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Introduction

Qumran scholarship is facing an exciting stage. All manuscripts have appeared in publication since the beginning of the century, and new editions of manuscripts and works are in process. The on-going digitization project of the scrolls by the Israel Antiquities Authority is expanding the accessibility of the texts to wider circles of scholars and increasing awareness of the collection, as well as of the material aspects of the scrolls. More and more widely, biblical scholars have begun to appreciate this data for their own disciplines, and, within biblical scholarship, Qumran scholars are seeking new ways of communicating their findings across disciplinary boundaries. For Hebrew Bible scholarship,

1 The series Discoveries in the Judean Desert (DJD) I-XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2 For example, DJD V is being re-edited under the direction of George Brooke and Moshe Bernstein. Part of DJD I is being re-edited in the Norwegian project Biblical Texts Older than the Bible.
4 For example, Charlotte Hempel invites biblical and Qumran scholars to engage in dialogue on the debates on "prebiblical" texts (texts that later became biblical) and non-biblical texts. 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), 203-4 (republished in abrid. The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies [TSA])
the scrolls present both new evidence to take into account and a challenge to investigate whether past models of text production, textual editing, and scribal culture are in need of revision.

This article focuses on two Qumran rule manuscript collections (\textit{serakhkim}),\textsuperscript{5} the Community Rule (S), and the War Scroll (M), which are central source texts to the study of the sectarian Qumran movement \textit{per se} but also work as an example of the kind of further evidence available for anyone interested in ancient textual practices and material data.

The study of these rules was revolutionized by the publication of the Cave 4 manuscripts in the 1990s and 2000s. Until then, the scrolls found in Cave 1, especially 1QCommunity Rule (1QS), were the main representatives of the new scribal activity of the "Qumran community" and the life in the assumed community. The 1QWar Scroll (1QM) was interpreted as demonstrating the eschatological nature of the community. However, 1QWar Scroll was and often still is considered to be in its own category, and much less along with the other rule texts, even though it too preserves the designation \textit{serakh} among its titles.\textsuperscript{6} There is

---

\textsuperscript{5} This category is by no means clear-cut or unproblematic. Below we discuss the use of the term \textit{serakh}. Frequently, the primary examples of the rule texts are the Community Rule (S), the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa), the Damascus Document (D), and few other texts, such as 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q263). Hempel helpfully speaks of family resemblance that can be identified in texts belonging to the category, Hempel, \textit{The Qumran Rule Texts in Context}, 1. We wish to add that the War Scroll (M) also deserves to be included in the family.

\textsuperscript{6} 1QM 3:13; 4:9; 5:3; 9:10. Cf. 1QS 5:1; 6:8; 1QSa 1:1. 6. All in all, the term \textit{serakh} is frequent in the rule texts: in explicit form, eight times in 1QS, four times in 1QSa, 19 times in 1QM, and 10 times in CD. In 1QM, \textit{serakh} refers to the array of the final battle, but is also used as a title for different organizational orders. However, the titles are not identical in form: in 1QS and 1QSa, the form is often \textit{serakh}, whereas the occurrences in 1QM lack the pronoun \textit{serakh} (except in 1QM 16:3 where a new section begins with the words \textit{אנה ויהי serakh}". See further distinctions by Charlette Hempel, "\textit{serakh}," in \textit{Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten, Band II} (ed. H.-J. Fabry und U. Damen; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013), 1111–17, and comparison between the term \textit{serakh} and \textit{serakh} by Lawrence H. Schiffman, "\textit{Memory and Manuscript: Books, Scrolls, and the Tradition of the Qumran Texts}," in \textit{New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceeding 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), 153–50.
a clear need to include it in the dialogue with the other *serakhim*, and this is also one aim of this study.7

After the publication of the Cave 4 *serakh* material, urgent questions emerged: How should we interpret the fragmentary evidence in relation to well-preserved Cave 1 manuscripts? How were the various scrolls similar and dissimilar? What can the variant readings reveal to us about the changes within a given work or the changes within the community? Is it possible to show the direction of dependence and trace the development from one manuscript to another?

Questions about variants and their meaning are a natural part of any study of "parallel" manuscripts. The situation in studying "biblical" manuscripts has shown that our previous models and categories are lacking. Categorizing "biblical" scrolls into previously known "textual families" (proto-Samaritan, proto-Masoretic, and proto-Septuagint) or into representatives of local varieties (Palestinian, Babylonian, Egyptian) has proved to be insufficient in explaining the full variety of manuscript evidence, and the situation cannot be improved by adding categories to the previous ones.8 Textual pluriformity seem to have been the norm rather than an exception.9 Also, the issue of what marks a literary work as a "rewritten" form of an earlier one rather than a version of that same tradition is thrusting forward important questions of what makes a work distinguishable from other works, what amount of variation is allowed in order to justifiably speak of the same work, and how the

---

7 Another rule text, the Damascus Document, known from its medieval manuscripts (CD A, B) and from Cave 4 and 5 manuscripts (4Q266–4Q273, 5Q12), but not from Cave 1, is often compared to the Community Rule. Here we focus on the comparison between the Community Rule and the War Scroll, and the nature of their manuscript evidence.


ancient scribes themselves perceived what they were doing.10 These is-
issues are not at all different from what has been and needs to be asked in
the study of the rule texts.11 In the following, we shall first touch upon a
few general issues concerning ancient textual variation before going into
detailed evidence on the Community Rule and the War Scroll.

10 The discussion on "rewritten Bible" and rewriting scriptures is vast and vivid, see recently,
e.g., Molly M. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment," JBL 131 (2012):
T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Sidnie White
Crawford, Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans,
2008), and useful summaries of the state of research by eadem, "Rewritten Bible" in North
American Scholarship," and by Michael Segal, "Qumran Research in Israel: Rewritten Bible
and Biblical Interpretation," in The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of
beyond the Deadlock of 'Rewritten Scripture': Composition and Reception, Once Again" (paper
presented at the IJQS Munich 2013), argues that the category of "rewritten Scripture"
is not useful since it confuses two things: rewriting as a way of creating texts, and au-
thority being ascribed to a text. Scriptural texts themselves emerged as a result of rewriting
(intertextuality), and rewriting is not the same as recognition of authority.

11 While we wish to critically view the concepts and models that influence scholarship, we
ourselves struggle to find the most useful and least problematic concepts. The reader will
notice the terms such as "work," "tradition," "text," "version," and even "composition" and
"document" being used also in this article, without any highly formalized definitions. Our
contention is that the indispensable level should always include the understanding of the
material remains: the (scholarly reconstructions of) physical fragments and manuscripts.
Scholars often hurry to understand either the literary works or compositions (structured
textual ideas) that the material manuscripts transmit, or the traditions present in the manu-
scripts (independent ideational parts, such as the tradition on the two spirits terminologically
marked distinct elements, such as the "rabbinic" tradition). Material features are neglected.
They might nevertheless play a part in the meanings of a tradition or a literary work—at least
as for the manner of their representation, purpose, distribution, and usability. Different levels
of analysis should not be merged together, but we claim that the material level and the liter-
ary level, as well as the scholarly editorial level of representing and speaking about these, are
important and should illuminate each other. In other words, scholars should not only analyse
the ideational/intertextual level or the material scribal cultural level, but seek to understand
the ways in which these two interacted and influenced each other. The term "document" is
in this article used purposefully for one possible term to be understood as crossing bound-
aries between these levels. A physical manuscript always documents something—it represents,
preserves, and transmits certain ideas, claims, and information in a particular form and order.
At the same time, a manuscript represents a document, a whole and a unity, which can be
taken on its own and which interacts with whoever is reading it. Both the material level and
the literary level can be approached from two directions: from the outside, placing the doc-
ument as part of the wider process of documenting (e.g., earlier traditions, parallel manu-
scripts), and from the inside, emphasizing the uniqueness and completeness of that particular
document (e.g., material features of a particular manuscript, significance and message of that
piece of information).
Models to Think with

A growing number of scholars have actively sought new models to think with when we study ancient manuscript variation. One starting point is the observation that our scholarship has been, and probably still is, very much influenced by what could be called an anachronistic "book model" that modern scholars are themselves used to living with. This includes ideas and material features relating to printing culture and accuracy in reproduction, to the process of publishing a work—be it its first print or subsequent re-prints or re-editions—and the idea of finality (cf. pre-publication form is often called a "manuscript"), to the use of codex form and material features such as table of contents, not to mention ideas like authorial rights and plagiarism. It could therefore be argued that this model assumes a closed and often authorized or somehow fixed text or collection of texts, which was not present in the scroll-manufacturing culture and times before the canon. Thus, when we say "psalms," our primary model presumes a "Book of Psalms," a collection later known by that name and connected to a material object which has certain characteristics, such as codex form, division between different psalms, a certain length and structure. We may adjust our model on the basis of the close study and reading of a psalms scroll, such as 11Q1Ps, but our anachronistic model is yet revealed in the way we, for example, count the "number of copies of the (Book of) Psalms" preserved in the Qumran collection, even though some manuscripts contain only fragments of some psalms and little or no evidence of how large the collection was and whether the title "Psalms" as we know it is at all warrant-ed. In contrast, when the ancients said "psalms," they may have had in mind a thing closer to a category such as "prayer" or "wisdom": things

---

that are not bound to any one collection or fixed entity but can materialize in written and oral-performative form.\textsuperscript{13}

If the book model is not appropriate, what is then? When orality was observed to be an essential part of any writing culture of antiquity, it was suggested that a scroll or a codex in the pre-print era was like musical notes to a musician: notations and visual aids in their oral performance.\textsuperscript{14} Going further along those lines, “new (material) philology” is a novel approach, adopted from medieval studies, according to which manuscript variation is the very essence of most manuscript cultures. Each manuscript should be recognized to have its own characteristics when analysing the meanings attached to that text, and the roles of authors, scribes, performers, readers and users are all part of what makes a given artefact what it is.\textsuperscript{15}

Some scholars have begun to seek analogies or new metaphors in the contemporary digital age: in open-ended collective enterprises such as Wikipedia or open source programming languages, or in the reading practices of the Internet with their different modules, links outside and

\textsuperscript{13} Below we discuss how the book model influences the perception of “rules” in the way in which rules are seen as “complete” works, instead of open-ended collections of rules. However, “rules” are not similar to “psalms” in the sense that psalms appear to be short individual pieces (whatever the coherence or not in organizing them together), whereas rules are often longer and written in prose. Dissimilarities between different genres and kinds of collections have to be allowed for. Nevertheless, the aim here is to identify the influence of our modern conceptions on the ancient ones.

\textsuperscript{14} On orality and writenness, see Martin S. Jaffe, \textit{Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism 200 BCE–400 CE} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). David M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablets of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) notes the importance of performing in the ancient reading and memorizing practices. See also Karel van der Toorn, \textit{Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible} (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), esp. 9–49. Written texts were perceived as living oral traditions and reservoirs and actualizations of wisdom, rather than fixed, final statements; an author was not an individual stating a new piece of information but rather a speaker with authority from earlier sayings and voices. However, scholars also acknowledge that not all pieces of rewriting and additions were carriers of earlier oral traditions but could result from the creative work of the scribes who were versed in earlier writings: e.g., Gerd Granroth, \textit{Abraham and Melchizedek: Scribal Activity of Second Temple Times in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110} (BZAW 406; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010).

\textsuperscript{15} See the introduction by Liv Ingelboorg Lied and Hugo Lundhaug, eds., \textit{Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology} (De Gruyter, forthcoming).
across the sections, and hierarchies of information. Francis Borchardt
explains that, in open source programs (such as Unix, Linux, Mozilla
Firefox Internet Browser), "the products are by their very design adapt-
able" for anyone who has access to the code and is able to improve its
properties or adapt its functions for his or her needs.\textsuperscript{16} Here the argu-
ment goes that, just as only a small community of people is now able to
participate in this kind of "editorial" work, so also in the ancient world
a very small minority was literate and skilled enough to operate with
texts and scrolls. Furthermore, both processes result in variant versions,
used simultaneously, and often with no linear evolution. Every product
is complete (for one who uses it), and no product is complete: the suc-
cess of the products depends on the user communities adopting them
and further adjusting them, and authorship is irrelevant to the users.\textsuperscript{17}
To view the Cave 4 manuscripts from this perspective certainly high-
lights the focus on individual manuscripts, not just on the textual his-
tory of one work.

According to the Internet user perspective, the analogy is drawn
between the amount and fluidity of information existing on the Inter-
et and the borderless traditions existing in the ancient world, as well as
the fragmented reading practices in both.\textsuperscript{18} Traditions were perceived to
be as bountiful as one in the present-day world would consider the digi-
tal world: no one can even imagine printing the Internet, as remarked
by Eva Mroczek.\textsuperscript{19} This is, in our view, especially suitable for thinking
about the rules.

In the following, we are not suggesting one analogy on ancient rule
texts, but wish to question the existing ones. Borchardt applied the
open source-code analogy to Daniel material, but it remains to be inves-
tigated how widely the same idea can be applied to other types of mate-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Francis Borchardt, “Daniel’s Court Tales as Source Code: What Daniel Can Teach Us about Biblical Development” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Chicago, 2012).
\item \textsuperscript{17} Borchardt, “Daniel’s Court Tales as Source Code.” Mroczek, “Thinking Digitally about the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 252, speaks of scribes as "inspired performers."
\item \textsuperscript{18} Mroczek, "Thinking Digitally about the Dead Sea Scrolls," 241-69.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 251.
\end{itemize}
rial. We shall take selected examples from the Community Rule and the War Scroll, especially the material evidence of their manuscripts and their editions, to point out which kinds of models are in need of further consideration and might help us forward. We shall discuss three issues concerning the fragmentary evidence of 4QS and 4QM manuscripts in relation to better preserved scrolls of 1QS and 1QM: 1) How the evidence is labelled and spoken of; 2) How the fragments and manuscripts are being edited; 3) How the differences between textual forms and physical aspects of the manuscripts are explained. All these questions relate to what we consider ancient manuscripts to represent and what we can learn from how ancient scribes worked and perceived their work. There are always two levels present in discussing manuscript evidence: modern scholarly practices of editing the manuscripts and concepts of speaking about them, and ancient scholarly and scribal practices of producing and using the manuscripts.

The Same Work or Different Works?
Principles of Labelling Manuscript Evidence

Many scholars have noted how labelling scrolls as “biblical” or not have influenced the perception of scrolls and the category of “biblical” scrolls.\(^\text{20}\) Similarly, labelling Cave 4 rule texts that have parallels or parallel sections in Cave 1 texts matters a great deal for understanding the category of the rule texts. Which manuscripts are viewed by scholars as “copies” of the same literary work and which manuscripts are viewed as distinct, separate works—and is there consistency in the principles used? Is it a matter of the amount of the shared material or the nature of the differing material? Does the ancient evidence contain any hints? We

\(^{20}\) Some of the most famous examples are the manuscripts 4Q158, 4Q364–367, which were first titled as 4QRewritten Pentateuch, but later scholars have proposed they should be referred to simply as 4Qtarah or 4Q Pentateuch; see Emanuel Tov, “From 4QRewritten Pentateuch to 4Q Pentateuch (?),” in Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism, 73–91; White Crawford, “Rewritten Bible’ in North American Scholarship,” 76; Segal, “Qumran Research in Israel: Rewritten Bible and Biblical Interpretation,” 319–20.
wish to pay attention to possible inconsistencies—they reveal that the issue is complex—not to say which principles are correct or claim that correct principles are even found yet.

**Community Rule**

Which manuscripts preserve the *Community Rule*? Ten manuscripts from Cave 4 and possibly one from Cave 5 (4Q255–264 [4QS²], 5Q11 [5QS]) are normally taken to represent the *Community Rule*. Another manuscript, 5Q13, on the other hand, is considered to represent another work, 5Q*Citing the Community Rule* or 5Q(Sectarian) Rule, since only one of its over twenty small fragments is thought to have a clear parallel to the S material. However, 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: most fragments cannot be identified properly. Explicit parallels to 1QS/4QS exist in fragment 4 of 5Q13, and these are about covenant renewal themes (examination, purifica-

---

21 Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes, the DJD editors of 4QS manuscripts, state in DJD 26:1: "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 (4QS²)." Often, they speak of "copies" of the *Community Rule* (e.g., pp. 8–9). Similarly, the editors Elisha Qimron and James Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community: Cave IV Fragments (4Q255–264 = 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. J. H. Charlesworth, with P. M. Cross et al.; Fribourg: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 53, write: "Twelve copies of the Rule of the Community have been identified in the Qumran Caves." However, in the case of 5Q11, Charlesworth, "Possible Fragment of the Rule of the Community (5Q11)" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1*, 105, is more careful and labels it only as a "possible" fragment of the *Community Rule* (but cf. p. 2). Further fragments of S have also been identified, e.g., 11Q29. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "A Newly Identified 11Q*Serekh ha-Yahad* Fragment (11Q29)?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 439–52.


tion, annual cycle), but the order of themes is different from 1QS.\textsuperscript{24} The material before this, in 5Q13 1–3, is about recounting God’s past deeds.\textsuperscript{25} This has no direct parallel in 1QS but it is material that very well could be the kind of 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.” Therefore, this manuscript has much greater potential to be seen as part of a Community Rule than perhaps it first appears on the basis of strict parallels.\textsuperscript{26}

In comparison, some of the “copies” of the Community Rule contain material that has no parallel in 1QS or other S manuscripts. Most famously, 4QS\textsuperscript{7} contains the calendrical text at the end where 1QS has the final hymn. But minor non-parallels are also significant. To name two examples: Two fragments out of four of 4QpapS\textsuperscript{1} (frag. A and B = 3 and 4) have no direct parallel in 1QS or elsewhere.\textsuperscript{27} Two of the three fragments of 4QpS\textsuperscript{6} have no parallel in 1QS or elsewhere.\textsuperscript{28} Should these manuscripts still be considered as S manuscripts and on what grounds?

\textsuperscript{24} Thus, for example, the rule of following the practice annually is mentioned only after the rule about purification. Schiffman, “Sectarian Rule (5Q13),” 137. Schiffman also notes that examination before the mevagger (instructor) more closely resembles CD 15:11 than 1QS where the examination takes place before the paqad (overseer, 1QS 6:13–15). In the other fragments, further parallels to 1QS exit in 5Q13: the theme of confession in 5Q13 22 (cf. 1QS 1:25) and the annual cycle in 5Q13 28 (cf. 1QS 2:15; 5:24; see pp. 140–45).

\textsuperscript{25} 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.

\textsuperscript{26} The liturgical elements in 5Q13 also point towards another set of manuscripts, the Berakhah (4Q286–290), which likewise include a combination of rules and liturgical material connected to the covenant ritual. Should parts of S be seen as Berakhah or the other way around? Or should one be seen as an embryonic form of the other? Another kind of combination can be found in 4Q265, which is named 4QMiscellaneous Rules (or previously 4QSerah Damascus), since it contains both rules similar to S material (penal code, organizational material) and rules similar to D material (halakhot, penal code). The unexpected mixture puzzles scholars, and there are no clear categories available. The element of halakhot (e.g., Sabbath laws) seems to prevent the manuscript being seen as anything close to S.

\textsuperscript{27} According to Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:27, the manuscript 4Q255 has four fragments: 1, 2, A and B. Before the DJD edition, Sarianna Metso, The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule (STD) 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 18, numbered these fragments as 1, 2, 3, and 4.

\textsuperscript{28} The inclusion of the third fragment of 4QpS\textsuperscript{6} is also questioned by the DJD editors Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:11. If it does not belong here, two fragments remain and one has a parallel to 1QS. In the edition by Qumran and Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community:
In the first case, 4QpapS, the opening line סַפְּרֶה סֶכֶר הָרָדָד (1:1) and has a clear parallel to 1QS's סַפְּרֶה סֶכֶר הָרָדָד (1:1). The DJD editors consider this as a critical feature of the manuscript being "a version of S and not simply a miscellany of quotations from diverse sources." This may be justified, but the title in 1QS is partly reconstructed and preserves the only parallel of all S manuscripts, so the title cannot be considered as very representative of all the S works. Charlotte Hempel suggests that 4QpapS may have contained one of the earliest drafts of the opening columns of S, not yet as extensive in form as later attested.

Concerning the other case, 4QS, Metso is sceptical: "There is a good likelihood that the manuscript is not a copy of the Community Rule at all, but some other work (a collection of hymns?) quoting a phrase from the Community Rule." This judgment seems to be based on the amount of shared material, which is too little to create an impression of 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

Cave IV Fragments," 98–99, the manuscript only has one fragment, the one that is parallel to 1QS 3:4–6.
30 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:10. Cf. also page 30: The preserved title "suggests that 4QpapS was a 'complete' copy of S."
31 However, the words יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל are also reconstructed in the handle sheet verso of 1QS. Metso, The Textual Development, 14, considers the first words (Serekh ha-yahad) to refer to 1QS, and the title beginning with the preposition יְהַ to refer to 1QSa and 1QSb. If the reconstruction of the title is correct, then it may partly link 4QpapS and 1QS together. The unparalleled fragment 3 (or A) of 4QpapS contains the expression ספר דַּעַת (4QpapS 3 4), not found anywhere else, so there clearly is at least something unique to this manuscript.
32 Charlotte Hempel, "The Long Text of the Serekh as Crisis Literature" (paper presented at the The Fourteenth International Symposium of the Orion Centre: The Religious Worldviews Reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jerusalem, May, 2013). Cf. also Metso, The Textual Development, 20, n. 31. The DJD editors too consider the possibility that the manuscript is a "draft," but not simply a draft of 1QS 1–4 as Hempel proposes; cf. Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:30: "The fact that it is written so roughly on the back of another text suggests that it may be an early draft or personal copy of S." 4QpapS likewise preserves material parallel to 1QS 1–4 only and was scribed at the same time as 1QS.
33 Metso, The Textual Development, 61; Metso, The Serekh Texts, 5.
is also found in 5Q13 (on this mss, see above). However, unlike Metso, the DJD editors are willing to see 4QSb as an S manuscript, as the signum also indicates, but they state: "This scroll may not have been a complete copy of S" (sic). Such a choice of words ("a complete copy of S") should be a warning bell to us; it seems to presume the existence of a thing that is finished, superior, and even closed.

The above examples suffice here to demonstrate what we clearly know from the existing manuscript evidence, and no one denies this: no remaining manuscript, given the title "S," is completely identical with another S manuscript. There is considerable variance, not only in textual forms and minor variant readings but also in the existence or not of sections that a given manuscript has. On the basis of the existing material evidence, there never was an S manuscript that was identical to another S manuscript. Therefore, there is no reason to assume that one manuscript was superior to another, or that we immediately know which manuscript may have been superior in the ancient usage.

34 Metso, The Serakh Texts, 62, also proposes that 4QSb is a copy of 5Q13 (not S, according to present editions).
35 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:11.
36 Differently, Metso, The Textual Development, 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." Hempel, too, insists that the final, authoritative "Endtext" of the Rule cannot be established. Hempel, "Pluralism and Authoritativeness," 208.
37 There is also the matter of scope. Is it justified to name one single fragment as an S manuscript (such as 4Q263 [4QS] and 4Q264 [4QS], see Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:197, 201), when there is an identifiable parallel to S material, but only in a few lines, and no data on what else this manuscript may have contained, if anything?
38 Qimron and Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community: Cave IV Fragments," 53, note that the 10 ms from Cave 4 may not be copies of the Community Rule but that "they may be in many cases copies of documents, like the hymn in column 11, which evolved separately and were finally collected together into the Rule of the Community." This possibility, however, is not shown in the way they label the manuscripts and generally speak of them as copies of S.
War Scroll

Considering the War Scroll, on the other hand, six Cave 4 manuscripts (4Q491–496) together with 1QM are regarded as representative of this work. Scholars may characterize these 4QM manuscripts as different "recensions" or "traditions," but the manuscripts are titled as M manuscripts. It is noteworthy that, the smaller the remains of the Cave 4 fragments or the less script preserved on them, the more likely it is that scholars have defined the manuscript as being identical with or representing the same tradition as 1QM.\textsuperscript{39} However, none of the 4QM manuscripts that have preserved a greater amount of text can be shown to be exactly identical to 1QM.\textsuperscript{40} It can thus be asked: How reasonable is it to suppose that one of the extremely fragmentary manuscripts would have been identical to 1QM?\textsuperscript{41}

In addition to these manuscripts, there are manuscripts that resemble 1QM but are not defined as M texts: in the DJD series, 4Q471 belongs to the category of War Scroll-like texts, and 11Q14 and 4Q285 are defined as presenting Sefer ha-Milhamah.\textsuperscript{42} These categories are not clearly defined: War Scroll-like texts and Sefer ha-Milhamah texts as well

\textsuperscript{39} Cf. Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Fragments* (CQS 6; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 41 (also 20–30), who defines the very fragmentary 4Q494, 4Q495 and 4Q496 as representing "recensions" similar to 1QM, and Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* (STD 76; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 18–19 (also 391–92), who categorizes 4Q494 and 4Q495 as "copies of a same recension" as 1QM (p. 391). It is of course tempting, when there is not much left of the text but that text fits together with 1QM, to suggest that the lost text proceeds similarly to 1QM. However, on the differences and the fragmentary nature of these manuscripts, see note 41.

\textsuperscript{40} Cf. 4Q491a, 4Q491b, and 4Q493, which Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 41 (also 20–30), defines as "other recensions," and Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 18–19 (also 396–97) as "different recensions" of 1QM. Note also 4Q492, which Duhaime defines as a "similar recension" and Schultz as a "copy of the same recension" as 1QM, but which, however, has some differences in comparison to 1QM.

\textsuperscript{41} In addition, there are distinguishable differences between the extremely fragmentary manuscripts and 1QM: For example, 4Q494 is sometimes considered to be identical with 1QM but there probably is at least one extra verse in comparison to 1QM. See Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 222, 227, esp. n. 144. As regards 4Q495, its frg. 2 appears to be identical with the text of 1QM 13:9–12—but drawing this conclusion presumes much reconstruction.

\textsuperscript{42} For 4Q471 and 4Q285, see Alexander et al., DJD 36. For 11Q14, see Garcia Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 33. Note also 4Q497 which, according to Builet, DJD 7:69, is "texte ayant quelque rapport avec la règle de la guerre."
have parallels to 1QM. For example, one out of three fragments of 4Q471 is considered to be a parallel to 1QM 2 and to 4Q491 1.\textsuperscript{43} 4Q285 was first suggested to represent parts of the missing end of 1QM but, in DJD 36, 4Q285 is categorized as representing Sefer ha-Milhamah texts. The main reason for this categorization was the term בָּעִי, which occurs particularly often in 4Q285 (IV 2, 6; VII 4) but only once in 1QM (see 5:1 where the term is actually נַעְשָׁה בָּעִי).\textsuperscript{44} At the same time, some of the M texts do contain a considerable amount of material with no direct parallel to 1QM: 4Q493 is one example.\textsuperscript{45} There is no clear policy why one manuscript is labelled M and another is not. Another good example is the manuscript 4Q491b, which has material not directly paralleled in 1QM and material in different order than in 1QM. We shall discuss this example further below, so the following table illustrates here the general difference of 4Q491b fragments 1–3 to 1QM (parallel material is marked with italics).\textsuperscript{46}

\begin{table}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{43} See Eshel and Eshel in DJD 36:442 (ed. Alexander et al.). It should be noted, however, that the fragment in question (frg. 1) is poorly preserved: in its nine lines, only 1–4 words per line are extant.

\textsuperscript{44} Alexander and Vermes in DJD 36:231–32, propose designating 4Q285 as Sefer ha-Milhamah "in order to indicate its close relationship to, but independence of, 1QM." Eibert Tigchelaar ("Working with Few Data: The Relation Between 4Q285 and 11Q14," DSD 7 [2000]: 49–56) notes regarding 4QM and 1QM that they cannot be considered as simply copies of the same composition but that "there were different compositions or editions dealt with the eschatological war, which were related to one another. 4Q285 and 11Q14 might be copies of one of those editions, or may represent a related composition." Philip Alexander ("The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of Jewish Opposition to Rome," in Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov [ed. S. M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 17–30) argues that 4Q285 and 1QM are distinct as regards the type of literature they represent: 4Q285 represents the intellectual scenario of the end-time war, whereas 1QM represents the strategic and terebb-literature for the war, however, the division is in our view not so clear as to allow such a categorization. See also Duhaime, The War Texts, 33, who summarizes the research history of 4Q285.

\textsuperscript{45} For 4Q493, see, e.g., Duhaime, The War Texts, 30.

\textsuperscript{46} For 4Q491, see, e.g., Duhaime, The War Texts, 33. The ensemble of 4Q491b fragments 1–3 shares most with 1QM; fragments 4–7, 16–17, 19–21 and 23 cannot be plausibly compared with 1QM since they are so small and fragmentary. The division of manuscript 4Q491 into three parts, a-, b-, and c-manuscript, is based on the study by Martin Abegg, "The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4" (PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1993). In his dissertation, Abegg ("The War Scroll," 4–9) divided the fragments of 4Q491 into three categories according to the script, line height, and orthography: group A includes fragments 8–10, 11 col. II, 13–15, 18, 22, 24–28, 31–33, 35, group B fragments 1–7, 16–17, 19–21, 23 and group C fragments 12 and 11, col. I. Brian Schultz...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Direct/Certain Parallels in IQM?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines 1–5 Hymn(?) score: God and his angels involved in the war (ends with nacat)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6a “The rule to observe in their encampments” begins</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging the divisions, weapons, tactics, age limits</td>
<td>5:3–7:3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 6b–7a Preparations: requirements for entry to war (women, children, unclean men cannot go; something is said about the craftsmen and the smelters; the section ends with nacat)</td>
<td>7:3b–5a (in addition, lame, blind, crippled, disabled cannot go; nothing about craftsmen or smelters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 7b–9a Preparations: separation of holy and unclean (the section ends with nacat)</td>
<td>• 7:6b–7 (after the mention on angels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The distance between the camps and the latrines(?)</td>
<td>• 3:4b (in the middle of the list of trumpets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Separating men for the daily duty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Going to the house of meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Conquering the World, 17, 20–22, 373–74) supports Abegg’s view, and Esther Eshel ("4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” ResQ 17 (1996): 175–203) has also pointed out that 4Q491c has some unique orthography and phrases. Duhaime does not divide 4Q491 into three in his edition but he introduces Abegg’s theory in his book The War Texts: IQM and Related Fragments (CQS 6. London: T&T Clark, 2004), 24–30, and considers it plausible. However, Abegg’s theory has also been criticized: Florentino García Martínez and Eliezer Tchekhov followed Abegg’s division in their The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 3:978–981, but later García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The ‘I’ of Two Qumran Hymns,” ETJ 78 (2002): 321–39, came to the conclusion that the separation of 4Q491b and 4Q491c is not convincing although 4Q491a clearly is a separate manuscript (p. 328). Kipp Davis is working on the material and suggests re-joining some of the fragments. He sees two different hands and possibly several compositions in the same scroll (oral communication, results to be published in 2015). Being conscious of this ongoing debate, we take our examples from the manuscript 4Q491b, but our main argument does not depend on Abegg’s theory.)*

*In 4Q491b, there occur elements parallel to IQM in almost every part of the text, cf. e.g., lines 1–3 and IQM 1:4–9, 14–15; 13:1–3; or line 13b and IQM 7:12b–9:9. However, in this table, only direct/certain parallels are taken into account. What should also be noted is that 4Q491b fragments 1–3 include 20 fragmentary lines. They have parallels to various parts of IQM, namely columns 3–9, which is a large section of text.*
### Table 1. Comparison between 4Q491b and 1QM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines 10b–18</th>
<th>Going to the war</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Requirements for entry into the war (unclean men cannot go) and the reasons for them (the angels are involved in the war)</td>
<td>7:5b–6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proceeding to the war (three lines)</td>
<td>5:16–17 (seven lines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marching out in turns</td>
<td>• 9:17b (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting up an ambush</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Directing the war with trumpets</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gathering the lines</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three lines march out in turns</td>
<td>• 7:10–12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The war garments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines 19–20</th>
<th>Fulfilling the rule (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tasks for the priests and the Levites, directing the war with trumpets</td>
<td>7:12b–9:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table illustrates that both manuscripts include restrictions about persons who can participate in the warfare and both texts are concerned about the purity of the camp and the battle, but the information is clearly organized differently, and 4Q491b includes more detailed procedures for the preparations as well as the opening section (hymn?) in connection with these matters, unlike 1QM columns 3–9.

To conclude this section, (1) comparing the S and M policies, the principles of naming the S and the M manuscripts seem not to be the same as regards the amount of variation allowed between different manuscripts. In the case of M, there are manuscripts, interpreted as representing M, that clearly contain material not having any direct parallel in 1QM (such as 4Q491b, 4Q493), whereas in the case of S, the manuscripts containing anything in slightly better shape but different from 1QS (except the calendar section at the end) are placed outside the S category (such as 5Q13; 4Q265). (2) Furthermore, in both cases, a closer look at S and M manuscripts reveals that the individual manuscripts are always different from each other in some respects (either concerning individual variants or the sections included), and often are in a very fragmentary condition or extant only in one or a few fragments, making it very speculative to determine what the original manuscript
might have looked like. (3) Outside the scholarly S and M categories, on the other hand, there exist manuscripts that are not similar to other S and M manuscripts in all parts but clearly are similar in some parts, and possibly no more different than the manuscripts inside the S and M categories. The differences found in varying principles are understandable since the editors are not the same and the publications derive from different stages of DJD publication history, but it demonstrates that editorial principles are not consistent, and certainly have an impact on further scholarly work, especially serious for non-Qumran specialists who might not feel competent to study the primary manuscript evidence.

**Principles of Manuscript Editing**

Speaking about different manuscript versions of any literary work is of course complicated by the fact that the existing evidence is fragmentary. Editing and reconstructing fragments are very much connected to our views of what a given manuscript is thought to represent and what it could have been like in its fully preserved form. Quite naturally, consciously and unconsciously, the longer and better preserved manuscripts function as models for putting together the pieces of the less well preserved manuscript fragments.\(^{48}\) Only recently has this been questioned, and the general principles of editorial practices and goals of editing have started to move towards more careful and refined paths. Eibert Tigchelaar has put forward the important claim that editing is constructing, that is, interpreting the evidence—not reconstructing, building it up as if the end result was visible from the existing pieces.\(^{49}\) The first level of editing is to transcribe the text in the fragments, but all the following levels (editing manuscripts, works, and textual groups) are schol-

---

\(^{48}\) Similarly, in the case of "biblical" manuscripts, priority has often been given to the "complete" Masoretic text, which has then influenced the reconstructions of the Qumran Hebrew manuscripts.

\(^{49}\) Eibert Tigchelaar, "Proposals for the Critical Editing of Scrolls Compositions" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, 2012; available through www.academia.edu).
arily constructs.\textsuperscript{50} Thus the field is changing in many respects for the future. Here we shall illustrate the importance of going back to the material evidence and seeing what exactly is extant in each case and what is not: how the joins between fragments, reconstructions of lacunae, and the number of columns are based on scholarly assumptions, and how strong each assumption is on the basis of existing evidence. Let us take a closer look at the two examples chosen for this article, first the Community Rule and then the War Scroll, to see how the Cave 1 versions have influenced the editorial principles of Cave 4 material.

\textit{Community Rule}

Alexander and Vermes, the DJD editors of 4QS material, explain that they have a "maximalist approach" to editing the fragments. They clearly state that 1QS, as the "more or less complete manuscript of the document," should always be checked to see if lacunae in Cave 4 fragments can be reconstructed accordingly.\textsuperscript{51} This principle should, in our view, be questioned unless there is some evidence to suggest that 1QS should be given priority and other manuscripts depend on it. The editors admit that 1QS is not a very carefully prepared manuscript but contains many scribal errors and corrections, and they too see problems in merely using the text of 1QS to reconstruct other manuscripts if 1QS has errors or problems.\textsuperscript{52} The maximalist principle is not justified if we think that 1QS is not in any way special except for the fact that it is well preserved. However, corrections in 1QS have also been suggested to indicate that 1QS was especially carefully preserved in order to serve

\textsuperscript{50} Tigchelaar hopes that scholars will move beyond the fragment level and invites critical editions of works, similar to critical editions of "biblical works." Editions of the scrolls may also differ depending on the audience.

\textsuperscript{51} Alexander and Vermes. DJD 26:15. The editors also express reservations about Hartmut Stegmann’s method of material reconstruction (p. 16).

\textsuperscript{52} Alexander and Vermes. DJD 26:16. Similarly Qimron and Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community: Cave IV Fragments," 53: "It is unwise to assume it [1QS] is the final or best version of this important collection of rules."
as a model of the *Community Rule.*

On this suggestion, two issues need to be distinguished: The fact that 1QS happens to be an almost completely preserved scroll should not be used as evidence to think that 1QS is a complete copy of the S tradition and others are not. If we think that 1QS is special because it is the longest representative of the S tradition, we already base the argument on assumptions about the original length of the other manuscripts—which requires material reconstruction and careful judgment of how certain conclusions about the length can be achieved. On the other hand, scribal corrections may indeed suggest that editorial activity was deemed necessary for this scroll but this editorial activity should not be prioritized for other types of editorial and scribal activity without further grounds.

---

53 This is cautiously suggested by Eibert Tigchelaar, "In Search of the Scribe of 1QS," in *Emanuella,* 439–52, esp. 451, on the basis of comparison of 1QS to 4Q175, which were copied by the same scribe: 1QS contains many corrections, showing that the scribe was less trained and influenced by the weakening of gutturals and Aramaisms, but yet the scribe was more consistent in orthography and morphology in 1QS than in 4Q175. Tigchelaar further suggests (p. 452) that the scribe of 1QS compiled the biblical quotations in 4Q175 or used these quotations to compose 1QS 9:3–11, one of the sections that are clearly interpolations in 1QS. However, it should be noted that this section is present in 4QS (but famously lacking in 4Q5), so the interpolation was not known only by the scribe of 1QS. Devorah Dimant, "The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance," *RevQ* 22 (2006): 615–30, makes a stronger case for 1QS being a model copy. In the end, however, we do not have the firm evidence to suggest that this particular copy was a model copy, if the concept of "model copy" requires that we find 1QS re-copied: there is no identical scroll to 1QS.

54 Here, the profile of the scroll caves is a relevant issue: What should be inferred, for example, from the fact that 1QS was in a scroll jar and 4QS manuscripts were not? Recently, scholars have begun to investigate the possible profile of different Qumran caves. Could Cave 1 and Cave 4 text be defined as distinct from the other cave collections and from each other, and, if so, how? Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context,* 303–57, proposes that Cave 4 texts comprise a highly "eclectic and scholarly" collection. Cave 1, on the other hand, could be a selection from Cave 4 texts; see Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context,* 331, and Daniel Stöckl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *DSQ* 14 (2007): 313–33. The strict distinction between 1QS and 4QS versions is not useful, as Hempel, "The Long Text of the *Serekh, *shows when he rather makes a distinction between the "long version" of 5 (1QS and 4Q539, that include material from the first four columns) and "short version" of 5 (4QS). She suggests that the long version could be reflecting a response to a crisis situation or commitment problems in the movement. For further discussion on the profile of the caves, see Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context,* 308–11.
To discuss one example of the editorial principles of 4QS texts in more detail, we shall take a look at 4QS\(^6\) (4Q256). This is a designation for the remains of some 8–15 fragments, dating from the second half of the 1st century B.C.E., with very few material joins between them.\(^5\) To reach any conclusions about the original size of the scroll and placement of the fragments, existing material features are of vital importance. Alexander and Vermes reconstruct 23 columns and state that, "the text seems originally to have matched 1QS in length and general content,"\(^6\) even though material from only nine columns is preserved. They do not make the estimation on the basis of material features of the existing fragments, but on the basis of the text of 1QS. They also consider the possibility that the scroll was even longer, since the last column contains text where 1QS ends.\(^7\) Sarianna Metso paid more careful attention to the material features in her study from 1997. She follows Milik's suggestion that the manuscript contained 20 columns altogether.\(^8\) The fragments of 4QS\(^6\) contain material which, in Metso's view, is parallel to 1QS in the following way (brief descriptions of contents are ours):\(^9\)

\(^5\) Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:39–64. According to the editors, the inclusion of fragment 1 in the manuscript is not certain. The editors list 8 fragments but several fragments consist of many pieces, 15 altogether. Metso, The Textual Development, 22–24, lists 12 fragments.

\(^6\) Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:39.

\(^7\) Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:41, 63.

\(^8\) Metso, The Textual Development, 22–31, Plates II, III; Geza Vermes, "Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4," JJS 42 (1991): 250–55. However, another matter is the degree of certainty in placing the fragments in a particular order in the first place: this order very much follows the order of 1QS. Metso says that the fragments do not allow the kind of material reconstruction as in many other 4QS manuscripts (4QS\(^{des}\)).

\(^9\) Alison Schofield, From Qumran to the Yahuda: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule (STD) 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009), largely follows Metso. See her appendix where she presents a synoptic comparison.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QSb (4Q256) Metso</th>
<th>DJD</th>
<th>contents</th>
<th>parallel in 1QS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frgs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>Material from the covenant entry/ renewal ceremony</td>
<td>1QS 1:16–19, 21–23; 2:4–5, 7–11(^{61})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frg. 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Material of community principles: how to turn together to the Torah and separate from wickedness</td>
<td>1QS 5:1–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frgs. 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Material from the rabbim sessions and penal code</td>
<td>1QS 6:10–13; 16–18; 7:7(^{62})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frgs. 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>Material from the rules of the maskil, and maskil’s prayer</td>
<td>1QS 9:18–22; 10:3–7, 14–18; 11:22(^{63})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Parallels in 4QS\(^{b}\) to 1QS.

The most famous variant of 4QS\(^{b}\) in comparison to 1QS is the notably shorter version of 1QS 5.\(^{65}\) Here we will not discuss these shorter textual forms, but instead pay attention to the overall course of the contents of the manuscript. Even though this manuscript is often noted as preserving material at great length (in contrast to 4QS\(^{4}\), which probably lacked a parallel to 1QS 1–4), the following table illustrates how 4QS\(^{b}\) completely lacks parallels (in gray) to many central sections of 1QS; in other words, these sections have not been preserved in 4QS\(^{b}\):

---

\(^{60}\) See n. 55 for the different fragment numbers in DJD.

\(^{61}\) Schofield, *From Qumran to the Talmud*, appendix, also sees a parallel to line 1QS 2:6.

\(^{62}\) Schofield, *From Qumran to the Talmud*, appendix, does not see a parallel to 1QS 7:7.

\(^{63}\) Schofield, *From Qumran to the Talmud*, appendix, sees a parallel to 1QS 9:17–23.

\(^{64}\) Here, if rightly placed, 4QS\(^{b}\) contains more text after the parallel end of the hymn in 1QS 11:22. See Alexander and Verner, *DJD* 26: 63.

\(^{65}\) The shorter version of 1QS 5 is also found in the manuscript 4QS\(^{4}\). Because of this, the manuscripts 4QS\(^{4}\) are often discussed together; they agree with each other against the longer version of 1QS. But it has to be noted that 4QS\(^{b}\) and 4QS\(^{4}\) are not identical with each other: most notably, 4QS\(^{b}\) lacks the section parallel to 1QS 1–4 altogether.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4QS(a)</th>
<th>DJD</th>
<th>contents</th>
<th>parallels in 1QS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4Q256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frags. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>Material from the covenant entry/renewal ceremony</td>
<td>Covenant renewal ceremony (1QS 1:16–3:12) 1QS 1:16–19, 21–23; 2:4–5, 7–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maskil's teaching on the two spirits</td>
<td>Discourse on the two spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fig. 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Material of community principles: how to turn together to the Law and separate from wickedness</td>
<td>Community principles (1QS 5: 1–26) 1QS 5:1–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eating, praying, sharing counsel; groups of ten</td>
<td>Coming together (1QS 6:1–9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frags. 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Material from the rabbin sessions and penal code</td>
<td>Behaviour in rabbin sessions &amp; penal code (1QS 6:10–7:25) 1QS 6:10–13; 16–18; 7:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational principles in the movement; unintentional and intentional sins; coming of Messiahs</td>
<td>Twelve men and three priests (1QS 8:1–9:11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frags. 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>Material from the rules of the maskil, and maskil's prayer</td>
<td>Rules for maskil (1QS 9:12–11:22) 1QS 9:18–22; 10:3–7, 14–18; 11:22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Comparison between 4QS\(a\) and 1QS.

There is no material evidence to suggest that these particular sections (in gray) belonged to 4QS\(a\). However, this does not mean that material from these sections of 1QS or some other material could not have existed in 4QS\(a\). Metso discusses especially the discourse on two spirits, of which there is no textual evidence in 4QS\(a\), but comes to the conclusion that its absence from the manuscript seems, on material grounds, "highly improbable." This is based on the preservation of margins in fragments.
4 (= DJD frg. 3, par. to 1QS 2:7–11) and 5 (= DJD frg. 4, par. to 1QS 5:1–20) and marks of stitching in both: if these fragments came from separate sheets but these sheets were not directly connected, there must have been another sheet and more text between them.66 Metso first reconstructs in the lost sheet a parallel to 1QS 2:23–3:12, which would take one column. Since one leather sheet most probably had several columns of text, this lost sheet would also have contained the discourse on two spirits.67

But the critical question is whether there is any compelling reason to assume that the lost text would have been the discourse on two spirits, rather than something else.68 The comparison between the manuscripts rather gives reason to expect that each manuscript had considerable variation in the sections that they contained, and no extant manuscript has evidence of containing all the sections that 1QS contains.69 Although it is by no means impossible that 4QS9 contained the discourse on the two spirits, we wish to remark that it also could have contained some other, now lost textual section. The only manuscripts, besides 1QS, to contain extant evidence of the discourse on two spirits are the manuscript 4Qpap5 and 4QSpap5. The evidence in the first, 4Qpap5, is very uncertain, and at the most, as stated by Alexander and Vermes in DJD, preserves a “different recension” of the two spirits dis-

---

66 This is also supported by the fact that fragment 5 (= DJD frg. 4) has a mark in the upper right margin, a gīmel, which indicates, according to the editors, that this was the third sheet, see Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:41.

67 Otherwise, the lost sheet would have contained one column only, which would have been odd (Metso, The Textual Development, 29).

68 That the discourse on two spirits is a unique piece with its own independent origin does not rule out the possibility that it too was edited for the purposes of the 5 compiler. Hempel, “The Teaching on the Two Spirits and the Literary Development of the Rule of the Community,” in Dualism in Qumran (ed. G. Xeravits; Library of Second Temple Studies 76; London: T&T Clark, 2010), 102–20, has recently investigated the links between the discourse on two spirits and the rest of 1QS and considers the possibility that the thematic links derive from the redactor or compiler of 1QS or even that the compiler of the discourse was also the compiler of 1QS.

69 In Metso’s (The Textual Development, 68) view, the manuscript 4QS9 “appears to be the only preserved copy of the Community Rule from Cave 4 containing all the major parts of the text of 1QS.” However, if even 4QS9 does not contain all parts of 1QS, even though it perhaps has the widest distribution of sections across the sections of 1QS, there is no reason to assume that any manuscript would have looked like 1QS.
course. The 4QSpa, on the other hand, has a clear parallel to 1QS 4:4–10, but it has no parallels to other sections outside the sections of 1QS 1–4, which, in our mind, underlines the question whether or not the discourse on two spirits existed in 4QS: clearly, this discourse could have been represented independently from 1QS 5–7 and even on its own.

War Scroll

The maximalist principle clearly has had an influence on editing the 4Q manuscripts, and 1QM—the longest representative of the M tradition—continues to have an impact on editions. The exceptionally large number of editions shows the challenges in editing and classifying these texts. In the DJD edition of the 4QM texts from 1982, Maurice Baillet aimed at joining the fragments whenever possible—and he often made the joins with the help of 1QM. Furthermore, Baillet tended to reconstruct each manuscript as fully as possible, usually on the basis of 1QM. This made it easy to observe the links between 1QM and the Cave 4 war texts—which probably was a conscious aim and also the kind of research result desired of the DJD volume.

---

70 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:37.
71 Note also the additional words placed here, preserved in two fragments, 4QS 16 and 4Q487 37, which, according to 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, should be placed as parts of this manuscript.
72 Tigchelaar, "These are the Names of the Spirits of...", 543–45, further identifies the discourse on the two spirits in 1Q29 fragments 13–17, which he re-edits as manuscript 1Q29a. Also the manuscript 4Q230 contains similar material of the two ways (p. 530–38).
73 Baillet, DJD 7: 12–72.
74 Cf. e.g., connecting fragments 5 and 6 (see Baillet, DJD 7:20). The certainty of this connection has since been called into question; cf. e.g., Abegg, "The War Scroll," 51.
Martin Abegg (1993) was the first to challenge Baillet’s views.⁷⁶ Abegg preferred to treat the fragments separately and did not accept all Baillet’s joins.⁷⁷ However, in his readings of the fragments, Abegg followed mainly Baillet and made large reconstructions based on IQM, mostly similar to Baillet. Abegg’s interest was focused primarily on the links between IQM and 4QM manuscripts, as is shown by the inclusion of an edition of IQM at the end of his dissertation, in which coincident passages with the Cave 4 war texts are marked.

Jean Duhaime’s edition (1995)⁷⁸ differed from the two previous ones by refraining from large reconstructions.⁷⁹ However, in the arrangement of the fragments and in his readings, Duhaime followed mainly Baillet.⁸⁰ Concerning the much-discussed manuscript 4Q491, Duhaime later introduced Abegg’s theory of dividing it into three different manuscripts and considers it plausible.⁸¹ According to Abegg, the fragments of manuscript 4Q491 should be arranged into three different manuscripts, 4Q491a, 4Q491b and 4Q491c.⁸² In this article, we take our examples from the manuscript 4Q491b, especially its fragments 1–3, but our main argument does not depend on the theory of this division.

---

⁷⁶ Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 211, states that his edition is indebted to Sukenik’s, Carmignac’s and Yadin’s earlier works.
⁷⁷ Cf. e.g., 4Q491 fragments 14 and 15. About the theory of 4Q491a, b, and c, see n. 46.
⁷⁸ Jean Duhaime, “War Scroll (IQM, IQ33); Cave IV Fragments (4QM1-6 = 4Q491-496); War Scroll-Like Fragment (4Q497)” in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Vol. 2 (ed. James H. Charlesworth with J. M. Baumgarten et al.; The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 80–203. Duhaime’s work was edited by James H. Charlesworth and Brent A. Strawn, who wrote part of the comments in the footnotes. The comments concern mostly the similarities between the 4QM texts and IQM.
⁷⁹ As Brooke, Review, 576–79, notes, Duhaime’s edition “enables one to see easily more or less what the original fragment looks like.”
⁸² Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 4–9. The manuscript 4Q491b includes fragments 1–7, 16–17, 19–21, 23 of 4Q491 in this theory. On the arguments and discussion of this theory, see n. 46.
The most recent editions of 4QM manuscripts demonstrate well two very different approaches to manuscript editing. Rony Ishay (2006) is a cautious editor: her main aim is to provide the reader a reliable reading of the letters in view, and she avoids large reconstructions. As regards 4Q491, the most controversial of the 4QM texts, Ishay does not follow either Baille’s order or Abegg’s division: she creates her own arrangement of the fragments, and further separates individual fragments from one another. She shows an interest in treating each fragment independently, even though her separations can be criticized. However, she does not abandon Baille’s idea of the fragments of 4Q491 belonging to one manuscript—she only states that the fragments “do not yield a coherent running text.”

Elisha Qimron (2010), on the other hand, aims at reading all the war texts together and placing the text of the 4QM manuscripts as part of the running text of IQM. For example, 4Q493 is situated between columns 7 and 8. When any textual form of a 4QM manuscript is identical with IQM, the transcribed text is coloured, whereas the text that is only found in IQM is black. Thus, the manuscript 4Q491 is shown to exist in columns 12, 14, 16 of IQM, and is further situated between columns 6 and 7, 15 and 16, 16 and 17, 18 and 19 of IQM, and at the end of the scroll. This way of editing has a great impact on readings: in Qimron’s edition, IQM most clearly directs the reading of 4QM manuscripts. Qimron’s edition shows that using the Cave 1 manuscript as a basis for editing the Cave 4 manuscripts is not a passing phenomenon.

---

85 Rony Ishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran: Manuscripts 4Q491–4Q496 (edition and commentary) and their comparison to War Scroll (1QM)" (PhD diss., University of Haifa, 2006). In comparison to other editions, it is difficult that Ishay does not make a distinction between certain, probable and possible letters but marks only identified or unidentified letters. If a letter is not clearly visible, she usually marks it as an unidentified letter. The work is an unpublished dissertation in Hebrew, so our access to it is limited.

84 See Ishay, "The Literature of War at Qumran," English abstract.

89 Ibid.


87 Tigchelaar, “Proposals for the Critical Editing,” notes that Qimron’s editions are not intended to be critical editions at all but to present composite texts in an economical form. Overlaps are easily seen in this type of edition but the user cannot assess the distinct manuscript features and variants. Ariel Feldman, for his part, notes that there is a significant differ-
The critical question raised in the previous discussion on the S-material—namely whether there are reasons to suppose that those parts of the Cave 1 text that have not been preserved in Cave 4 texts would have existed there—is worth asking also in the case of the M-material.

Principles of Explaining the Nature of Differences between Manuscripts

The above-discussed principles of categorizing manuscripts (which manuscripts represent the same literary work or rule collection) and the principles of editing fragments, manuscripts, and works have to be solved before scholars can actually compare different versions of the same work and benefit from the knowledge about scribal practices to be drawn from this evidence. In this section, we will take a closer look at proposed explanations offered about the relationship between our selected Cave 4 examples and their Cave 1 parallels. Whereas the traditional questions have concerned the direction of dependency—in the cases where direct literary dependency is likely and parallels can be closely compared—scholars have also considered issues of the function of various types of manuscripts (e.g., small script: private usage) and the dating of the manuscript (earlier script: earlier version, later script: later version) to determine the relationship between different manuscripts. Other physical factors, such as the place of writing and access to resources and education, have also entered the discussion. Here too, it plays a significant role what the individual manuscripts are perceived to be.

ences between Qimron and Yadin's assessment of the number of lines of 1QM: according to Yadin, there were some 20 lines per column, whereas Qimron argues that the number of the lines was some 30. In addition, Feldman also notes Qimron's suggestion that—as Feldman puts it—"the Q War materials that have no parallel in 1QM may be accommodated in those additional lines." Feldman does not directly accept this idea but writes: "It remains to be seen whether this proposal, as well as the entire concept of using a composite edition strategy for the texts that bear marks of inner literary development, will gain scholarly support." See Feldman, "Review of The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Writings, Vol. 1," in JSS 58 (2013): 201–2.
4Q5: 4Q256 (4QSb)

The case of our 4QSb example was already introduced above (see tables 2 and 3). According to the DJD editors, 4QSb represents "a different recension of S from 1QS," even though it may have been similar to 1QS in length.88 They further explain that these recensinal differences were major in the middle part (i.e., in the parallel to 1QS 5:1–9:11: community organization and penal code) but less significant at the beginning and end of the scroll. The editors identified the manuscript as belonging to "Recension B" as opposed to "Recension A" of 1QS, but refrained from taking any further stance as to the relationship or order between the recensions.89

On the other hand, scholars have not been satisfied with the mere descriptive approach but attempted to find out which variants represent more original versions. In the 1990s, there emerged two major explanations for the order between 1QS and 4QSb. Some relied on the paleographical manuscript age to determine the earlier version (thus 1QS),90 whereas others followed the principle that shorter forms represent earlier forms (thus 4QSb).91 Thus the shorter 4QSb either was an abbreviated form from the longer form, or it was a late copy of an earlier, now lost but more original textual form.

According to Metso's well-known theory, the (hypothetical) original short form of S was split, at an early stage, into two different lines of textual growth, of which 4QSa represents one and 4QSbd the other, and later 1QS combined (and modified) both these lines.92 Built into this theory are the following assumptions concerning 4QSb: 4QSb is not directly dependent on 1QS but on a shorter form of S. If the second

88 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:10–11, 46.
89 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:12.
91 Vermes, "Preliminary Remarks," 250–55; Metso, The Textual Development, 68; see more scholars' views in Metso, The Serekh Texts, 17–19. Note that the DJD editors, Alexander and Vermes, thus differ in their views, which could be the reason for their not stating much on the matter in the DJD Volume.
92 Metso, The Textual Development, 146–47.
copyist’s corrections and additions to 1QS are ignored, a direct dependency in the other direction can be assumed: 1QS was dependent on the textual form of 4QS or a text very similar to it.

However, it has to be noted that this type of theory only explains the relationship between manuscripts that are already assigned to the S category. Thus, for example, a manuscript like 5Q13 (see above) is not part of the scheme, or its parallel to S is noted as being a quotation from S—that is, being dependent on S manuscripts rather than the other way around (or both are seen as sharing a common source). Furthermore, the fact that 1QSa and 1QSb are in fact part of the final S recension in the 1QS manuscript is largely ignored in the theory. And lastly, to be precise, the model of textual growth is shown not to be an absolute rule in the theory, since 1QS, if it was dependent on a textual form represented in 4QS, does not follow it fully: it does not contain the material that continued after the final line of 1QS (11:22), and there are also other minor pluses in 4QS that are not part of 1QS.

This last aspect, assumed linear evolution of textual growth and direct dependency, has been noted especially by Alison Schofield, who sees the situation as more complicated than previously suggested. Even if Metso’s (rather than Alexander’s) theory explains the most significant

34 E.g., 4QS 9:8 contains the additional prohibition of outsiders and insiders eating together ("he shall not eat with him"), after another prohibition, probably (if similar to 4QS) forbidding the men of injustice to touch the pithy of the men of holiness. The prohibition against eating is not transmitted in the parallel sentence in 1QS (9:13). See Schofield, From Qumran to the Yahad, 101. Instead, however, 1QS 5:16 does contain the prohibition for the men of the yahad to eat "from their possessions" (in 4QS, this is also reconstructed on the basis of 4QS, but it is addressed to the men of holiness). It seems that 4QS preserves the prohibition in both directions: outsiders (men of injustice) may not eat with men of holiness and men of holiness may not eat with outsiders.
35 Schofield, From Qumran to the Yahad. Similarly, but from different direction, Charlotte Hempel, "The Literary Development of the S Tradition – A New Paradigm," ResQ 22 (2006): 389–401, seeks to acknowledge more complexity in understanding the development of S traditions, see further below. However, two important research questions should not be confused: what can be said about the relation of the existing manuscript compositions with each other (the main focus in Metso’s study and now also Schofield), and what can be said, on the basis of existing manuscript evidence—including the internal evidence (literary critical factors) within one manuscript—of the complex textual history of the composition or compositions (main focus in Hempel’s approach).
differences, as Schofield holds, it is not yet a fully satisfactory model. In Schofield’s view, 4QS\(^b\) includes variants that most likely represent earlier readings in comparison to 1QS, but also variants that most likely did not simply function as a Vorlage to a textual form of 1QS or that are “ambiguous,” not bending towards direct dependency in either direction. She characterizes the manuscripts as having gone through semi-independent development (in other words, 4QS\(^b\) also represents changes or forms that have neither influenced nor even been known to the scribes of 1QS). To explain these circumstances, Schofield draws from social anthropological research by Robert Redfield on the relation between codified religious traditions and local communities in the periphery: local communities always exemplify variation but, at the same time, some form of dialogue and connection with the centre exists. The centre, in this case, is both the Jerusalem establishment and, at a lower level, the hierarchy in the movement, possible at a later stage at Qumran.\(^{96}\) The earlier traditions radiated “outwards” from Jerusalem, and 1QS is tentatively suggested to be “the official Qumran copy.”\(^{97}\)

Schofield’s theory is worth considering, although some of its details can be contested.\(^{98}\) The search for new models can be applauded but the risk in the centre-periphery model is that it requires too much independence between the communities that produced the existing plurality. What we rather see is that there was also great stability in that certain traditions were shared. Hempel seems to have similar reservations

---

\(^{96}\) Schofield, From Qumran to the Yahad, 49–51, 275. A similar kind of situation of textual plurality and variation is of course often attested in “biblical” textual witnesses (i.e., versions are not simply daughter versions of another but also testify to further changes, some earlier readings, and later revisions according to the other versions). Schofield outlines how her theory differs from the theory of “local texts” concerning biblical witnesses (60–62), but does not explain whether the radial-dialogic model has anything to offer to explaining variation among the biblical witnesses.

\(^{97}\) Schofield, From Qumran to the Yahad, 130, 273.

\(^{98}\) Some of Schofield’s cases of textual variants (From Qumran to the Yahad, 92–103) where she sees ambiguity or evidence that 4QS\(^b\) readings are secondary in comparison to 1QS can equally or even more likely be explained by assuming that the scribe of 1QS added something or revised the reading to suit his needs, e.g., the cases 1QS 5:5, 6–7, 23; 6:2; 8:26, and their parallels; see Schofield, From Qumran to the Yahad, 92–94, 98–99, 103. These cases are not easy to judge in either direction, but at least question marks should be added to the presentation of the variants and their “secondary” nature in the table on p. 127.
about Schofield’s model: “There is no need to assume that various copies of the Serekh reflect distinctive practices and geographical provenances rather than a fluid textual tradition not unlike the textual fluidity of the emerging scriptures.”

Hempel herself has approached the issue from another perspective, remarking the great internal diversity and even contradictions within an individual S manuscript. She proposes that “the quest for the earliest form of the text of the Rule is best identified in the common material shared by the manuscripts rather than in the earlier of two variants where the manuscripts diverge.” In other words, comparing the variants between the S manuscripts does not bring us very far back to the earliest forms of the text; instead, the significance of the material that “sticks” and stays the same in different manuscripts, despite the new material and terminology that is being brought in around it, can be far greater in understanding the development of the traditions.

When we start to think with along these lines and with new analogies, new models for thinking emerge. Starting from the fact that none of the existing S manuscripts is exactly identical with another S manuscript, it can be argued that scribes who preserved known material always also created new material or combined and modified known material in creative ways—as in the digital age when information is being updated. The scribes may have preserved known material in very much the way in which scholars now refer to earlier scholarship on the theme. Known material was there for the sake of continuity and familiarity, for setting the stage for discussion, and for preserving information. The changes these scribes made or the additions they attached were their

---

100 Hempel, “Pluralism and Authoritativeness,” 200.
101 But there is a difference in that the modern academic conventions have the need to provide authenticity for and give credit to earlier scholars. Van der Toorn (Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible, 16) suggests another analogy: “biblical” books compare to archives, where heterogeneous material is brought together. Similarly, rule texts are argued by Saritam Metso, “Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from Rule Texts Found at Qumran,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 315–35, to be reservoirs of communal decisions, rather than prescriptive rule collections. Note, however, that the perspective here is not only on the function of *writing down* rules, but also on the function of *preserving* certain rules in various manuscripts.
(personal) mark on the issue, driven by any set of socio-religious or practical concerns or constraints, and probably also taking place whenever there was the need to preserve a deteriorating manuscript or distribute an existing manuscript. The fact that they, for example, preserved material about the community principles (section in parallel to 1QS 5: turning to the Torah and separating from wickedness) in several manuscripts (4QSCb, d; 1QS) may well be explained by the fact that this type of material serves as prototypical concerning the “rule” of belonging: anyone having heard it, would recognize the types of issues expected to be discussed in that scroll. On the other hand, in this way, new ideas could actually be effectively learned, taught and distributed: they were not loose pieces of information but were twists in the earlier and familiar knowledge or new combinations of pieces of information.101

To think of the text of our 4QS example in this way, it may represent one of the first combinations of material from the covenant renewal ceremony, of communal principles, and of the final psalm (but possibly not yet, e.g., the discourse on two spirits), thus giving a liturgical framework to the whole work, with both collective and individual voices present (and this combination was then built upon and further expanded in forms such as the 1QS manuscript). But it is also significant that the manuscript 4QSb is written later than 1QS. Perhaps the “twist,” that is, the personal contribution of the scribe in transmitting this particular tradition, was to be found in something that has not been preserved to us and can no longer be identified. The work built upon familiar knowledge, and it could even use the short form of this knowledge to save space102 in order to present some new idea—perhaps

101 Schofield, From Qumran to the Yehud, 63, speaks here of the fluid line between an author and copyist: there is a dialogue in the process of “authoring (and redacting) a text and transmitting it.”
102 Thus, three options are conceivable in relation to longer textual form such as 1QS: the scribe of 4QSc had a shorter Vorlage, or the scribe abbreviated a longer form, or a combination of these. In our view, the order of the emergence of the textual forms of S is most probably from shorter to longer (as argued by Meiss, see above and n. 92) but that does not mean that scribes could not be sufficiently skilled to edit texts into more condensed forms if they needed to. Some of the scribal additions in 1QS are often complicating the sentences and the
at the end of the scroll, which is now lost, or by placing the maskil title in the central familiar section.\textsuperscript{104}

This way of thinking can also be applied to M. The most significant differences between 4Q491(a and b) and 1QM are in the so-called encouragement speeches. The narrative parts of the texts are often alike but the speeches are fluid. It seems that the speeches offer a place for new literary activity and creativity while the narrative parts serve for continuity and familiarity.

Or to think of another, digital model, one manuscript may have represented a “search result” for one type of search of information and the other to another type of “search.” In the following we shall study 4Q491b, where the purity concerns are in two places in the preparations for the war, whereas in 1QM, the purity concerns are collected together. Neither end result may be considered as necessarily superior to the other (even though one may be older than the other); they may just organize the information differently.\textsuperscript{105} Which line of tradition then survives and is distributed more widely may rely on purely external factors and by chance but sometimes also on the accessibility of the knowledge: one is easier to use than the other, for example.

text often runs more smoothly without them. One may imagine a scribe would leave precisely such additions out if a shorter form was needed. However, here we have to allow for more variety in manuscript forms: it is quite unlikely that each case where 4QS\textsuperscript{2} is shorter than 1QS, 4QS\textsuperscript{2} would have been shortened from exactly the form present in 1QS. Some cases are easier to imagine in this way (e.g., biblical quotations) whereas others are more difficult (e.g., some individual words).

\textsuperscript{104} Thus, the focus of 4QS\textsuperscript{2} can be seen to be in the teaching and liturgical duties of the maskil—or in telling what the duties of the maskil are portrayed to be. Cf. the discussion on the maskil by Schofield, \textit{From Qumran to the Yehud}, 154–55. Schofield also (p. 101) considers the possibility that the prohibition against eating with the men of injustice in 4QS\textsuperscript{2} (see note 94 above) is explained by a setting outside Qumran, in which intermingling with outsiders needed more careful attention. However, this presumes that a Qumranic setting would have been isolated or that outsiders would not have been as easy to keep outside in an extra-Qumranic setting as at Qumran.

\textsuperscript{105} Cf. Van der Toorn, \textit{Scriptural Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible}, 47: “To them [the ancients], an author does not invent his text but merely arranges it; the content of a text exists first, before laid down in writing.”
4QM: 4Q491b

Scholars have not shown as keen an interest in explaining the textual history of M as in explaining the textual history of S, probably because of the nature of their contents. But the situation is also not quite similar at the manuscript level between S and M; for example, 4QM parallels do not have as clearly shorter forms, from a later period, in comparison to 1QM as 4QS manuscripts have in comparison to 1QS. When there are differences, these are mostly explained assuming a rolling corpus idea, resulting in growth in 1QM. No one has suggested that differences between 4QM and 1QM would require a model like the centre-periphery model by Schofield. The 4QM manuscripts are mostly read as providing comparative material to 1QM and seldom on their own. We wish to demonstrate how 4Q491b as an individual manuscript differs greatly from any other manuscript—it contains material in different order and material not found anywhere else, and it lacks material from 1QM (see Table 1 above)—and yet it makes sense as it stands. Also, we discuss the various models scholars have for explaining the differences between 4Q491b and 1QM: 4Q491b is a good example since its relationship to 1QM is widely discussed without any comprehensive conclusion.

As shown in Table 1, the structure of fragments 1–3 of 4Q491b can be divided into three parts: hymn, preparation for war, and battle. First, the hymn emphasizes that human beings are not alone in the war: God and his angels are involved in the battle (lines 1–5). The hymn is followed by the “rule to observe in their encampments” (line 6).

---

106 E.g., S is thought to represent life in the real communities whereas M is somewhat utopian. On the other hand, there are also a considerable number of editions of the war texts. There is still work to do with the basic questions concerning the war manuscripts, and that too is one reason for the textual history of M not being as thoroughly investigated as that of S.

107 The genre of lines 1–5 is unclear but we tentatively suggest it to be a hymn. These lines seem to be related to the victorious end of the war (see line 4). In order to explain the inconsistency that the end of the war is described before the phases of the war (lines 6–20), it is reasonable to take lines 1–5 as part of a hymn rather than the narrative. Many elements in these lines recall the encouragement speeches or hymns in 1QM (cf. e.g., line 3a and 1QM 17:6; line 3b and 1QM 12:9).
which describes the preparations for the war. This second part includes restrictions for those entering the war: no women or children or unclean men can go to the battle (line 6b). The craftsmen and the smelters are mentioned but, because of the fragmentary condition of the text, their position in the war remains unclear (line 7a). Furthermore, there are purity regulations: distance of the latrine from the camp,\footnote{This is a suggestion made on the basis of 1QM 7:6b–7 which is very strongly reminiscent of lines 7b–8a of Q491b. However, in theory, it is possible that the distance of two thousand cubits is between some other destinations.} and prohibition against nakedness (lines 7b–8a). When preparing for the battle, some men are separated for the daily duty (line 8b), and marching out to the house of meeting is part of the preparations (lines 9). After the 

\text{vacat}\ in line 9, the text moves on to discuss the purity rules on the battlefield: any man unclean because of his seminal emission is excluded (line 10a).\footnote{The text here is fragmentary but the invoking of the presence of angels and the mentioning of “night” gives us reason to suppose that the text discusses here the uncleanness caused by seminal emission. Cf. 1QM 7:6; Deut 23:11–15.} The reason for this is given: the angels are present in the battle (line 10b).

From line 11 onwards—and this is the third part of the text—the actual battle is described. The war is to proceed by marching out in turns to the battle (lines 11–12a). In addition to the direct attack, an ambush is a possible part of the tactics (line 12b). The war is directed by means of trumpet sounds (line 13), which serve as signals for both the attackers and those who lie in ambush. Lines 14–17a describe the movements and gathering of the troops, both marching out and withdrawing.

At the end of the preserved text, the war garments (probably those of the priests) are discussed (line 18). After that, it seems that something new starts. This new section, however, probably continues to discuss rules for encampments since it begins with the words יִשָּׁר הַמָּשִׁית, and mentions commanders of the camps (line 19).

The presence of quite a large amount of text that does not occur in IQM shows clearly that, as a whole, Q491b fragments 1–3 cannot be defined as being dependent on one certain IQM passage. Those passag-
es that have similarities to 1QM are not exactly like it or in the same order (cf. 4Q491b lines 6–8, 10 and 1QM 7:3–7). Most notably, 1QM collects the rules about excluded persons (including the man with seminal emission) together and only then gives the rationale of angels being present, and the rule about the latrine and nakedness. In DJD, Baillet suggests the option that 4Q491 could be a collection of extracts or a summary with inserts, intended for “personal meditation.”

Thus, the differences between 1QM and 4Q491 are explained by different purposes of use: while 1QM was a communal scroll, 4Q491 was a private manuscript. Baillet argues for this difference by noting that, in 4Q491, the lines are very tight and the script is especially small. However, he leaves open the question of the motivation behind the changes: for example, why would there be a need to reduce the number of battle lines for a private manuscript? The material facts are undoubtedly something that should be taken into account when discussing the relationship between the texts—they have not received much attention in the discussion since Baillet.

Later scholars have devoted their time to explaining the possible literary interdependence between 4Q491b and 1QM. As Abegg puts it, scholars have mostly seen three options for explaining the similarities between texts: first, 4Q491b is a summary of 1QM; second, 1QM is an expansion of 4Q491b; and third, there is a common source or common tradition behind these texts. However, Abegg himself does not state his own opinion. Duhaime, for his part, concludes that fragments 1–3

100 Baillet, DJD 7:12.
101 Ibid. Cf. above on the possibility of 4QpsapS being a personal copy, n. 32.
102 George J. Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex: Reconsidering the Qumran Opiastrographs,” in On Scrolls and Scrolls: Essays in Honour of Graham Iower Davies (ed. J. K. Aitken et al.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 123–38, discusses the meaning of opisthographs and the likelihood of their being created for personal use. This is relevant for the study of M and S texts, as there are opisthographs among them as well (4Q496: 4Q497; 4Q255, possibly 4Q257).
103 Abegg, “The War Scroll,” 36. Abegg notes that the last-mentioned option is also pondered by Duhaime— and, actually, Duhaime ends up considering that, in this case, it is most probable that two different redactors had independently used the same source texts (see Jean Duhaime, “Étude comparative de 4QM* frg. 1–3 et 1QM,” RevQ 14 [1991]: 459–72, 471. See also Duhaime’s introduction to the war texts in Charlesworth’s series, “War Scroll,” 142.
of 4Q491b are all in a briefer text than 1QM, and, while 1QM is quite an elaborated text which has a tendency to generalize the application of the rules, especially concerning purity, fragments 1–3 represent a more practical point of view. Also, according to him, in 1QM, the “biblical” sources are utilized more. Duhaime seems to agree with the commonly occurring idea that texts tended to expand (rather than be shortened), and if we judge him correctly, his presupposition is that the briefer text is earlier than the longer one and that later texts are more probably spiced with “biblical” citations. However, he does not argue that fragments 1–3 and 1QM are directly dependent on each other but emphasizes that his explanation is also valid if the editors behind the texts have independently used a common source and considers this in many cases a probable option.

The theory of a common source has later received endorsement—for example, Ishay tends to consider it as a relevant option. Ishay, like many others, takes note of the fact that both 1QM 7 and 4Q491 1 include a list of regulations concerning the encampment but that these lists differ in length, style, running order and in some respects in content as well. In her interpretation of the complete manuscript 4Q491, she aligns herself with Duhaime’s thoughts, arguing that 4Q491 and 1QM are two different re-workings of common source material that consisted of war descriptions and a thanksgiving hymn. In addition, she thinks that, at the same time, some “sporadic theological reworking of the parallel sections” was done. Ultimately, however, according to Ishay, “it is impossible to determine whether one version depends on the other or the two elaborate a common source.” Thus, just as Duhaime finally does, she also leaves it open whether the texts are using a common source or whether they are dependent on each other.

Brian Schultz, whose study Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered is one of the most recent contributions to the war

114 Duhaime, “Étude comparative de 4QM ffg. 1–3 et 1QM,” 471.
115 Similarly to what has been argued of 1QS and S texts from Cave 4, see above and n. 92.
116 See, e.g., Duhaime, “Étude comparative de 4QM ffg. 1–3 et 1QM,” 469, 472.
117 Ishay, “The Literature of War at Qumran,” English abstract.
118 Ibid.
texts, discusses the 4QM texts in light of his understanding of the contents of 1QM, namely that this text describes a two-phase war. The first phase is “the war against the Kittim” and it is described in columns 1 and 15–19. The second phase, “the War of the Divisions,” is described in columns 2–9. In addition, Schultz argues that some version of columns 1–9 of 1QM was a primitive form of the composition now known as 1QM and columns 10–19 were added to it later. Schultz places 4QM texts into the theoretical framework of the two-phase war: he argues that manuscripts 4Q491a, 4Q492, 4Q494 and 4Q495 represent “the War against the Kittim,” whereas manuscripts 4Q471 and 4Q493 and 4Q491b represent “the War of the Divisions.” The manuscript 4Q496—as well as 1QM 1–2—preserves the transition between the phases. As regards the relationship between 4Q491, fragments 1–3 and 1QM, Schultz (referring, for example, to Duhaime and Ishay) agrees with previous scholars that the authors of 4Q491 and 1QM used a common source, and that of these two, 4Q491 was composed earlier.

Naturally, any theory should be able to explain the differences in contents between 4Q491b and 1QM. The camp gets surprisingly little attention in 1QM whereas it is one of the main themes in 4Q491b. In 4Q491b the camp gets its own rubric (see lines 6–10), whereas in 1QM the purity of the camp is discussed in connection with the requirements for the soldiers (see 7:3–7). Johanna Dorman suggests that in 4Q491 there is a disconnect between the war camp and the battlefield: the requirements presented in 4Q491 lines 6–7a concern those who enter into the war camp (no women, children, afflicted men, nor possibly physically disabled), and the stricter requirements in line 10b concern those who participate in the actual battle (no men who are unclean by their seminal emission). The angels are clearly present in the

---

119 Schultz, Conquering the World, 401.
120 Ibid., 374, 382–83.
121 The verb עָנָה, which is used in the rubric in line 6 of 4Q491b (מענה), occurs in 1QM only twice, and the noun מֵעָנה occurs only once in columns 3–9 (6:10; the other two occurrences are in 14:2 and 19:9).
battle. Instead, in 1QM, when the similar requirements are presented, the camp and the battlefield are not clearly separated as in 4Q491b. Therefore, in 1QM there was no hindrance from moving the regulation of the latrine and its distance from the camp to the end of the list of excluded persons and after mentioning angels (see 1QM 7:6–7). Consequently, the angels are thus potentially understood in 1QM to be present both on the battlefield and in the camps, whereas in 4Q491 the angels are on the battlefield only.

Following Dorman’s lead, it could be argued that, in 1QM, the idea of the presence of angels is widened, which is in line with the fact that 1QM lacks the notion (present in 4Q491b line 9b) of soldiers going to the house of meeting before going to the battlefield. In 1QM, the whole camp served as the tent of meeting and the presence of angels was not limited to the battlefield only. However, 1QM still recognizes that purity on the day of the battle is important (7:6, excluding a man with emission), followed by the mention of the angels. Thus it can be asked whether the lack of clearly distinguishing between the camp and the battlefield is intended in 1QM, or rather follows from the different organization of the information.

As regards the first lines of 4Q491b, they can be interpreted as hymnic material, including ideas like the hand of God will smite and there will be eternal destruction, atonement will be executed, and everlasting joy will prevail—similar ideas that in 1QM occur in hymn passages, often considered to be late parts of the compilation (see, e.g., 1QM 1:4–9, 14–15; 13:12b–16). Although it is difficult to compare the fragmentary hymn sections of 4Q491b to 1QM in detail, it is clear that in 1QM the hymn sections are large and in 4Q491b the hymn elements are much shorter. This leads to the impression that in 1QM the hymn elements were compiled together and/or the hymn parts were expanded.

All in all, scholars consider it difficult to suppose that there is a direct literary dependence between the two M manuscripts, 4Q491b and

1QM. The most common model to explain the relationship between these texts is that they are reworkings of a common tradition—although many scholars do not rule out the option of mutual dependence either. What can be concluded from all this is that if a similar source was a basis for both 4Q491b and 1QM, it was possible to process this source very freely and creatively. On the other hand, this is also true if the texts are interpreted to have a mutual literary dependence on one another—and this is something that actually challenges the theory of a common source: if it was possible to make noteworthy changes in the source, would it not be probable to think that one of the texts was the source for the other? In our view, 1QM is more likely to rewrite 4Q491b, since it has a general tendency to organize material in lists and collections. We noted at the beginning that manuscript differences could be viewed as organizing information differently. There may also be theological implications involved in such organization (such as in 1QM, the presence of angels also in the camp) but some of those implications might also result from the rewriting.

Conclusions

What new information and evidence can the Qumran rule texts provide to biblical scholars? Qumran manuscripts provide first-hand evidence of textual variation, as well as of physical manuscript variation. This evidence is valuable and needs to be fully appreciated in all its scope in order to learn about scribal practices and textual pluriformity in the

---

123 Duhaime considers both options: when discussing lines 11–12b of fragments 1–3 of 4Q491b and 1QM 5:16–17, he speculates that if the author of 1QM worked with the text of fragments 1–3 in front of him, he clearly changed and extended his source in his own text. On the other hand, if the author of fragments 1–3 worked with the text of 1QM, it has to be concluded that he summarized his source and reduced the number of lines from seven to three—and according to Duhaime, without any apparent reason. In the end, Duhaime introduces an explanation which he considers to be the simplest: authors of these two texts had a common source or a common tradition with which they worked independently and towards which they adopt different attitudes (Duhaime, "Étude comparative de 4QM" frg. 1–3 et 1QM," 468–469, 471).
ancient world and in the Qumran movement in particular. We have argued above that there exist at least three sets of principles that are in play in any study of the Qumran rule texts: (1) principles of labelling manuscripts, (2) principles of editing fragmentary manuscripts, and (3) principles of comparing manuscripts with one another. While these principles are often implicit, practical (not theoretically oriented or models for other work), or provisional (not final or the only alternatives), they nevertheless influence the way in which scholars become accustomed not only to speaking about *serakhim*, but also to perceiving them. Therefore, critical remarks are necessary at every step, and a meta-perspective into our scholarly work might help us in asking if the models we think with are the best available. Furthermore, bringing the scholarship on two rules texts, the *Community Rule* (S) and the *War Scroll* (M), into dialogue with each other is beneficial for recognizing some of the differences in principles and for evaluating the potential benefit of scholarship in the field of the one to the other.

We wished to have shown first of all, that (1) what is "S" and what is "M" is by no means clear if we look at the existing manuscript evidence. Some manuscripts with clear parallels to 1QS are labelled by editors and scholars as S manuscripts even though they also have material not paralleled by 1QS (such as 4QpapS⑧, 4QS⑧). At the same time, some other manuscripts, such as 5Q13, are not deemed to be S, presumably because they have too little parallel material. But what amount is sufficient? Or what types of parallels are the critical elements? Similarly, as regards M, a single fragment, 4Q493, which includes material very similar to 1QM 7-9, 16, 18 but nothing directly parallel to it, is labelled as M. Things that mark one manuscript as M (such as 4Q491b) and another not (such as 4Q285) are not at all as clear as one could expect. Furthermore, the principles between S and M seem to differ: a manuscript like 4Q491 (even if one follows the division of the fragments into three manuscripts: 4Q491a, 4Q491b, 4Q491c) contains so many unparalleled sections in comparison to other M manuscripts and elements in different order, that it is difficult to imagine that such an extent and nature of differences would have been allowed among the S manuscripts.
(2) Second, there is clear tendency to regard the 1Q versions as primary and more important manuscripts. The 4Q manuscript editions are often explicitly and openly dependent on 1Q versions in ordering 4Q fragments and reconstructing their lacunae. The manuscript 4QS is often presented as the closest to 1QS in length and scope as it preserves parallels to most sections of 1QS, and the fact that it does not include a parallel to the discourse on the two spirits is not given much weight, or the discourse is presumed to have existed there. Also, the possibility that 4QS contained material after the hymn parallel to 1QS 11:22 is significant if the argument is that 1QS was the “fullest” or most developed and complete version, but this is often dismissed. None of the S manuscripts is identical with another S manuscript, which should very much caution us from presuming that we know what the missing parts of any manuscript contained. The same is true with the M texts: none of the M manuscripts is exactly identical with another M manuscript, but 1QM has often been used as the model to lead the reconstruction of 4QM manuscripts.

(3) Third, manuscript variants have been studied in order to determine the most original textual form or the direction of dependency between two or more versions, and, at the same time, to observe and recognize the meaning of manuscript variation. As regards S, there exists a division between scholars who take the shorter S versions as representative of earlier textual forms and scholars who take them as representative of later textual forms (abbreviations) since their manuscript age testifies to a later origin. New critical remarks have also been pronounced on whether it is possible to see the direction of dependence always from 4QS textual forms to the textual form of 1QS. It seems that it is not, which complicates the picture. As regards M, there is indecision and caution in saying anything firm about the 4QM versions in relation to 1QM. Some (often the most fragmentary) of the 4QM versions are deemed to belong to the same recension as 1QM and others to a different recension, even though the relation between the recensions is not explained. The 4QM versions are most often considered as building blocks in 1QM, and their unique nature is often dismissed.

Are there any solutions to these observations and critical perspectives? Here we wish to hint at at least a few. (1) As soon as scholars title
something as "S" or "M" there is an understandable tendency to view the manuscript so titled on the basis of the only extant almost complete manuscript, 1QS1QM—but even those models are used selectively (e.g., 1QSa and 1QSb are normally not part of the model of S). In theory, labelling all manuscripts as “1QS1QM-like manuscript” would better reveal that full identity does not exist between any of the manuscripts. It would be clear that a given manuscript has a parallel or parallels to 1QS or 1QM but that no one could decide which parallel is more important than another. New labels are, however, much avoided and not in practice desirable. Yet our scholarly work should attempt to be more specific, and also careful, when we speak, for example, how many “copies” exist of S and M and what it means to speak of fragmentary evidence as “copies.”

A different option would be to choose to speak of “S/M-like manuscripts” or “serekh ha-yahad- and serekh ha-nilbama-like manuscripts. We already speak of “S” and “M” as if these were existing things. However, “S” and “M” are abstract categories that only exist in our minds. In fact, it is the similarities that matter rather than differences in the whole concept of “S” and “M.” This observation proposes that our perception and need to speak of “S” and “M”—which are then represented in one form or the other in the manuscript evidence—might actually be close to the ancients’ perception: there existed rules for joining the movement and rules for its gatherings, as well as rules for preparing to face the enemy and conducting the war. “S” and “M” could in this perception include much more than the manuscripts so titled—and probably did in the ancients’ minds. Some manuscripts were discussed in this article.24 We argue that what determines the perception is the comparative context. Therefore, what we are dealing with is the prototype of such categories as “S” or “M.” No one can list their defining criteria or build a firm boundary around them since their boundaries are fuzzy.25

24 Another large question, but not touched on in this article, is the category of S in relation to D. The Dena’icus Document includes much material that could fall under the perception of “S”—or the other way around.

25 Compare this to recent discussion on genre theory: scholars have identified several different approaches to understanding genre, and one of the most prominent is the prototype
Whenever an individual manuscript is perceived, it relates in different ways to the prototypical understanding of “S” or “M,” and is perceived differently depending on the comparative counterparts. Therefore, in the end, the conceptualizations of “S” and “M” as cognitive ways of perceiving some of the similarities, extending over individual exemplars, is part of ancient and contemporary perception alike. Each manuscript is a document that documents traditions, their presentation and their understandings. This brings us to the second aspect:

(2) Material philology suggests that each manuscript should be taken in its own right. Thus 4Q versions should not just be viewed as less full and complete—somehow inferior versions. There is no evidence to think that any of the 4QS or 4QM manuscripts would have been even closely identical to 1QS or 1QM: they do not contain the same textual sections and they do not contain the same textual forms of the parallel sections. Editing scrolls and studying the existing material evidence carefully is time-consuming work, and often non-experts avoid it, but for the scholarship to advance on the question of what to think about the plurality of texts, even previous editorial principles have to come under scrutiny—and at least Qumran scholars have no excuse for avoiding the task. Edition principles are in the process of being critically evaluated and developed. Eibert Tigchelaar has been advancing the view that there is always need for different levels of editing (fragments, manuscripts, works, textual families), and also different editions for different audiences and media.

(3) Scholars have always tried hard to explain diversity and plurality, but the prototype perspective might suggest that we should rather explain why there are identical forms and similarity. Why, in an oral culture, does there exist literal accuracy and literary dependency? Can Cave 4 copies still be seen as a result of editing texts, rather than editing ideas? What if the textual similarities are the “template” into which new

theory; see Vol 17/3 of Dead Sea Discoveries. The cognitively-based prototype theory is more useful in perceiving the rule texts than the family resemblance approach, which assumes genealogical similarities, and a family may include exemplars that have little to do with each other.
ideas are introduced? We must not exaggerate the differences. The ancient people may well have seen the common elements as more important than the differences. It is likely that as soon as some forms of "rules" began to be written, the ancient minds started to work with the principle that is common to all human perception: to create an understanding of prototypicality and view a single representative as more or less prototypical, also depending on the situation, on points of comparison and on prior familiarity with different exemplars.

It is of course legitimate to ask what the relationship of one manuscript is to another. Textual growth is generally recognized and goes well with the idea (above) of transmitting new ideas along transmitting prior knowledge. If, on the other hand, manuscript variation is explained by being abbreviations (for personal use, for example), special care should, in our view, be given to considering what might speak against this, and showing why the other option (textual growth) is not as likely. Furthermore, tools for explaining textual growth are also found in literary (source) criticism, which can to some extent now be enriched by manuscript evidence (textual criticism). The study of the rule texts should also be more fruitful since scholars recently have adopted a non-Qumran centred approach: S is not a text for the members living at Qumran only, and M does not necessarily represent a remote, isolated group envisioning the end-time war.

But more than this, our previous models to think with are challenged by new digital models: scribes as experts creating "open-ended programs" and transmitting material for different kinds of information processing: hierarchical levels of information, different search results and different models of presenting the data. The anachronism in these models is so obvious that it forces us to think what actually are our alternative, existing models, can we be more explicit about them, and improve them from non-linear, non-print, and non-book perspectives.125

125 We wish to thank the editors of the volume and other members of the Qumran group in Helsinki for their valuable comments in the process of preparing the article. Special thanks
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