ‘man’ (11QT^a 17:9), and concerning Yom Kippur, ‘any man’ is ordered not to work (11QT^a 27:6).

⁴⁵ See Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, p. 204, and there the suggestion by Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago, 1990).

vac The rule for those who live in all the camps. All shall be mustered by their names: the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, the *ger* fourth. Then they shall be recorded by name, one after the other: the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, the *ger* fourth. In the same order they shall sit, and in the same order they will inquire of all. (CD 14:3–6)⁴⁶

Famously, D has here four groups in hierarchical order.⁴⁷ What is relevant for the purpose here is that the passage does define a new religious obligation for the *ger*—albeit that the rule, in its annual form,⁴⁸ is new for both the natives and the *ger*. Sociologically speaking, such a voluntary recording created an Israel within Israel. Nevertheless, the *ger* was part of that ideal Israel.

Scholars have commented variously on this passage in D. Joseph Baumgarten writes: ‘It is a fair assumption that the term *ger* in this passage no longer had the biblical connotation of “stranger”, but the meaning found in rabbinic literature, where it is the standard designation for a proselyte.’⁴⁹ This suggestion is unsatisfactory, precisely because the *ger* does *not* have an interchangeable status to other categories and because the idea of proselyte conversion is problematic, as was seen above. In a more nuanced way, Katell Berthelot is of the opinion that the *gerim* mostly means strangers integrated into Israel, not the later proselyte, and that the *gerim* seem to be a permanently inferior category, unlike later proselytes.⁵⁰

What, then, should be inferred from the fact that the parallel passage in the *Community Rule* (S) has only three groups and no *ger*? The passage reads:

vacat They shall do as follows annually, all the days of Belial’s dominion: the priests shall pass in review first, ranked according to their spiritual excellence, one after another. Then the Levites shall follow, and third all the people by rank, one after another, in their thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens. Thus shall each Israelite know his proper standing in the *Yahad* of God, an eternal society. None shall be demoted from his appointed place, none promoted beyond his foreordained rank. So shall all together comprise a *Yahad* whose essence is truth, genuine humility, love of charity and righteous intent, caring for one another after this fashion within a holy society, comrades in an eternal fellowship. (1QS 2:19–25)

In theory, the *ger* could be included, but not mentioned, in the category of ‘all the people’. When we observe another difference between D and S, this becomes more understandable.

The *ger* is also found in D as an object of protection. Love towards the neighbour resembles the motif that was observed in Deut and H. The context in D is a long list (CD 6:11–7:6) of matters to be carefully observed according to the exact interpretation of the movement, including cultic matters, purity issues, appointed times, and these social relations: ‘...to love each his brother as himself, and to grasp the hand of poor and needy *vac* and alien (גֵּר) and to seek each the welfare of his fellow...’ (CD 6:21–7:1). Other than that, the *ger* does not appear in D as an object of protection. However, the ideal should be related to the concrete subsidiary system of assisting the poor and the needy testified in D (CD 14:12–17; par. 4Q266 10i:9–10), even though the *ger* is not

⁴⁶ Note the parallel in 4Q267 9v: in the first list of categories, *ger* is missing (line 7), but probably exists in the second list (line 10).

⁴⁷ Another text, *4QFour Lots* (4Q279) 5:6, describes four lots, one to the priest—the second and the third lost—and the fourth for the *ger*. In *4QText Mentioning Temple* (4Q307) 1:6, the *ger* is mentioned, but the context is not clear.

⁴⁸ Gathering together in the third month is mentioned in 4QD^a (4Q266) 11:17–18 ;4QD^e (4Q270) 7ii:11–12.

⁴⁹ Baumgarten, ‘Proselytes’, p. 700. Similarly, Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden, 1998), p. 135; Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, p. 206.

⁵⁰ Berthelot, ‘La nation de גֵּר dans les textes de Qumrân’, pp. 171–215.

explicitly mentioned in that system. Furthermore, the slaves of a household could be, in some cases, *gerim*.⁵¹ D prohibits forcing one's servants or employees to work on the Sabbath (CD 11:12) and forbids selling to Gentiles one's 'servant or maidservant' (CD 12:10–11); the following relative clause 'who have entered with him into Abraham's covenant' refers to the servants being affiliated with the covenant, males also through circumcision.

In comparison to this, S does not use the *ger*-language in its description of social solidarity. Nevertheless, it should be asked whether the inclusion of all those who join the movement could possibly include the *ger*:

They are to practise truth together with *humility, charity, justice, lovingkindness, and modesty* in all their ways. Accordingly, none will continue in a willful heart and thus be seduced, not by his heart, neither by his eyes nor yet by his lower nature. Together they shall circumcise the foreskin of this nature, this stiff neck, and so establish a foundation of truth for Israel—that is to say, for the *Yahad* of the Eternal Covenant. They are to atone for all those in Aaron who volunteer for holiness, and for those in Israel who belong to truth, and *for those who join them in community* (והגנויים עליהם ליהוד) (1QS 5:3–6)⁵²

Noteworthy is the verb (נִיפְּחַל) *niph'al* here, since it is used specifically of the *ger* in the *Pesher Nahum* (see below). S is by no means an inclusivist work.⁵³ However, the non-existence of the term *ger* in S should not be interpreted too hastily as hostility, since S has other particular characteristics that make it unique among the texts of the Qumran movement. First, S includes only little traditional *halakha*. Second, S has the tendency to keep silent about families. Very commonly, the difference between D and S has been interpreted in one of two ways: either S speaks only of a male community, so any *ger* affiliated with a household would have been irrelevant for S, or S represents a later development with stricter attitudes towards borderline cases. However, the silence on families is not direct testimony for celibacy.⁵⁴ Similarly, the silence on the *ger* is not direct evidence of their exclusion. Both the silence on *halakha* and the silence on families in S could be significant concerning the *ger*: the *ger* belongs to the sphere of 'legal Israel' and of the activities of the household. Thus S skips it, as it skips Sabbath observance and many other *halakhot*, and women and children, even though these could not be overlooked in the real life of the sect. To be sure, S does not show a particular interest to regulate on the *ger*, but it does not regulate many other matters either, which has to be taken into account.

If there is an Israel within Israel in the Qumran movement, was it to be expected that, in some cases or eventually, the criteria of belonging were tightened and some groups were excluded? A much stronger sentiment is indeed found in *4QFlorilegium*:

[‘And no] enemy [will oppress him an]ymore, [and no] son of deceit [shall afflict] him [agai]n, as formerly, from the day that [I appointed judges] over my people Israel’ (2 Sam 7:10–11). This is the house which [he will build] for [him] in the latter days, as it is written in the book of [Moses, ‘The sanctuary,] O Yahweh, which your hands have fashioned. Yahweh will reign for ever and ever.’ (Exod 15:17–18) This (is) the house which these will not enter [for]ever, nor an Ammonite, a Moabite, a bastard, a foreigner, or a *ger* forever, for his holy ones (are) there. [His glory shall] be revealed for[ev]er; it shall appear over it perpetually.

⁵¹ Thus Hannah K. Harrington, 'Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran', in Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović (eds.), *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen* (STDJ 70; Leiden, 2008), pp. 195–196.

⁵² Translated also as 'Gentile proselytes', Tov, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*.

⁵³ Scholars have recently discussed to what extent the exclusivist Qumran movement could incorporate inclusivist tendencies, see Gudrun Holtz, 'Inclusivism at Qumran', *DSD* 16/1 (2009), pp. 22–54; Hannah K. Harrington, 'Identity and Alterity in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Eckhardt (ed.), *Jewish identity and Politics*, pp. 71–89. The atoning function of the community in S should probably not be interpreted as benefitting every human being, as Harrington argues (pp. 81–82). The atoning of the land too (1QS 8:6, 10) is meant to purify the defilement of the land, not the people living in the land. The regulation in D, not to kill non-Jews for profit (CD 12:6–8), did not reveal any universal interest but was directed, according to L.H. Schiffman, 'Legislation Concerning Relations with Non-Jews in the Zadokite Fragments and in Tannaitic Literature', *RevQ* 43 (1983), pp. 379–389, against the Hasmonean wars.

⁵⁴ See Sivertsev, *Households, Sects*, pp. 130–140.

And strangers (זרים)⁵⁵ shall lay it waste no more, as they formerly laid waste the sanctua[ry of I]srael because of their sin. And he has commanded that a sanctuary of human(s) be built for him, so that they may offer incense in it to him, before him, works of thanksgiving.⁵⁶ (4QFlor [4Q174] 1–2i,21:1–7)

The text envisions the eschatological ‘house’ where God will be present in his glory and which will not be destroyed. Now the foreigner together with the *ger* is excluded. The list of groups excluded is based on Deut 23:2–3 and Ezek 44:9, but *ger* is not mentioned in either passage.⁵⁷ In theory, the passage could be seen to conform to 11QT, which did not allow the *ger* to enter the inner court but only the outer court of the temple area.⁵⁸ On the other hand, the list has been taken to refer to people who are excluded from the community membership, the *miqdash adam*, altogether (Deut speaks of congregation, not the temple). For the purpose here, it is the focus of the passage that is important: it is on the Lord’s rule in his house and *securing it in the future from all threats by outsiders*. Therefore, the *ger* in the list is seen as one of those that is potentially dangerous for the fellowship with the holy ones, who, however, will never get an upper hand in it. The list of people has the sense of outsiders, as indeed *zarim* in the passage could be translated.⁵⁹ These outsiders have laid waste the sanctuary but will not be allowed to do so in the future. In the following passage (4QFlor 1–2i,21:7–9), God is said to provide peace from all enemies. In my view, the passage does not exclude the *ger* from the movement but claims that the powerful *ger* will never win and the defiling *ger* will not be allowed to defile.

Every occurrence of *ger* in the DSS is potentially significant in showing that the category was not just dissolved or assimilated in the texts of this period. We met the motif of social protection in D, and the motif of fairness is found in some other texts too.⁶⁰ Moreover, the other side of the coin was protecting the rights of the natives. The jubilee law and the law of redeeming slaves were meant to maintain the possession of the land among Israelites and to ensure that a poor Israelite was not enslaved by strangers and foreigners. 4QOrdinances^a exemplifies such regulation in the spirit of H (4Q159 2–4+8:1–3).⁶¹

Identity

Hannah Harrington, when discussing whether the Gentiles were considered ritually impure or not, takes the stand that ‘the *ger* sheds his contagion when he completes his initiation into the sect and agrees to maintain his responsibilities to it.’⁶² By purifying himself in the initiation ritual to the movement, the *ger* could, from then on, be purified from other impurities just as the other members. Yet, he did not lose his lower status altogether, and, in Harrington’s opinion, ‘retained some level of impurity’.⁶³ However, the *internal hierarchy* of the movement should not be mixed with its *admission procedure*, especially as the latter varies in D and in S. It has

⁵⁵ Or, ‘outsiders’.

⁵⁶ The reading is תודה, rather than תורה.

⁵⁷ Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, p. 299, n. 150: the prohibition against Gentile sacrifice was common.

⁵⁸ The list is often compared to other lists in Qumran texts where people are excluded for purity reasons, mostly disabled and defiled people (e.g., 1QSa 2:3–10), see Anke Dorman, *The Blemished Body: Deformity and Disability in the Qumran Scrolls* (Groningen, 2007); Cecilia Wassen, ‘What Do Angels Have against the Blind and the Deaf? Rules of Exclusion in the Dead Sea Scrolls’, in Wayne O. McCredy and Adele Reinhartz (eds.), *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism* (Minneapolis, 2008), pp. 115–129.

⁵⁹ A similar sense could be reflected in 4QShir^b (4Q511) 18ii:8–10: ‘Righteous instructors correct my sins, and faithful judges correct all my guilty transgressions. For God is my judge and in the hand of a stranger [He shall] not [...]’.

⁶⁰ 4QapocrPent. B (4Q377) 1i:6; 4QIns^s (4Q423) 5:4.

⁶¹ The theme has to do with wider relations towards foreigners, and many more examples could be discussed. For example, in 4QApocryphal Lamentations B (4Q501 1–2), the speaker prays to God not to give the inheritance to *zarim* or foreigners—the motivation is the same as was in the legal command not to oppress the stranger: to remember the people’s enslavement; only now it is God who is asked to remember the low status of his people! See also 4QBeatitudes (4Q525) 5:7–8.

⁶² Harrington, ‘Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran’, p. 196.

⁶³ Harrington, ‘Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran’, p. 197. Harrington concludes that ‘the *ger*, although technically purified, is never fully accepted in the group.’

been suggested that the *ger* could represent the novice (not full-member) category,⁶⁴ but nothing in D points towards that; on the contrary, the *ger* has the same right in the inquiry as the others.

We conclude that the *ger* is a ‘full’ member but low in the internal hierarchy. In the Qumran movement, the *ger* would have been participating in all or most activities when possible but not having access to the top hierarchy, and, possibly, could have been susceptible on purity matters more easily than other members. Concerning identity, noteworthy in D is the self-understanding of the members themselves as ‘sojourners’ (CD 4:4–6; 6:5).⁶⁵

In one place, the *ger* explicitly appears not on the good (and poor) side but on the side of the errant (and possibly powerful) ones too. In the Peshar Nahum, the *ger* is part of those that are led astray: ‘kings, princes, priests, and populace together with the resident alien (ועם עם גר נלוה)’.⁶⁶ This shows the variety in perception in different contexts. Again, Baumgarten holds that these *gerim* are ‘proselytes’ (cf. Isa 14:1) and have an inferior position to others.⁶⁷ However, the passage merely states that all these groups of people are led astray (the *ger* is here included within the covenant people, as in Deut 29), and no-one remains unaffected by the counsel of the misleaders.

Patronage and clientage

Two brief notes must suffice here for exploring the Qumran evidence for patronage and clientage. First, the *ger* is represented in D explicitly as one to be assisted, and the *mevaqer* of the camp appears to be a patron, a benefactor who ascertains that his ‘following’ does not include those oppressed (CD 13:7–10). Secondly, the benefactions might not only be material goods, since philosophers offering people teaching for good life and happiness were also conventionally referred to as benefactors.⁶⁸ Some hymns, for example, have the speaker presenting himself as the client of the only true Teacher, completely dependent on the wisdom he has acquired from the divine patron (1QH^a 9:21–31), and, as a loyal client, he has sought to find others to follow (15:10). The singer appears to be a broker, a mediator between the patron deity and the client, drawing near to the worthy clients and rejecting untrustworthy clients (1QH^a 6). The *ger* could, in principle, be a client seeking such knowledge and wisdom.

Conclusions

⁶⁴ Philip R. Davies, ‘The ‘Damascus Sect’ and Judaism’, in *ibid.*, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Atlanta, Georgia, 1996), p. 75. See the discussion by Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, pp. 203–204.

⁶⁵ Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, pp. 162–163.

⁶⁶ The misleaders are identified as מתעי אפרים, either ‘misleaders of Ephraim’ or ‘those who misdirect Ephraim’.

⁶⁷ Baumgarten, ‘Proselytes’, p. 700. Similarly Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, p. 207, who refers to the language of ‘joining’ (לִהַל) which is used to describe ‘full converts’ in Esther 9:27. Donaldson (pp. 30–33) also explains that the ‘judaizers’ in Esther 8:17 (‘many of the Gentiles were circumcized and became Jews out of the fear of Jews’) are ‘full converts’. But cf. above and Mason, ‘Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism’, p. 464, on Esther 8:17 where the verb Ἰουδαῖζω, ‘to Judaize’, ‘denotes alignment with foreign law and custom’, not a religious ‘conversion’. The Hebrew מתייהדים in this verse is *hapax* and is fully understandable as joining with/attaching oneself to the *ethnos* of Judeans.

⁶⁸ Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, pp. 100–108.

We have outlined the changing depiction of the *ger* in the Hebrew Bible legislation, sought for new conceptualizations of the category, and discussed a few occurrences of the *ger* in the Dead Sea Scrolls in terms of activities and participation, identity, and loyalty.

If the Hebrew Bible testifies to a sociological interest of integrating the *ger* within the Judaeen *ethnos*, by drawing the *ger* into its central activities and by regulating how the *ger* should behave, in order to secure its purity and holiness (identity in distinction from others), could it not be expected that such an interest existed in the Qumran movement, which indeed was careful about its purity, holiness and perfection? One major observation is exactly this: a similar interest in integration and regulation about the *ger* did *not* take place. The authors do not take the step forward to prescribe demands and procedures for regulating the behaviour of the *ger*. Why is this?

There have been two basic answers to this question: 1) the *ger* was dissolved and fully assimilated, by ‘proselytism’, and treated similarly to other Judaeen members, which explains the silence, 2) the *ger* did not exist in the social life of the movement; it was rather a traditional echo, appearing here and there but not in reality.⁶⁹ I propose a third alternative: 3) the *ger* did not disappear from the movement nor assimilate among full members but did not demand special treatment because of the hierarchical structure already allowing for degrees of integration, ranking, and penalties. The *ger* remains a separate category, not regarded as problematic or in need of any tighter or more comprehensive legislation since the movement in any case determined one’s place according to sufficient factors (e.g., descent, knowledge, spirit, etc., CD 13:11; 1QS 5–7; 8:12–21). The *ger* was integrated in some or most activities of the movement and was required to show a similar degree of identification and loyalty to the movement as other members.⁷⁰

However, one ideological tendency might be observed: perhaps the Qumran movement did not recognize the ‘rich *ger*’ (or did not have such because of its critical attitude towards accumulating wealth). Thus, there was no question of what to require of such an independent *ger*. As a result of the Hasmonean expansion and inclusion of Idumeans and Itureans,⁷¹ the outside world changed, and the boundary category of the *ger* needed to be downplayed to strengthen the view that the foreigners would not have power over the chosen path of the movement.⁷² The exclusion of the *ger* in *4QFlor* can indeed suggest that the inclusion and protective attitude was complemented (if not changed) by drawing a future circle where the *ger* had no power.

⁶⁹ Along these lines, it could be explained that, at first, it was important for the movement to create an idealized picture of the covenant community which fulfilled its ethical obligations towards the weak and the poor. Later on, in a sectarian fashion, the interest was directed towards inner holiness and maintenance of the standards of membership. The *ger* was dissolved in the background as it did not represent an ideal group member. Cf. Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, p. 203, and ‘the tendency in the Qumran literature to engage in an imaginative recreation of the worlds as the authors would have liked it to be.’ Certainly, the *ger* in D, as any category (‘Israel’), also functioned as a marker of symbolic worlds, e.g., pointing towards the Mosaic community and ideal solidarity.

⁷⁰ For the difference between D and S, one more specific possibility is that the early community members did have Gentile slaves and other dependents who were naturally brought into the movement but, later on, the movement gained its initiates, to a growing degree, from children born into the movement.

⁷¹ See Berthelot, ‘La nation de גר dans les textes de Qumrân’, pp. 211–214.

⁷² This may well be in contrast to the actual circumstances around them, cf. Hasmonean policy and wars that impoverished many people.