UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Competitors to Middle Maccabees : Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls

Jokiranta, Jutta

Society of Biblical Literature

2021

The Middle Maccabees

Archaeology, History, and the Rise of the Hasmonean Kingdom

Edited by
Andrea M. Berlin
Paul J. Kosmin

THE MIDDLE MACCABEES

ARCHAEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL STUDIES

Brian B. Schmidt, General Editor

Number 28

SBL PRESS

THE MIDDLE MACCABEES

Archaeology, History, and
the Rise of the Hasmonean Kingdom

Edited by
Andrea M. Berlin and Paul J. Kosmin

SBL PRESS

SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2021 by SBL Press

Contents

Part 3. Voices: Textual Responses to the Middle Maccabees

20

Competitors to Middle Maccabees: Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls

Jutta Jokiranta

Introduction

Which evidence from among the Qumran Scrolls could be used as evidence for the period of middle Maccabees (160‒104 BCE)? The question is difficult: few scrolls contain historical names or specific events to give any firm points of reference; yet most theories of the origins of the Qumran community have placed it in the Antiochian crisis of the second century. Paleographic information remains the principal means to date the Scrolls, but recently scholars have criticized the typology of scripts that artificially follow the political periods (Hasmonean, Herodian), whereas additional criteria would be needed such as the differences between skilled and unskilled hands (Tigchelaar 2018). Digital projects are developing that may bring forward new results in the coming years.[1] Other aspects, such as radiocarbon dating for some scrolls, orthography and linguistic issues, content matters, and dating of other archaeological material are also used, but none of them provide specific, fixed dates.[2]

---

1. E.g., The Hands That Wrote the Bible: Digital Paleography and Scribal Culture of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Groningen); Models of Textual Communities and Digital Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Leuven); Scripta Qumranica Electronica (Göttingen, Tel Aviv).

2. For use of these aspects, see Webster 2002, 351‒68.

The purpose of this essay is first to give a coarse overview of some recent changes in Qumran scholarship on historical approaches to the scrolls, especially concerning the second century BCE. Second, I will take one rule text as a case study: the cryptic Rule of the Congregation (4Q249a) testifies in my view to competition for the most competent members in the society and represents contenders to the middle Maccabees' campaigns; yet when placed in another context (in the manuscript 1QS-1QSa-1QSb), the text may be read in another way.

This is not to deny the possibility of an indifferent stance or pro-Hasmonean views among the Scrolls as well. Whereas early scholarship was filled with discussions on the Hasmoneans—especially via the attempt to identify the Wicked Priest in Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab) and introducing theories of schism with the Jerusalem temple—few scholars today present a grand narrative of the historical events. Instead of trying to revise grand narratives or build a completely new one, we may exercise reading the Scrolls in the middle Maccabean and other contexts, without a firm commitment of placing each text in presectarian, formative, or sectarian phases of the assumed movement development, but rather take as broad a perspective on them as possible. The recent focus on individual scrolls as specific artifacts in their respective times requires that textually similar manuscripts are not taken as copies of some abstract, coherent work but that the uniqueness of each manuscript is appreciated in the first place. Our methodological approach has to be flexible enough to move between multiple alternatives at the same time: if starting with individual scrolls, questions can be addressed how the interpretation changes if the context changes; if starting from a certain context (such as the period of middle Maccabees), questions emerge as to which evidence is seen as primary and how our reconstructions change if interpretations of the evidence change.

The "Qumran movement" is here a scholarly label for the movement that produced or preserved the manuscripts found in the Qumran caves. These movement members did not only occupy Khirbet Qumran but were probably spread in various locations, formed a network of assemblies and counsel, and displayed some variety over time (Collins 2010; Jokiranta 2013).[3]

---

3. Previous scholarship was occupied with the "Qumran community," which was mostly understood as the community settling at Khirbet Qumran and as identical with the Community Rule (1QS) community. The "movement" language

The Movement in the Theories of the Second Century BCE

The second century BCE is considered to be the time of many changes in late Second Temple Judaism. In the words of Lee Levine (2009, 17): "It is quite apparent from the successful military campaigns that greatly expanded Judaea's boundaries, from the literature produced at this time, from the religious sects that coalesced, and from society's flourishing material culture that Jewish identity had now shifted into a mode radically different from what held sway heretofore." The Antiochian crisis, the Maccabean revolt, and regaining of control over Jerusalem opened up new possibilities. How the new Hasmonean kingdom was visible in the material culture is one major question in this volume (see also Tal 2009). In literary records, the time is often seen to be a fruitful springboard to Jewish sectarianism. The emergence of sects is famously dated to the latter half of the second century by Josephus (*Ant.* 13.171), at the period when the new independence from the Greek overlords brought competition between the groups about who got to define the new Israel and what it should look like (Baumgarten 1997).

To be sure, there are also scholars who date the emergence of Jewish sectarianism *earlier* than the second century. Joseph Blenkinsopp (2009) has advocated the view that the origins can be traced back to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Stephen Hultgren sees similarity in the covenant envisioned by the Chronicler and the new covenant in the Damascus Document: both have a large vision of restoration of all Israel, which stands in contrast to Ezra-Nehemiah's more exclusive Israel. Hultgren (2007, 536) dates the beginning of the Damascus covenant (people who identified with the returning exiles) to the third century BCE, "if not before," that is, much before the final rejection of Samaritans in the second century BCE.[4]

---

attempts to avoid assumptions of monasticism, location in one place, or coherent central governance.

4. The Damascus Document certainly presents a self-understanding of the righteous remnant that is traced back to the exiles, but it is another matter, in my view, whether the all-Israel vision can be historically linked to a certain situation; sects typically present a program for all Israel that can in reality consist of only partial, "true" Israel. For a critical note on Hultgren, see also Collins 2010, 35 n. 80. The dating of the Chronicles is under debate; for some parts of Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles being late, Hasmonean-time literature, see Finkelstein 2018.

The beginning of the sectarian settlement at Khirbet Qumran was first dated between the mid- and the late second century BCE and was for long seen as crucial in the formation and nature of the *yaḥad*.[5] Qumran was the place of exile in the desert and exemplified the community's suffering and removal from the center. After Jodi Magness (2002) argued that Khirbet Qumran was settled only from the first half of the first century BCE onwards, scholars started to more carefully consider what that meant for the theories of a schism in the mid-second century BCE. The new near-consensus emerged that the movement beginnings were not tied to any schism over the high priesthood but rather wider conflicts and controversies over various halakic issues and that the movement existed prior to the site at Qumran.

The *first* century BCE, rather than the second, is presented as the heyday of the Qumran movement by John Collins (2010, 88–121). This is based on questioning the historical value of the schematic dates in the Scrolls that have been interpreted to refer to the second century,[6] confirming that there is no evidence on any conflict in the Scrolls over high-priestly succession in the mid-second century, and suggesting that the great majority of historical allusions in the scrolls refer to the first century BCE. Thus, the Wicked Priest of Pesher Habakkuk who was in conflict with the Teacher of Righteousness can well be Hyrcanus II (76–67 BCE; yet this conflict was not the raison d'être for the movement, and there may have been many high priests considered to be wicked), and the sectarian disputes are more likely placed in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus and Salome Alexandra than Jonathan Maccabeus. Yet, Collins does not deny that the movement was in existence in the second century BCE and that also the Teacher may have lived then.

The focal point in all discussions on the emergence of the Scrolls movement is *which evidence is taken as primary in reconstructing the early events* and *what is seen as the primary reason for forming of a distinct movement*—these are two sides of the same coin. I shall briefly discuss a few texts that have had a primary role in early studies and some of the directions that the more recent research has taken.

---

5. For an overview, see Meyers 2010.

6. The only mention of the movement's beginnings in CD 1, "390 years" of time of wrath, and "twenty years" of finding the way, are symbolic (based on Ezek 4:5 and the 490 years of Dan 9) and do not help us date the movement. Traditionally, the 390 years is thought to have been fulfilled in the beginning of the second century, e.g., Burrows 1956, 196.

1. The pesharim and especially Pesher Habakkuk, among the first scrolls found in Cave 1, were for long the primary source for the history of the Qumran community. The pesharim are conflict literature through the fact that the quoted scriptural passages provide the figures and groups to be identified—often by sobriquets—with the movement and its opponents. The scholarly founding narrative centered on the Teacher of Righteousness, who, because of the conflicts with the Jerusalem establishment (the Wicked Priest), withdrew to the desert to found a community expecting the eschatological turn and final culmination of history. All this was most commonly set in the mid-second century; thus the Teacher was possibly Onias III or the unnamed high priest before Jonathan's time who was displaced of power, and the Wicked Priest was possibly Jonathan Maccabeus, or several high priests. The outside enemy, the Kittim, were most probably the Romans.[7]

Few pesharim contain explicit historical names, but the ones that exist give a broad time scale from the second century to the first century BCE: the frame in Pesher Nahum extends from "the kings of Greece from Antiochus [probably Antiochus IV Epiphanes, or Antiochus V, or Antiochus VII in the second century BCE] until the rising of the rulers of the Kittim [probably the Romans in 63 BCE]" (4QpNah 3–4 I, 3) and it mentions the individual Demetrius (likely Demetrius Eucaerus, whom the Pharisees called for help against Alexander Jannaeus; Josephus, *Ant.* 13.372–383) (4QpNah 3–4 I, 2; see further Eshel 2008, 117–31).

However, the pesher manuscripts themselves are normally dated to late periods, the end of the first century BCE or beginning of the first century CE.[8] These are late works that are somewhat removed from the rule documents of the movement. Thus, alternatively, even if the pesharim would intend to speak of second-century events and persons, they represent selective memory of the past for the sake of the present. The conflicts may be experienced in their present or be intensified or invented in order

---

7. See, e.g., Burrows (1956, 123–86), for early interpretations that discuss the pre-Maccabean and Hasmonean identifications of the figures and the possibility that the figures refer to several historical persons or even offices. Yadin (1957, 160–89), thinks that the identification of the figures remains open, but the resemblance of the war customs in the War Scroll to the Roman rather than Hellenistic customs gives reason to date this scroll to the latter half of the first century BCE.

8. For a collection of data, see Lim 2002, 20–22.

to legitimize the current existence (e.g., Jokiranta 2013).[9] The historical source material of the events in the second century is very much now read as historical source material of identity building of the later phases of the movement. Read alone, without the rule documents, these texts can easily be read as propaganda for certain views; in other words, they do not assume any separation for communal lifestyle.

2. The document 4QMMT (Some Works of Torah), even though it was not among the first finds from Cave 1, has occupied a central place in historical reconstructions. The editors presented it as addressed in the early period from the movement leader (possibly the Teacher of Righteousness) to a Hasmonean high priest in the attempt to convince the ruler of correct halakic practices (Qimron and Strugnell 1994). The tone of the text is not aggressive but rather conciliatory. However, its epistolary character has also been questioned, and since the text was being copied at later phases of the movement, other functions were suggested, such as internal education as well as the possibility that it was a fictional letter for the purpose of convincing the movement members of the legitimacy of their separation (concerning halakic practice, rather than physical separation; e.g., Fraade 2000, 507–26; Grossman 2002, 57–87; von Weissenberg 2009). Scholars have shown the proclivity of 4QMMT for multiple interpretations, which is also demonstrated by a recent theory by Gareth Wearne that 4QMMT was sent *to* rather than *by* the *yaḥad* (here: community represented by the Community Rule 1QS). In his view, the senders, who were still participating in the temple cult, were seeking legitimation from the recipients for not separating as radically as they did (Wearne 2019, 99–126).[10]

3. Rule documents speak less of the movement's beginnings, except for column I of the Damascus Document (see above). However, the views of the *relation* between the Damascus Document (D) and the Community Rule (S) involve a great deal of historical reconstruction. Often the scenario has been one of a parent movement (D) and its later development (S) or a schismatic offshoot (S); sometimes one of a larger movement ("marrying Essenes" in D) and a stricter community (celibate branch of S; see, e.g., Metso 2000, 85–93; Boccaccini 1998, 119–29). This contrast has to do with few crucial differences that are used to identify the "Judaisms" of the texts: the relation to the temple is claimed to be open in the Damas-

---

9. See recently Hartog (2017, 59–80), who identifies late layers in Pesher Habakkuk.

10. Wearne identifies the authors with the incipient movement, like the "D-group," and the addressees as a further separatist movement, like the "S-group" or *yaḥad*.

cus Document and closed in the Community Rule; women and children are mentioned in the Damascus Document but not in the Community Rule; dualism is mild in the Damascus Document but fully blown in the Community Rule; the Damascus Document is structured in camps but the Community Rule is not; the Damascus Document instructs on provisional sharing of property, whereas in the Community Rule everything is shared (e.g., Davies 2000, 219–32).

That the Damascus Document includes elements that the Community Rule does not (an admonition of the past history, including the figures of the Teacher of Righteousness and liar; a long section of halakot) is often not paid much attention in these explanations; the comparison of the documents is warranted by the overlapping material, such as rules about entering the covenant, the penal code, and some leadership figures. The juxtaposition of the documents is strongly influenced by outside evidence: classical sources where celibate Essenes are the norm and the marrying Essenes an exception, and the occupation of the Khirbet Qumran that is thought to be the dwelling place for one community living together and sharing everything.

The idea of the rule documents representing different *types of groups* is long-standing but challenged by recent studies on different *types of manuscripts* and by closer comparison of *sections in the texts*. For example, Charlotte Hempel, while maintaining that some of the halakot in the Damascus Document may derive from earlier times adopted by the movement, studies carefully the reworking in both the Damascus Document and the Community Rule and argues that neither can be held earlier as a whole. She also pays attention to the distinction between the "short" and the "long" version of the Community Rule, as testified by various manuscripts, rather than between the well-preserved 1QS and the more fragmentary 4QS manuscripts (Hempel 2013). Michael Johnson (2018) studies the manuscript evidence of 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSb and comes to the conclusion that 1QSa and 1QSb should not be regarded as appendices to 1QS but that they were sewn to the same manuscript and are an integral part of the same composite work. 1QS cannot be studied on its own without taking into account that it is part of 1QS-1QSa-1QSb manuscript, which also includes references to women and children.

In sum, few sectarian scrolls contain data that can be historically anchored to a specific time, but many scrolls contain schematic views of history and refer to conflicts between the movement members and their opponents—information that could fit many time periods and situations.

Yet, some important scrolls or their earlier versions were probably being composed during the middle Maccabees period, and some contain specific polemics against the Hasmonean program. This polemics shows that, even though priestly concerns were central in the movement, these concerns were also political in nature and that the movement sought to build a program that could compete with the Hasmonean endeavors, not to isolate themselves. I shall take one of the rules, Rule of the Congregation, 1QSa // 4Q249a, as a case study.

Reading Scrolls in the Context of Middle Maccabees:
A Case of the Rule of the Congregation

The Rule of the Congregation (Serekh ha-ʿEdah: SE, see below) has not been given much historical interest. The "latter days" (1QSa I, 1 // 4QSE I, 1–2) as well as the mention of "Messiah" (1QSa II, 14, 20 // 4QSE V, 2) led many scholars to regard the whole document as an eschatological rule, meant for the future.[11] It is also a special rule document among the Qumran scrolls since, besides the 1QS-1QSa-1QSb scroll (where 1QSa preserves SE),[12] some version of Serekh ha-ʿEdah is also preserved in cryptic script from Cave 4.

The Cave 4 fragments of Serekh ha-ʿEdah were edited in 2000, and fragments were assigned to eight or nine different manuscripts (Pfann 2000a).[13] However, recent work suggests that most of the fragments can be placed in one single manuscript (here 4QSE; Gayer, Stökl Ben Ezra, and Ben-Dov 2016; Ben-Dov, Stökl Ben Ezra, and Gayer 2017).[14] If this reconstruction is followed, one also has to give up most of the typology of the cryptic script

---

11. Schiffman (1989) studied 1QSa as an eschatological rule but saw it as reflecting the present age as well. Vermes (2004, 159) names the scroll as "The Messianic Rule." It has also been pointed out that the concept of "latter days" included events already realized: Steudel 1993, 225‒46. See discussion by Hempel 1996; Collins 2010, 75–78; Gillihan 2012, 18‒19. Hempel identified in 1QSa material reflecting early beginnings of community formation. For further research history on 1QSa, see Metso 2007, 51‒56. For 4QSE, see below.

12. For 1QSa, see Barthélemy 1955; Pfann 2000a; Bloch, Ben-Dov, and Stökl Ben Ezra 2019; Johnson 2018.

13. Already Tov (2004, 44, 48‒49) expresses reservations whether all the cryptic SE papyri fragments come from separate manuscripts.

14. Note that this 4QSE text is in many places reconstructed on the basis of 1QSa only, and the parallels to 1QSa presented in this article might not be fully extant in

(the SE fragments would represent a single script)—and there is very little whereby to base the dating of this manuscript, but most likely the cryptic script text was in existence around 100 BCE at the latest, if not earlier.[15]

Moreover, the meaning of the cryptic script is under debate. Stephen Pfann (2000b) argues, following Józef Milik, that the script was a personal script of the *maśkil*, the wisdom teacher or instructor.[16] Single letters in Cryptic A script are written in the margins of other scrolls and may, according to Tov (2004, 204), signify a "sectarian coded message." Eshbal Ratzon and Jonathan Ben-Dov (2017, 909) challenge the secrecy assumption and state, "Encryption was a means of conveying prestige to the initiated but not a means of 100-percent security or preventing comprehension by other community members."

Our interest here has to do what the text might reveal of the options available during the Hasmonean campaigns. *The text is a combination of rules for covenantal education, military order, and holy assembly*. It gives rules about various age groups and their growing responsibilities, rules for preparing for assembly concerning "judgment, or council of the *yaḥad*, or time/testimony for war" (1QSa I, 25–26 // 4QSE III, 8–10), rules about who should be excluded from the congregation (office), and rules for the sitting order in meals and blessing of the bread and the wine.

Since the Rule of the Congregation is, besides the Damascus Document, one of the few rule texts to explicitly mention women and children in the covenant education (1QSa I, 4 // 4QSE I, 6), it has received gender-inclusive readings also in other parts of the text.[17] However, the duties in

---

4QSE. The fragments of 4QSE represent largely the same text as 1QSa, with few significant variants (shorter text in comparison to 1QSa).

15. For a recent use of the typology of the cryptic script, see Pfann 2015, 205–7. Most scrolls written in the cryptic script have been dated from archaic to mid-Hasmonean periods (only one, 4Q298, to Herodian); see Webster 2002. One comparison point is the script in 4Q249, titled as 4QMidrash Moshe: the manuscript is dated by carbon-14 to 191–90 BCE, and the title appears in the verso in the square script that is seen to represent a script from roughly 100 BCE by Ben-Dov, Stökl Ben Ezra, and Gayer 2017, 31. See also Pfann 2000a, 522–23.

16. Also calendrical information was written in cryptic script: things may have been studied and tested before reaching final views and systematizing the information.

17. The text in 1QSa I, 4–11, 25–27 can be read in gender-inclusive way, as argued by Wassen 2005, 140–43; Grossman 2011, 497–512; Keady 2017, 160–67, but for modifying this reading for an eschatological setting, see Gillihan 2012, 462–66. A famous sentence in 1QSa I, 11 rules that females have a role in testifying: "she will be received

the text are written in a male-dominating way, and I argue that the text reflects the desire to offer a path to male members in society to prove themselves, but as an alternative to Hasmonean military campaigns.[18] I will highlight these aspects of the text.

Natives in Israel

The Rule of the Congregation is clear that the army consists of the natives in Israel (1QSa I, 6 // 4QSE I, 9–10). This could be taken as an implicit statement against the use of foreign mercenaries by the Hasmoneans.[19] Elsewhere in the scrolls, the "stranger" is sometimes included in the covenant (CD XIV, 3–6) so the stress on the natives is here noteworthy.[20]

Military Color

The document cannot be said to be about military order (see "hosts") only, since it speaks of legal cases and duties in the clan structure, but the military color is certainly strong. As often pointed out, the language of "going out and coming" refers to leadership in a military context (e.g., Num 27:21; Josh 14:11): "Anyone so destined must take his pla[ce] in service, [to go for]th to battle and return[21] while the congregation looks on" (1QSa I, 16–17 // 4QSE II, 6–7; Pfann 2000b).[22] The ideal structuring into

---

to bear witness of him." See debates and discussion on why this should *not* be corrected to masculine form: Wassen 2005, 140–43; Schuller 2006, 96–97; Keady 2017, 20. However, this sentence is lacking in 4QSE; see Ben-Dov, Stökl Ben Ezra, and Gayer 2017, 66-67.

18. This does not mean that the gender-inclusive reading of education would be wrong, nor that the movement would not have included women. If taken as testimony of a program for Israel, the document naturally included women and children, but the primary challenge was not their position in society but rather that of the males.

19. For use of mercenaries, see Berthelot 2018a, 370, 324-40. Similarly, the law of the king in the Temple Scroll (11QT^a LVI, 12–LIX, 21) implies that the military forces are people of Israel (Schiffman 2008, 496).

20. Bautch (2012): even if true bloodline is emphasized, familial identity is always partly fictive.

21. However, 4QSE probably lacks one of these two verbs here (Ben-Dov, Stökl Ben Ezra, and Gayer 2017, 69). See 1 Sam 8:20, where also only one verb is used.

22. The sentence probably refers to the thirty-year-olds, but Vermes (2004, 160) takes it to refer to the family heads of the previous sentence.

the heads of the thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (1QSa I, 14–15; 29–II, 1 // 4QSE II, 2–3; III, 15–16) could refer to the military ordering and/or judicial function (Exod 18:21–26; Num 31:14, 48–54; Deut 1:9–15). The cryptic script may have something to do with (military) education for the knowledgeable ones.

Priestly Authority

Both in the above passage and in a later passage where Levites "lead the entire congregation in and out" (1QS I, 23 // 4QSE III, 3–4), the authority of the sons of Aaron is decisive. Military campaigns take place under highest priestly authority. The Levites may have held an intermediate position between the highest priesthood and the lay leaders (Bloch, Ben-Dov, and Stökl Ben Ezra 2019, 33). Moreover, in the meal setting, the blessing order makes it clear that priestly authority comes first, before any lay leader or king, Messiah (1QSa II, 17–22 // 4QSE V, 5–13).

There are several other scrolls that have been connected to anti-Hasmonean polemics on overstepping priestly authority. Most recently, Berthelot (2018a, 342–71; see also Eshel 2008, 63–89) identifies hidden criticism against John Hyrcanus (and his sons). For example, 4Q175 fits John Hyrcanus, who "is the only person to have laid claim to the functions of a political and military leader, a priest and a prophet" (Berthelot 2018a, 358; Eshel 2008, 63–89). This critique was about adopting various leadership roles that should be separate and about not submitting to priestly authority—in other words, having no internal (or divine) control over royal power, which was seen to lead to great violence and misfortune.

The important question for us is whether this sort of critique had anything to do with the Hasmonean campaigns as such or merely their merging of power. In other words, did the authors of these scrolls consider it likely that priestly authorities (and the divine), *had they been consulted*, would have advised *not* to lead these (Hasmonean) campaigns at all, or were they certain that the priests would have advised to lead the campaigns in a different *way* or at a different *time*?[23] This may be partly purely speculation: If the leaders were not accepted, anything they did was rejected. Yet there is another discussion going on about warfare: in the Temple Scroll,

---

23. If the War Scroll (1QM) is taken as an answer, it has a schematic forty-year war, led by priests or God himself, so the movement could be seen to take a passive role, waiting for the final turn to take place.

a distinction exists between a defensive war and a nondefensive war: only in the latter, the king must consult the Urim and Thummim (through priests).[24] If this theory of justified war of when to go out to war and how to deal with the enemy (see Deut 17; 20; 11QTᵃ LVI, 12–LIX, 21; LXI, 12–LXIV, 1) was developing during this time, were the Hasmonean wars considered to be defensive or nondefensive? In Serekh ha-ʿEdah, there was a three-day purification period before convening to decide of war (1QSa I, 25–27 // 4QSE III, 8-10): perhaps this was part of strategy to make sure the warfare abides to the law. The authors of Serekh ha-ʿEdah may have approved even nondefensive wars, but only with priestly authority.

Hierarchy and Male Honor

The hierarchies are frequently emphasized in Serekh ha-ʿEdah, but in slightly different forms.[25] The section in 1QSa I, 6–25 // 4QSE I, 8–III, 8 displays various responsibilities of various age groups (ten, twenty, twenty-five, and thirty years), as well as of the Levites. After these rules, male honor is at stake when the text says:[26]

<div dir="rtl">

ולפי שכלו עם תום דרכו יחזק מתנו למעמ[ד לצב]ואת

עבודת מעשו בתוך אחיו[בי]ן רוב למועט [ולפי] זה יכבדו איש מרעהו

</div>

In proportion to his[27] intelligence with the perfection of his walk, let (each man) strengthen his loins for his assignm[ent to ser]ve (in) the work of his duty among his brothers, [whet]her high or low, let [ea]ch man honor the other, respectively. (1QSa I, 17-18 // 4QSE II, 8-11)

The idea is certainly that every man deserves to be honored according to his position in the hierarchy, and this is not determined only by his age but also according to his abilities: intelligence, striving for perfection,

---

24. See discussion by Berthelot 2018a, 366–71. Parts of the relevant passage are fragmentarily preserved in an early manuscript, 4Q524 frag. 5.

25. "All citizens of eschatological Israel are brothers, but not all brothers have equal status," as expressed by Gillihan 2012, 484.

26. The Hebrew text of 1QSa follows the new edition by Ben-Dov, Stökl Ben Ezra, and Gayer 2017. The translations follow partly Tov 2006; Vermes 2004, 159–62.

27. Vermes (2004, 160) divides the sentences differently: "And every head of the family in the congregation who is chosen to hold office, [to go] and come before the congregation, shall strengthen his loins." However, the heads belong to the previous sentence as ones who take the lot and do the decisions.

strength, and performance (also 1QS I, 28 // 4QSE III, 13–14). There may be competition involved in outdoing the other member.[28] Male honor may also be visible in the rule that no mentally incompetent man ("simpleton") is accepted in the duty, except for forced labor or certain tasks:

<div dir="rtl">

וכול איש פותי
אל יבוא בגורל להתיצב על עדת ישראל לרי[ב מ]שפט ולשאת משא עדה
ולהתיצב במלחמה להכניע גוים רק בסרך הצבא יכתוב משפחתו
ובעבודת המס יעשה עבודתו כפי מעשו
</div>

> No simpleton is to be ordained to office as a leader of the congregation of Israel with regard to law[suits or jud]gment, nor carry any responsibility in the congregation. Nor shall he hold any office in the war to subdue the nations. His family shall merely inscribe him[29] in the army register, and he shall serve in labor force, in proportion to his capacity. (1QSa I, 19‒22 // 4QSE II, 12–III, 2)

This rule highlights the construction of masculinity in the movement. Allowing such an incompetent person to participate in the battle would risk the goal of winning the battle and thus achieving male honor, or, if such a person would happen to be successful, this would challenge the masculine ideals based on military hierarchy. Perceptions of masculinity are historically and culturally contingent; masculinity is not a quality but ideology.[30] The hegemonic position is the accepted male ideal, and those who are unable to aspire to hegemony take a complicit, subordinate, or marginal position, such as the incompetent man here. But there can also be competing ideas of the ideal, and this can be seen to happen in the text on a wider scale: ideal masculinity involves not only military success but accepting one's place in the hierarchy and submitting oneself to purity demands (see below).[31]

---

28. See the somewhat exaggerating translation in Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library: "Let [ea]ch man seek honour for himself, striving to outdo his fellow." See Ben-Dov, Stökl Ben Ezra, and Gayer 2017, 22: "there[by] each man shall be honoured by his fellow."

29. Ben-Dov, Stökl Ben Ezra, and Gayer (2017, 22) present an alternative translation, suggesting that even though the family head is incompetent, his family should be registered: "he (i.e. the simpleton) shall have his family inscribed."

30. Keady (2017) has recently used Raewyn Connell's work for investigating masculinities in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

31. Asikainen (2018) argues that self-assertive behavior and self-control were

Assembling for Decision Making Is a Sacred Act

The congregation (all Israel) was assembled in the beginning of the text for education and hearing of the law, but its leading personnel is also assembled for various decision-making tasks: justice, council, or war (1QSa I, 25–26 // 4QSE III, 8–11). Here the assembly is envisioned as a sacred space in terms of access: one has to be eligible in order to enter. The preparation takes three days (see Exod 19:14–16), so these cannot be everyday gatherings. Priestly rules for safeguarding the temple sanctity (Lev 21) lie in the background of the rules for excluding persons from the possibility to participate: the unclean, smitten, paralyzed, lame, blind, deaf, dumb, elderly (1QSa II, 3–9 // 4QSE IV, 3–10).[32] However, as with priests who have a disability, the exclusion does not mean exclusion from membership or right to speak but rather from official duties (1QSa II, 9–10 // 4QSE IV, 10–13). In this sense, the rules may seek to integrate persons in the marginal or subordinate positions in society. Whereas the hegemonic ideal in the Hasmonean elite society, if judged by their military campaigns and portrayal in 1 Maccabees, was a David-like hero, the Qumran movement offered more variety: the highest position was given to healthy and capable persons, but they needed to obey the superiors and control themselves (e.g., in case of semen impurity), and persons with temporary impurity states or disabilities were given concession to be heard (see discussion by Berthelot 2018a, 109–18).

Conclusion

What overall insight might we gain from reading one particular early rule text in the context of the second century BCE? The Rule of the Congregation in the form of 4QSE, as far as we can reconstruct it, envisions a congregation of Israel,[33] in structured and ordered manner, organizing its education, duties, and leadership, in order to be operative for matters

---

competing ideals in the first century. A single text cannot naturally answer these questions. See further Keady 2017.

32. For comparisons to rules in the War Scroll, the Damascus Document, and the Community Rule, see, e.g., Bloch, Ben-Dov, and Stökl Ben Ezra 2019, 36–37; Wassen 2005, 144–56; Wassen 2008, 115–29; Dorman 2007.

33. It is often suggested that this all-Israel perspective later changed into a more sectarian enterprise. However, we need caution here. Many sects have aspirations to

relating to jurisdiction (including family matters), derivation of laws and governance, and military matters. I have argued that it reveals competition over male members, who needed to be offered a credible place and path in society (and not merely as critique of specific practices).

First, it must be noted that the text is in no way anti-Hellenistic. It may envision the possibility of war against the nations (neighboring regions? war against empire?), but these authors could also have been knowledgeable in the Hellenistic culture and interested in making the most of it (Jokiranta and Hartog 2017). In many ways, the ideal constructed movement is a voluntary association comparable to (but not the same as) Hellenistic associations (Gillihan 2012; Eckhardt 2018, 86–96).

Is it anti-Hasmonean, then? The text could well, in my view, be read in the context of Hasmonean struggles for power and their growing military operations, especially from John Hyrcanus onward, as presenting an alternative order in the society, largely ruled by priests and/or sages and scribes associated with promoting reliance on expert power and restrictions on kingly power. The emerging movement had to compete in the same market and thus in a way speak the same language as other leader circles of the time: if the military campaigns were new, groups that would have other primary ambitions needed to take a stance on the issue and promote themselves in the arena where male honor could be achieved.[34] Thus, the war against the nations was a natural topic in the turbulent times, but the war itself was not the aim for these authors; keeping the social order was.[35] This social order came through: (1) careful education in the laws of all Israel; (2) providing clear steps for males in advancement and hierarchy for leadership; (3) basing all decision making in an ethically and spiritually sustainable organ where members were eligible, qualified, and prepared, but not excluding ineligible members from the social entity; and (4) placing all expectations of/claims to king-Messiah in a secondary role, with the primary role being orderly meetings and small groups coming together. How utopian or real-

---

change the society at large; they only have different ways to try to achieve this, see the "responses to evil" by Bryan Wilson and discussion in Jokiranta 2009, 177–209.

34. This question closely follows the Weberian track, whereby sects are seen to be channels to assert oneself (Chalcraft 2007).

35. This reading partly agrees with Gillihan (2012, 7–8, 457–60), who presents rule documents as comparable to "politeiai, constitutions for real and imagined states," but rather than taking SE as a rule for a restored society (in the future), I think it can be read as an early rule for aiming at maintaining social order in a changing situation.

istic was this rule? Had we only one manuscript, I could easily make a case for its idealistic structuring of Israel. But the existence and emergence of a variety of different rules and later manuscript evidence gives reason to believe that some Judeans did in fact assemble, follow such rules, and at least attempted to create a larger movement along these lines in the society. In the context of the 1QS-1QSa-1QSb scroll, Serekh ha-ʿEdah may be read anew: What does it mean, for example, to rely so heavily on the heads of families and advancement by age in comparison to the guidance by the *maśkil*, *mevaqqer*, and the *rabbim* in 1QS?[36] All rules, not only this one, in one way or the other, are ideal: they present an *ideally constructed world* of what the authors wished to create, maintain, and preserve in memory. In the second century BCE, the movement possibly had many options (or choices to decide) still open (even if not all realistic),[37] and we have not yet sufficiently answered why it went one way and not the other.

---

36. For reading 1QSa as a composite work where the "Sons of Zadok" tradition and 1QSa I, 1–3 closely resemble 1QS traditions but other parts are closer to the D traditions, see Hempel 2013, 47–62.

37. It could have chosen a leader and legitimized its existence on that leader's (and his family's) excellence (instead, it seemed to have relied on traditional priestly authority as well bureaucratic authority where small-group assemblies gave counsel); it could have built its own temple and thus openly challenged the Hasmonean rule (instead, it came to assert being a temple of men, still possibly having contact with the Jerusalem temple, and produced studies on the future temple); it could have written its own court history (for both 1 and 2 Maccabees as court literature, see Honigman 2014; instead, it wrote itself into past biblical history and rewrote biblical traditions). It probably did adopt the purification rituals that became more widespread during this time; it also created a network structure enabling the development and practice of many new ritual (prayer, covenant entry, etc.) practices independent of the temple.