

STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH [126]

Converts in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The Gēr and Mutable Ethnicity

CARMEN PALMER

BRILL

Converts in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

George J. Brooke

Associate Editors

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

Jonathan Ben-Dov

Alison Schofield

VOLUME 126

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/stdj

Converts in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The Gēr and Mutable Ethnicity

By

Carmen Palmer



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at <http://catalog.loc.gov>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 978-90-04-37817-9 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-37818-6 (e-book)

Copyright 2018 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi, Brill Sense, Hotei Publishing, mentis Verlag, Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh and Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Acknowledgments	IX
List of Abbreviations	XI
Key to Symbols	XII
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Context	5
1.1.1 <i>Context Part I: “Sectarianism” and Levels of Social Closure within the Sectarian Movement Affiliated with the DSS</i>	5
1.1.2 <i>Context Part II: Gēr Research within Scriptural Tradition</i>	10
1.2 Problem and Significance	16
1.2.1 <i>Problem and Significance Part I: Who Is the Gēr in the DSS?</i>	16
1.2.2 <i>Problem and Significance Part II: of What Does Ethnicity and Conversion Consist?</i>	23
1.2.3 <i>Problem and Significance Part III: Summary and Moving Ahead to the DSS</i>	31
1.3 Response: Methodology	32
1.4 Chapter Outlines	38
2 Provenance and Dating of the Gēr in the Dead Sea Scrolls	41
2.1 Overview of the Provenance of the Sectarian Movement and the Damascus and Serekh Traditions	42
2.1.1 <i>The Sectarian Movement: Deposed Zadokite Priests?</i>	42
2.1.2 <i>The Sectarian Movement and Prevailing Dating</i>	44
2.1.3 <i>The Sectarian Movement: Essenes?</i>	45
2.1.4 <i>The Relationship between D and S: Chronology</i>	48
2.2 Means of Establishing Provenance and Dating of the Texts	52
2.2.1 <i>Literary Devices</i>	52
2.2.2 <i>Paleography</i>	53
2.2.3 <i>Orthography Style</i>	54
2.3 An Assessment of the Occasions Where the Term Gēr Has Been Employed	55
2.3.1 <i>A Text That Influences Damascus (D) and Serekh (S) Traditions: 4Q423 Instruction⁹ Frag. 5, 1–4</i>	55
2.3.2 <i>Texts Correlated with the Damascus (D) Tradition</i>	58

- 2.3.2.1 Damascus Document Manuscripts: Cairo Genizah, 4QD, and 6QD 58
 - 2.3.2.1.1 *CD VI, 14–VII, 1* 59
 - 2.3.2.1.2 *CD XIV, 3–6* 62
- 2.3.2.2 11QT^a Temple Scroll XL, 5–6 63
- 2.3.2.3 4Q377 Apocryphal Pentateuch B Frag. 1, I 67
- 2.3.2.4 4Q159 Ordinances^a Frags. 2–4, 1–3 71
- 2.3.2.5 4Q279 Four Lots Frag. 5, 1–6 75
- 2.3.3 *Texts Correlated with the Serekh (S) Tradition* 78
 - 2.3.3.1 4Q169 Peshar Nahum Frags. 3–4, II, 7–10 78
 - 2.3.3.2 4Q174 Florilegium Frag. 1, I, 1–4 82
- 2.3.4 *Texts Correlated with the Sectarian Movement: Alignment with Damascus (D) or Serekh (S) Tradition Indeterminate* 86
 - 2.3.4.1 4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple Frag. 1 86
 - 2.3.4.2 4Q498 Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments Frag. 7 87
 - 2.3.4.3 4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back Frag. 45 88
- 2.4 Chapter Conclusions 91
- 3 A Textual Study of the *Gēr* in the Dead Sea Scrolls** 93
 - 3.1 A Text That Influences Damascus (D) and Serekh (S) Traditions: 4Q423 Instruction^s Frag. 5, 1–4 95
 - 3.2 Texts Correlated with the Damascus (D) Tradition 97
 - 3.2.1 *CD VI, 14–VII, 1* 97
 - 3.2.2 *CD XIV, 3–6* 99
 - 3.2.3 11QT^a Temple Scroll XL, 5–6 102
 - 3.2.4 4Q377 Apocryphal Pentateuch B Frag. 1, I 105
 - 3.2.5 4Q159 Ordinances^a Frags. 2–4, 1–3 110
 - 3.2.6 4Q279 Four Lots Frag. 5, 1–6 113
 - 3.3 Texts Correlated with the Serekh (S) Tradition 116
 - 3.3.1 4Q169 Peshar Nahum Frags. 3–4, II, 7–10 116
 - 3.3.2 4Q174 Florilegium Frag. 1, I, 1–4 119
 - 3.4 Texts Correlated with the Sectarian Movement: Alignment with Damascus (D) or Serekh (S) Tradition Indeterminate 122
 - 3.4.1 4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple Frag. 1 122
 - 3.4.2 4Q498 Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments Frag. 7 123
 - 3.4.3 4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back Frag. 45 125
 - 3.5 Chapter Conclusions 126

- 4 Locating the *Gēr* and Assessing Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement** 129
- 4.1 Shared Kinship as a Marker of Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement: How *Gēr* Represents Kin 130
- 4.1.1 *Gēr Is (an Israelite) Brother* 130
- 4.1.2 *Gēr Is Identified as Israelite Kin through Other Kinship Terminology* 131
- 4.1.3 *Physical Proximity with Respect to Other Judeans Indicates *Gēr* as Sharing in Kinship* 132
- 4.1.4 *Effacement of *Gēr* as a Resident Alien* 132
- 4.1.5 *Judean Convert Status of a *Gēr* Is Denied* 133
- 4.1.6 *Who Is a “Brother”?* 133
- 4.1.7 *Ethnic Identity in the Feature of Shared Kinship: Conclusions* 136
- 4.2 Connection to Land as a Feature of Ethnic Identity: *Gēr*’s Incorporation in the Promise of Land 137
- 4.2.1 *The Promise of a Land of Honey* 138
- 4.2.2 *Land Inheritance and Lots* 139
- 4.2.3 *Significance of Birth and/or Livelihood in the Land of Israel* 140
- 4.2.4 *Connection to Land as a Feature of Ethnic Identity: Conclusions* 140
- 4.3 Common Culture in the Covenantal Practice of Circumcision as a Feature of Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement 142
- 4.3.1 *Overview According to Pre and Post-Hellenistic Influence* 142
- 4.3.2 *Allusions to Physical Circumcision as a Reminder of Complete Covenantal Obedience in the D Tradition* 146
- 4.3.3 *Circumcision of the Heart as Spiritual Obedience in the S Tradition* 148
- 4.3.4 *Common Culture in Circumcision as a Feature of Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement: Conclusions* 152
- 4.4 Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement Chapter Conclusions 154
- 5 Sociohistorical Comparison between the Sectarian Movement and Greco-Roman Associations** 158
- 5.1 Greco-Roman Associations: An Introduction 165
- 5.2 Greco-Roman Noncosanguinal Brothers: Professional Associations 167

5.3	Greco-Roman Noncosanguinal Brothers: Cultic Associations	172
5.3.1	<i>Nuclear “Families” and Hierarchical Relationships in Cultic Associations</i>	172
5.3.2	<i>Adopted Brothers in Cultic Associations and Beyond</i>	176
5.4	Shared Kinship and Mutable Ethnicity in the Brothers of Greco-Roman Associations: Conclusions	183
6	Conclusion	185
6.1	Summary of Findings	186
6.2	Further Implications for Scholarship	191
6.3	Proposals for Further Research	194
	Bibliography	197
	Index of Modern Authors	217
	Index of Ancient Sources	220

Acknowledgments

This study is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation. Over the course of this project, the *gêr* has been at times both friend and foe. Nevertheless, thanks to the help of many individuals, the project took shape and came to completion. First, I would like to thank my cosupervisors and Doktormütter, Professors Sarianna Metso and Judith Newman. Their critical-mindedness and attention to detail, hand in hand with their creativity and ability to see concepts on a large scale, provided the parameters necessary to help mold and tame my work.

During the completion of my doctoral program, my thesis readers and examiners also provided insight that helped and will continue to help shape my scholarship into the future. Terence Donaldson, my internal examiner, assisted me in becoming better acquainted with ethnicity theory. John McLaughlin, my Toronto School of Theology examiner, was a part of my doctoral process from the start and always offered careful questions concerning textual authority, interpretation, and criticism. I am extremely grateful for the time and attention given to my work by my external examiner, Cecilia Wassen. I have followed her original scholarship on sectarianism, purity, and the sectarian movement affiliated with the Dead Sea Scrolls since early on in my program, and am pleased that she shared her insight and expertise with me.

There are many scholars who offered assistance in myriad ways (whether they remember these interactions or not after the passage of time), such as recommending articles for consideration, reading draft chapters, instructing courses foundational to my thought, or otherwise engaging in conversation concerning my work. While my ideas have been shaped by many more than I can name here, in particular I must mention those scholars with whom interactions impacted this specific project in some way: Ehud Ben Zvi; Katell Berthelot; John Collins; Zeba Crook; Maxine Grossman; Philip Harland; Jutta Jokiranta; Michael Kolarcik; Hindy Najman; Eileen Schuller; Michael Segal; Eibert Tigchelaar; and Molly Zahn.

I must also thank those organizations that assisted me financially during my studies. Emmanuel College provided me with both financial support, and the opportunity to instruct the course Introduction to Biblical Hebrew for a number of years. Teaching this course improved my Hebrew reading for the purpose of my thesis and subsequent monograph. Victoria University made editing services available to students, and I offer my thanks and gratitude to Susan Riggs, my editor there who spent many hours becoming acquainted with the intricacies of my subject matter and helping me to present the information

to my audience as clearly as possible. Financial support was also offered generously through the Canadian Friends of Hebrew University, which, along with my supervisor Sarianna Metso and other colleagues, made a trip possible to see in person scrolls 4Q377, 4Q498, and 4Q520 at the Israel Antiquities Authority.

I am also grateful to George Brooke, editor of the series *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, in addition to the anonymous reviewers of my project, and to Brill, for their assistance to improve my research and to bring this project to fruition as a book. Any remaining shortcomings are entirely my own responsibility.

Finally, I am grateful to friends and family for their encouragement and support over the course of this project. I have been fortunate to have many friends and colleagues who have assisted and continue to assist me in my work. Especially, I would like to thank my spouse, Michael Kooiman, whose love, support, and belief in my work were imperative to bringing this project to completion. I dedicate this project to him.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. Abbreviations not located in the *SBL Handbook* include the following:

- CQS Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
- ECDSS Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls
- GAP Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha
- IJS Institute of Jewish Studies: Studies in Judaica
- JSJSup Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods Supplement Series
- SBLEJL Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
- SBLSS Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
- SDSS Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
- ThWQ* *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*

Key to Symbols

- [] Undecipherable or missing
- [...] Lacuna of unspecified length in the manuscript
- ψ[⌘] Reconstruction of illegible or missing letters
- (...) Omission of citation text performed by present study
- {⌘} Legible text erased by the scribe
- ⌘ Damaged letter, although its reading is certain
- ⌘ Damaged letter, the reading of which is uncertain
- Clear traces of one undecipherable letter

Introduction

The present study, at its core, asks one question: what is the meaning of *gēr* when the term is employed within the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS)? *Gēr* is a scriptural term that has served as a proven indicator to denote a sociohistorical shift from “resident alien” to a later meaning of “Gentile convert to Judaism.” No other term has done this. For example, immigrants into Judah after the collapse of the Northern Kingdom in 722 BCE may serve as the sociohistorical context for the *gēr* as a resident alien for whom harvest gleanings should be left in the fields (e.g. Deut 24:19–21). In the first centuries CE where Judean conversions are well-documented,¹ the *gēr* of rabbinic literature takes on a meaning of one of these Gentile converts to Judaism. This meaning is evidenced by the term’s expansion to that of a “righteous *gēr*” (the religious convert) which now contrasts against that of a “*gēr tōshāb*” (representing the prior “resident alien”). But within the context of the DSS and the sectarian movement affiliated with them, whether at the founding site of Qumran or beyond,² the meaning of the

1 Narratives understood as “conversions” occur in a variety of Judean texts, such as those described by Philo in *Spec. Laws* 1.51 and 1.308–309; and Josephus, *Ant.* 13.257–258; 13.318–319; 20.139; and 20.145.

2 The present study defines those groups affiliated with the Dead Sea Scrolls found at the site of Qumran as the “sectarian movement,” to acknowledge that the movement does not consist of only one, uniform point of view, nor even one, uniform, locale. See the brief introduction to the sectarian nature of the movement in Section 1.1.1 of the present chapter, in addition to the brief overview of the Damascus and Serekh traditions included within Ch. 2 of the present project, Sections 2.1–2.1.4. The term “sectarian movement” draws upon the sentiment captured by Jutta Jokiranta to describe the movement (albeit in her case with the usage of the term “Qumran movement”). Concerning the term, she writes: “the term ‘Qumran movement’ refers to the movement responsible for composing, copying, and preserving the Dead Sea Scrolls, irrespective of whether this movement or parts of it were located at Khirbet Qumran. When we think of Qumran sectarianism, it matters whether we think of a small, unique, central community, or rather a network of parallel communities, or something else (e.g. chronologically subsequent communities; contemporary conflicting communities).” Jutta Jokiranta, “Sociological Approaches to Qumran Sectarianism,” in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 205, n. 2. To this definition, the present study would add one further caveat, which is that it is not certain to what degree every manuscript preserved at Qumran may correlate with this sectarian movement. For example, Aramaic texts make up roughly thirteen percent of the manuscripts found at Qumran, but are suggested to be distinct within the full DSS corpus; how representational they are of the sectarian movement is uncertain. See, for example, Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran

term is uncertain. Currently there is no consensus on the *gēr*'s identity within this body of writings, appearing on thirteen occasions within texts that utilize the technique of scriptural rewriting: a variety of meanings have been posited for the *gēr*, including a non-Judean slave, a Judean who is halfway initiated into the sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS, or a Gentile convert who is only included in a hypothetical era.³ Because the scrolls denote a level of social closure toward not only non-Judeans, but oftentimes also toward other Judeans, scholars most frequently conclude that a definition of a *gēr* as a Gentile convert to Judaism, as in the *gēr* of rabbinics, is unlikely. The socially closed nature of the movement has been interpreted to suggest that a former Gentile's inclusion would be denied.

Why would a socially closed movement include a *gēr* within the community, as certain texts seem to suggest, if this figure represents a "resident alien" Gentile? At some point between the postexilic period and the first centuries CE, the term *gēr* does change to include the new and widely understood meaning of "Gentile convert to Judaism," and the present study aims to determine whether the nature of the *gēr* in the late Second Temple period writings of the DSS suggests such a change. Furthermore, what features would undergo transformation for a Gentile to "convert" to Judaism within the context of the DSS? What circumstances would permit or deny the inclusion of a former Gentile? Unlocking the mystery of the *gēr*, as found within the context of the DSS, will

-
- Community," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 197–205. (As it happens, no *gēr* is found in these Aramaic texts.) The possible wider affiliations within the DSS corpus as a whole is the reason for which the present study verifies a connection to the sectarian movement, and more specifically to the D or S traditions, of each text that employs the *gēr*, as evidenced within Chapter 2.
- 3 The term *gēr* appearing in scriptural rewriting in the DSS could signal a change in meaning for the term, just as was seen above in other forms of scriptural rewriting. The study excludes occasions of the *gēr* within scripture that closely mirrors what will become the Masoretic Text. Apart from these two general categories mentioned, no other occasions of the term exist in the DSS, such as in cryptic documents, calendars, or business dealings, to the present author's knowledge. See the present chapter, Section 1.3, for specifics on the present study's methodology and terminology. For the particular perspectives of the meaning of the *gēr* listed above, see, respectively, the works of John Lübbe, "The Exclusion of the *Ger* from the Future Temple," in *Mogilany 1993: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Hans Burgmann*, ed. Zdzislaw J. Kapera, Qumranica Mogilanesia 13 (Kraków: The Enigma Press, 1996), 175–82; Philip R. Davies, "The 'Damascus Sect' and Judaism," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen, JSOTSup 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 70–84; Terence Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007). See also the present chapter Section 1.2.1 for summaries of these scholars and others on the matter of the *gēr* in the DSS.

also shed light on the ongoing debate concerning the nature of the movement itself, and can subsequently broaden scholarship's understanding of not only other late Second Temple Judean groups, but also other groups within this Hellenistic time frame.

The societies of the ancient Mediterranean emphasized group orientation.⁴ And, if one considers a conversion, most broadly, as a permitted change from one "group" to another, then one finds evidence of various features "converting" and being made mutable to something different when considering the wider scope of groups within later Second Temple Judaism and the Greco-Roman world. For example, Roman citizenship was granted to foreigners who made contributions to Rome.⁵ Groups and individuals could become Hellenes if they relinquished their "barbarian" language and took up Greek.⁶ Judeans who wanted to take part in the Greek custom of the gymnasium hid their circumcisions.⁷ Gentiles who gave up familial, homeland, and accompanying religious practices could be incorporated into Jewish law.⁸ All of these examples demonstrate a conversion of sorts and permitted mutability of various features, including those features observed above of citizenship, language, practices of common culture (including religious practice), and descent or ancestry, a feature that will be defined in this study as "kinship" to allow for broad definition.⁹ These features are examples overall of what one could

4 Philip Esler writes the following: "The various cultures of the ancient Mediterranean region were strongly group oriented. The family was the most important group, and ties of kinship were the strongest social ties of all. Yet other groups also carried weight." Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 54.

5 J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *Romans and Aliens* (London: Duckworth, 1979), see 82–96.

6 Rebecca F. Kennedy, C. Sydnor Roy, and Max L. Goldman, select and trans, *Race and Ethnicity in the Classical World: An Anthology of Primary Sources in Translation* (Indianapolis; Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2013), 67, drawing on Herodotus's *Hist.* 1.56.2–57.3. Kennedy offers the following annotation for this passage: "Herodotus addresses the idea of language as an identifier of race and ethnicity. One can be born as part of one group, but can become part of another through the adoption of a new language."

7 Kennedy, Roy, and Goldman, *Race and Ethnicity*, 76, drawing on Josephus, *Ant.* 12.239–241.

8 Philo, *Virtues* 102.

9 The present study uses the term "kinship" to describe the ethnic identity component variably described as "fictive" ancestry or shared decent (see below in Section 1.2.2). Kinship is very subjective group by group. As Robert Parkin has observed with modern kinship groups of the present era, the meaning of kinship can vary, with non-Western groups referring to all members in society using kinship language, regardless of the "exact relationship," and Western society "progressively dilut[ing] the circle of kin." Thus while "kinship" as a term can appear ambiguous, the meaning of the term will become clearer in this context of the sectarian movement once the texts are assessed. The term performs the requisite task of identifying the new relationship that will be noted when the *gēr* comes to be affiliated with an Israelite

regard in this Mediterranean world as “ethnic communities”: groups with features of sameness, including in most general terms both features of kinship and culture,¹⁰ that can be defined against, and unlike, other groups with features of kinship and culture.¹¹ Therefore, a “conversion” consists of a change in features that enables a change in membership between ethnic communities (those communities exhibiting features of kinship and culture). In other words, ethnicity comprises mutable features in these blended Hellenistic and Judean milieux, and is more than notions of kinship, connection to land, or religious practice alone.

Based on the above examples, certain features pertaining to kinship and culture do seem to be emphasized for each occasion of conversion. Following this logic, if the *gēr* is found to represent a “convert” within the DSS, then certain features of ethnicity may be mutable within the sectarian movement affiliated with the scrolls. Charting changes observed in the term *gēr* as it is employed within the DSS, just as has been done previously to observe sociohistorically influenced changes in meaning, and comparing these findings against other similar groups to check for the feasibility of sociohistorical observations, will in fact reveal mutable features of ethnicity within the movement. Simply put, despite the socially closed nature of the movement affiliated with the DSS, the study argues that the *gēr* employed in texts that draw on the technique of scriptural rewriting in the DSS is a convert, although variably included or excluded within the movement.¹² A *gēr*-convert is a prior Gentile who converted

“brother.” This shared notion of kinship is not cosanguinal, but does signify more than “fictive kinship,” in that the *gēr* is perceived as no longer a Gentile in a very “real” way. Otherwise, his presence would break purity regulations. See Robert Parkin, *Kinship: An Introduction to the Basic Concepts* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 123.

10 See, for example, Fredrik Barth, “Introduction,” in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, ed. Fredrik Barth (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), 11; Richard Jenkins, *Social Identity*, Second ed. (London; New York: Routledge, 2004), 101; Jonathan M. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 8–10. See further explanation on the matter of the features of ethnicity, below in this introductory chapter, Section 1.2.2.

11 John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith write that the term *ethnos* and various derivatives within the Greco-Roman world refer to “other peoples who ... belong to some group unlike one’s own.” They clarify that in their work that follows, the term “ethnic” is applied to all groups—not only the “other”—an application to which the present study follows suit. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, “Introduction,” in *Ethnicity*, ed. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 4–5. See Section 1.2.2 of the present chapter for further explanation concerning the components of “ethnicity” in this Mediterranean milieu and more broadly within the scope of ethnicity studies.

12 See Section 1.3 of the present chapter for descriptions of scriptural terms, including “scriptural rewriting.”

to Judaism and is assumed to have undergone circumcision, and joined the movement affiliated with the Damascus tradition. However, this same Gentile convert to Judaism, represented in the *gēr*, is found to be excluded from the movement affiliated with the Serekh tradition. Members of the Serekh tradition believe that they themselves have become supra-Judean, having undergone a secondary circumcision “of the heart.” The nature of conversion or its denial is esteemed to involve a notion of mutable or immutable ethnicity, whereby features of a shared notion of kinship, connection to a land, and a common culture in the practice of circumcision, are critical components.

1.1 Context¹³

1.1.1 *Context Part 1: “Sectarianism” and Levels of Social Closure within the Sectarian Movement Affiliated with the DSS*

Overall, scholarship’s notion of the movement affiliated with the DSS found at Qumran as a sectarian one with low tolerance of outsiders is well-founded. It is easy to grasp why the movement has been perceived to eschew Gentile converts. Certainly one of the contested features of current Qumran scholarship is the idea of a particular type of “Qumran sectarianism,” based on, for example, the use of a solar calendar system.¹⁴ Nevertheless, on a basic sociological front,

13 For the sections titled “Context” and “Problem and Significance,” the study relies on the writing strategy of Rachel Cayley in Explorations of Style, “Introductions,” explorationsofstyle.com.

14 As one example, in Carol Newsom’s foundational article in which she defines the nature of a Qumran sectarian text, her suggested criterion of “adherence to the solar calendar” may no longer be used as a sign of Qumran sectarianism. Helen Jacobus has demonstrated that it appears more likely that the sectarian movement maintained “different calendars” which were used for “different purposes.” For example, the theory that the movement solely utilized a solar calendar breaks down when one considers that 1QPesher Habakkuk, an established text of the movement with its frequent use of the term *yahad* (see within Section 2.3.3.1 for discussion of this term) suggests possible use of a lunar calendar with reference to the day of Atonement in xi, 6–7. Carol Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, ed. William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 177; Helen R. Jacobus, “Group Identities and Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” paper presentation, Society of Biblical Literature International Meeting, University of Amsterdam, (The Netherlands, 23 July 2012). See also the published dissertation of Jacobus, expanding on the same topic, in which she proposes “that there was a multiplicity of shared calendars, rather than a plurality (that is, each group using only their own separate calendar), that there may have been a variety of common texts for different purposes shared by various groups in Second Temple Judaism over periods of time.” Helen R. Jacobus, *Zodiac Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Reception*, 1JS 14 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014),

David Chalcraft argues that “it is still very worthwhile to think about the religious movements/social movements attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls in terms of sects and sectarianism.”¹⁵ Chalcraft’s own working definition of a sect is the following: “a social group whose claims to exclusivity have led to strict demarcations and discipline of membership, and whose operation of social closure utilises religious attributes of belief and practice.”¹⁶ These general descriptors of demarcation and social closure are critical to a sectarian identity, and are common attributes within definitions of sectarianism as defined by those who have studied the phenomenon within late Second Temple Judaism, as well as the movement affiliated with the DSS specifically. Within these studies on sectarianism attributed to either late Second Temple Judaism generally, or the sectarian movement in question specifically, the descriptors of demarcation and social closure have been described in various ways, for example, “boundary marking mechanisms,”¹⁷ “a particular and internal worldview,”¹⁸ “an alienative, expressive response to society,”¹⁹ and also “high tension with the greater society.”²⁰

-
- 452–53. Jacobus also suggests 4Q318 to be a “lunar zodiac calendar” which is a “Qumran calendar.” See Helen R. Jacobus, “4Q318: A Jewish Zodiac Calendar at Qumran?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, ed. Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 90 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 365–95 (citation from 394).
- 15 David J. Chalcraft, “Is a Historical Comparative Sociology of (Ancient Jewish) Sects Possible?” in *Sects and Sectarianism in Jewish History*, ed. Sasha Stern, IJS Studies in Judaica 12 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011), 237.
- 16 Chalcraft, “Comparative Sociology,” 239–40. See also the following for summaries on the development of the sociological study of sectarianism and its relevant aspects for comparison: David J. Chalcraft, “The Development of Weber’s Sociology of Sects: Encouraging a New Fascination,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*; David J. Chalcraft (London: Equinox, 2007), 26–51; Jokiranta, “Sociological Approaches.”
- 17 Albert Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*, JSJSup 55 (Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997), 7.
- 18 Eyal Regev, “Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organization: The Qumran Sects in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites and Amish,” *Numen* 51 (2004): 179.
- 19 Anthony J. Saldarini, “Sectarianism,” in EDSS, vol. 2, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 855.
- 20 Cecilia Wassen and Jutta Jokiranta, “Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, ed. David Chalcraft (London: Equinox, 2007), 222. Wassen and Jokiranta draw on the sectarian notion of “tension” and its measurement to define sectarianism within the D and S traditions, drawing on the work of Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge, *A Theory of Religion*, Toronto Studies in Religion (New York: Lang, 1987); in particular see Wassen and Jokiranta, “Groups in Tension,” 208–10, and Stark and Bainbridge, *A Theory of Religion*, 121–28. See also Jutta Jokiranta, “‘Sectarianism’ of the Qumran ‘Sect’: Sociological Notes,” *RevQ* 20 (2001): 223–39, in which she argues that useful criteria for assessing

These descriptors of demarcations and social closure may be observed especially in the expansionist interpretation of Torah and legal halakah sustained within the sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS. The purpose of this expansion is to maintain higher purity standards. Based on the literary evidence, Hannah Harrington describes the movement's process by which it maintains this heightened level of purity as the following:

- 1) an effort to extend the holiness of the Temple to the whole Temple city and require a high level of purity for the ordinary city (the level which the sectarians strove to maintain in the present era), 2) a stringent interpretation of Scripture which homogenized all ambiguous data of the Torah on purity issues to agree with the most demanding relevant text, and 3) an attitude toward community food which required ritual purification before eating.²¹

This "ordinary" city with the heightened Temple-level purity described by Harrington can be observed in regulations concerning similar-minded prohibitions to enter the Temple city for three days after having had sexual relations (11QT^a XLV, 11–12), and prohibiting sexual intercourse within the Temple city (CD XII, 1–2). These prohibitions created an expansive notion of spatial purity, rendering a notion of social closure to outsiders understandable.

A notion of expansive spatial purity may also contribute to views of social closure. For example, Francis Schmidt has suggested an actualization of the notion of expansive spatial purity; he suggests that the expansion occurs within the hierarchical structure of the movement itself. Schmidt argues that where the "Community of the New Covenant" is concerned (his term for the sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS), notions of purity and impurity are inseparable,²² since the areas to demarcate degrees of purity or impurity are transposed onto the very Community hierarchy and activities themselves.²³

sectarianism in an emic (insider) point of view, such as what is evidenced in the Qumran texts, include the following: "tension with socio-cultural environment"; viewing oneself as "uniquely legitimate"; and setting up "boundaries against others." Jokiranta, "Sectarianism," 238–39.

21 Hannah K. Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations*, SBLDS 143 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 67.

22 Francis Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple. De Jérusalem à Qoumrân: Identité et lien social dans le judaïsme ancien* (Editions du seuil, 1994), 142. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.

23 For example, according to Schmidt, women are a demarcation line of impurity based on their position within each Community institution. The Council of the Assembly described in 1QSa 1, 25–27, as well as the Council of the Community described in 1QS VIII,

Purity zones are built into the sectarian movement's very structure,²⁴ bringing pure and impure together in a very physical manner. In Schmidt's model, profanation prevention is solely reliant on maintaining the regulations concerning these hierarchies and structures, thus raising the stakes on keeping this purity expansive and controlled. These elevated standards of purity, which induce demarcation and social closure, are indeed signs of sectarianism.

The "operation of social closure" pertaining to this sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS is not uniform, however: differences have been noted between its two primary rule text traditions, namely those traditions of the Damascus Document (CD) and its various 4QD manuscripts (collectively known as D),²⁵ and the Rule of the Community (1QS, or Serekh Ha-Yahad) and its related manuscripts (collectively known as S).²⁶ These differences between D and S exist as different degrees of social closure, concerning which John Collins argues the following: "they should be seen as complementary branches of a larger movement, one of which aspired to a higher degree of holiness than the other."²⁷ Eyal Regev describes the particular sectarian nature of the דן community in terms of a group exhibiting strong signs of tension with the wider community as well as membership based on merit.²⁸

Certainly, differences in regulations between the two rule traditions suggest a stronger concern on the part of S to avoid profanation and impurity, by managing a more closed and tightly orchestrated movement.²⁹ For example,

1–2, represent the highest level of purity, and consequently women do not appear in these gatherings. Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple*, 143, 151–52.

24 Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple*, 155.

25 D signifies "the comprehensive term for CD plus the 4QD fragments." John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2010), 13. The present study will also refer more generally to the "(D)amascus tradition," which represents the texts related thematically to the D rule, included within the study.

26 An overview of the manuscripts containing versions of the Rule of the Community can be found in Sarianna Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, CQS 9 (London; New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 2–6. Not included within the scope of the present study are the smaller 1QSa Rule of the Congregation and a number of other smaller more fragmentary Qumran rule texts, such as 4Q265 Miscellaneous Rules. Sarianna Metso lists this fragmentary manuscript and a number of others that use "organizational terminology." Sarianna Metso, "Problems in Reconstructing the Organizational Chart of the Essenes," *DSD* 16 (2009): 390. The present study will also refer more generally to the "(S)erek tradition," which represents the texts related thematically to the S rule, included within the study.

27 Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 6.

28 Eyal Regev, " דן ," *ThWQ* 2: 121–130.

29 It should be noted that alternative theories have been forwarded concerning the level of social closure between the traditions of D and S. For example, Cecilia Wassen and Jutta Jokiranta observe high tension deviant behaviours in D that are not necessarily as obvious

S adds a key descriptive marker of shared possessions that is not present in D. 1QS V, 2 specifies that members are to share “with Torah and property,” while 1QS VI, 17–22 offers specific regulations regarding a graded system of integrating members’ possessions in conjunction with their entrance process into the movement.³⁰ D, on the other hand, makes references to multiple dwelling sites not noted in S. Reference is made to “the rule of the assembly (מושב) of the towns in Israel (ערי ישראל)” (CD XII, 19).³¹ In addition, on multiple occasions references are made to movement members living in camps (מחנות), as witnessed in the following, for example: “the rule for the assembly of 23 [the] c[amps]” (CD XII, 22–23); “the assembly of the camps” (CD XIII, 20); and a discussion regarding “if they live (in) camps according to the rule of the land” (CD VII, 6). Furthermore, D makes numerous references to women and children.³² For example, CD V, 7–10 describes an emendation to a law concerning marriage prohibitions, and CD XIII, 16 makes reference to anyone who marries a woman. CD VII, 6–7 describes a regulation concerning those members living in camps who take wives and beget children. CD XIII, 17–18 regulates concerning children of divorced members. CD XVI, 10–12 describes a regulation regarding the oath of a woman. S (excluding 1QSa) is moot on the matter of women

as the physical isolation observed in S. For example, CD XIII, 15–17 gives over the parental role of marriage or divorce approval to the “Examiner.” Such acts of supervision would exert control over group members and distance outsiders, acting as another type of social closure. Wassen and Jokiranta, “Groups in Tension,” esp. 217–18, 223. As one additional example, Gudrun Holtz has observed what she describes as “inclusivist tendencies” within S, such as 1QS VIII, 4–10 and IX, 3–6, whereby one observes a desire to atone for the land, which Holtz interprets to mean “the nation as a whole.” Gudrun Holtz, “Inclusivism at Qumran,” *DSD* 16 (1999): 25, 43.

- 30 Within the present study, all citations from 1QS, unless otherwise noted, use the text and translation of James H. Charlesworth and Elisha Qimron, “Rule of the Community (1QS; Cf. 4QS MSS A–J, 5Q11),” in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, PTS DSSP 1 (Tübingen; Louisville: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 1–51. Citations from CD, unless otherwise noted, use Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, “Damascus Document (CD),” in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents, in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, PTS DSSP 2 (Tübingen; Louisville: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 4–79.
- 31 In the present study, מושב is translated as “assembly” and not “settlement,” for the sake of consistency among various works.
- 32 Both Eileen Schuller and Cecilia Wassen take note of a reference to marriage prohibitions in CD V, 7–10. Eileen Schuller, “Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1999), 131; Cecilia Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document*, SBLAB 21 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 137.

and children. Generally, S appears to trend toward a more closed community outlook than D, with the shared possessions and lack of references to multiple and public dwelling sites in S as well as no mention of the presence of women and children. These known differences in social closure may also produce differences in the meaning of the *gēr*, and should thus be taken into account.

1.1.2 *Context Part II: Gēr Research within Scriptural Tradition*

While the *gēr* as it is employed within the DSS has thus far been minimally studied, certainly the *gēr* within other scriptural traditions has been studied at length. These other studies demonstrate that the different meanings of the *gēr* indicate a sociohistorical marker of the era in which the text is situated. The term shows itself to take on different meanings over time.

The noun *gēr*, with the meaning of a male “resident alien,”³³ is added as a new term into the Covenant Code (Exod 21–23, CC) and the Deuteronomic Laws of chs. 12–26 (DL), the former of which was composed some time prior to the latter’s composition in the seventh through to sixth centuries BCE.³⁴ The most basic *gēr* resident alien of the CC becomes a part of the “tripartite” *personae miserae* of the widow, the orphan, and the resident alien of the DL, demonstrating that these persons, due to an absent family network, are included among those who are typically lacking in provisions.³⁵ Scholarly literature has suggested all of the following concerning the background of this *gēr*: he is an indigenous inhabitant of Canaan who is living amidst those who now make up the forming identity of “Israel”; he is an Israelite uprooted from somewhere else, such as one who has immigrated into Judah after the fall of Samaria in

33 José Ramírez Kidd argues that “the noun גֵר designates a legal status and is, therefore, restricted to *men*.” The noun, as separate from the verbal form גָּר, is never found in the feminine form in this prerabbinical period. José Ramírez Kidd, *Alterity and Identity in Israel*, BZAW 283 (Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 1999), 24, 28.

34 There is no reference to such an equivalent in ancient Mesopotamian law codes. Christiana de Groot van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 34–36. See also Charles Fensham, “Widow, Orphan and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature,” *JNES* 21 (1962): 129–39. Concerning dating, generally scholarship considers the CC to precede and to be revised by the DL, the composition of which has most commonly been considered to take place in the southern kingdom during the seventh and sixth centuries BCE. This dating links Josiah’s reforms of 2 Kings 22–23 with the corresponding centralization laws of DL. The absence of identifying Jerusalem as “the place” in Deut 12:13–15 can be explained as a purposeful reworking of “in every place,” borrowed from Exod 20:24, with the intention of maintaining the authority of that earlier text. See Bernard Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), esp. 23–52.

35 See Norbert Lohfink, “Poverty in the Laws of the Ancient Near East and of the Bible,” *TS* 52 (1991): 34–50.

722 BCE, the capital of the northern kingdom of Israel; he is a sojourner originating from the kingdom of Judah; or, more generally, he is a permanent resident yet one who cannot own land.³⁶ In each case the notion of a “resident alien” is appropriate. More recently, particular attention has been paid to the literary *gēr* in Deuteronomy, especially with regard to whether variances in narrative and portrayal of the *gēr* are due to progression over time, or, a trajectory of other motivations. Mark Awabdy concludes that the *gēr* is both non-Israelite and non-Judahite and that there is a continuity among the *gēr* texts.³⁷ Ruth Ebach, on the other hand, argues for a three-fold differentiation in the *gēr* of Deuteronomy, in light of ongoing reconstruction of Israel’s identity vis à vis the appearance of new groups over time.³⁸

Laws concerning the resident alien *gēr* within the Priestly material (parts of Leviticus and Exodus, and Numbers, represented as P) and the Holiness Legislation (Lev 17–26 and other material, represented as HL) offer further cultic and legal inclusion than the DL. Dating for these materials ranges anywhere within the preexilic, exilic, and Persian postexilic periods.³⁹ These egalitarian

36 For a variety of succinct overviews concerning the meaning of the preexilic *gēr*, see: Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), 74–76; D. Kellermann, “Ger,” in *TDOT*, vol. 2, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 439–49; Jacob Milgrom, “The Alien in Your Midst,” *BRev* 11.6 (1995): 18, 48; T.J. Meek, “The Translation of Ger in the Hexateuch and Its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis,” *JBL* 49 (1930): 172–80; de Groot van Houten, *The Alien*, Chs. 3 & 4; Kidd, *Alterity and Identity*, Introduction; Christoph Bultmann, *Der Fremde im antiken Juda: Eine Untersuchung zum sozialen Typenbegriff “ger” und seinem Bedeutungswandel in der alttestamentlichen Gesetzgebung*, *FRLANT* 153 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992). In particular, to see focused examples regarding whether the *gēr* originated from Israel or from Judah, one could contrast the view of Matty Cohen, “Le ‘ger’ biblique et son statut socio-religieux,” *RHR* 207 (1990): 131–58, who argues the *gēr* is from Israel subjected to Judean domination after the fall of Samaria, against that of Nadav Na’aman, “Sojourners and Levites in the Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE,” *ZABR* 14 (2008): 237–79, who argues that the sojourner originates from Judah and is the offspring of refugees who fled following Sennacherib’s campaign.

37 Mark A. Awabdy, *Immigrants and Innovative Law: Deuteronomy’s Theological and Social Vision for the גר*, *FAT* 2, 67 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

38 Ruth Ebach, *Das Fremde und das Eigene: Die Fremdendarstellungen des Deuteronomiums im Kontext israelitischer Identitätskonstruktionen*, *BZAW* 471 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014).

39 Moshe Weinfeld dates DL and P to be concurrently written during the monarchic period, but from divergent factions. Israel Knohl identifies a Priestly Torah, written between the tenth and eighth centuries BCE, with the latter part overlapping in the creation of a Holiness School text, written between 740–700 BCE. Jeffrey Stackert argues that the Holiness Legislation “collects and distills the several law collections (CC, DL, P) that precede it.” Stackert’s work suggests a late exilic or even postexilic date for the HL material. See the following, respectively: Moshe Weinfeld, *The Place of the Law in the Religion of*

cultic regulations between the *gēr* and the *ʿezrāḥ* (native born) are solely for the purpose of legal equality.⁴⁰ This new need for legal equality is due to the HL's concern for the land to remain pure and holy.⁴¹ This reason is stipulated in Lev 18:26–28 as follows:

26 But you shall keep my statutes and my ordinances and commit none of these abominations, either the *ʿezrāḥ* or the *gēr* who resides among you 27 (for the inhabitants of the land, who were before you, committed all of these abominations, and the land became defiled); 28 otherwise the land will vomit you out for defiling it, as it vomited out the nation that was before you.⁴²

If any of the people in the land, whether native born or *gēr*, do not follow purity regulations, the sanctuary and land will become defiled. Such an understanding is made evident when one compares Deut 14:21 with Lev 17:15–16. While Deut 14:21 regulates that *gērīm* and foreigners (sg., the *nokrî*) may eat animals that die of themselves but Israelites may not, Lev 17:15–16 is clear that both an *ʿezrāḥ* and a *gēr* who happen to eat such an animal must bathe, or they will be committing a moral impurity. The *gēr* in P and HL is still a resident alien, albeit with the addition of legal and cultic equality. The addition is accredited to an exilic or postexilic context in which a rationale for exile must be accounted. The change is also accredited to a new social-economic and historical situation in the Persian era in which now there are also many wealthy non-Israelite families (for example, merchants) living in the land. These individuals (represented as *gērīm*) may be wealthy and free, but they may not own land on a

Ancient Israel (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), Ch. 5; Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), esp. Ch. 1 for an overview of the two “schools”; Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation*, FAT 52 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 224–5.

40 Shaye J.D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1999), 120. See also Moshe Weinfeld, who argues that the material the present study qualifies as “HL,” demands of the *gēr* “only those obligations affecting the sanctuary and purity of the congregation.” Weinfeld, *The Place of the Law*, 92.

41 On the matter of the *gēr*'s inclusion within legal regulations specifically for the sake of purity of the land, Rolf Rendtorff writes the following: “In some texts the *gēr* is explicitly made co-responsible, together with the *ʿezrāḥ* or Israelite, for the purity of the land.” Rolf Rendtorff, “The *Gēr* in the Priestly Laws of the Pentateuch,” in *Ethnicity and the Bible*, ed. Mark G. Brett (Boston; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 83.

42 Within the present study, Hebrew Bible translations are a combination of the NRSV and my own.

permanent basis.⁴³ Scholarship that believes that the *gēr* of P and HL represents a “convert” has been outweighed by that which suggests the gradual integration of common culture merely helped to pave the way for later conversions.⁴⁴ It is understood that Gentile conversion, apart from absorption into the Israelite people by means of intermarriage such as that observed in Deut 21:10–14, did not happen in pre-Hellenistic Israel.⁴⁵

Instead, such a process is understood to have taken effect within the context of Hellenistic influence, which is the context for the third and second centuries BCE translation of the Torah into the Greek Septuagint.⁴⁶ Scholarship has

43 Christophe Nihan, “Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation,” in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle, BZABR 16 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011), esp. 131–32.

44 On the notion of the *gēr* as a convert within the Holiness and Priestly legislation, see Christiana de Groot van Houten, “Remember That You Were Aliens: A Traditio-Historical Study,” in *Priests, Prophets, and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp*, ed. Eugene Ulrich, et al., JSOTSup 149 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 224–40. Concerning Lev 19:33–34, she writes that these laws are “the most inclusive and expansive yet,” and argues that resident aliens “have become insiders.” de Groot van Houten, “Remember That You Were Aliens,” 237, 238, respectively. On the notion that gradual integration of the *gēr* within Priestly legislation paved the way for later conversions, but did not suggest Judean status within that time period, see Rainer Albertz, “From Aliens to Proselytes: Non-Priestly and Priestly Legislation Concerning Strangers,” in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle, BZABR 16 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011), 53–69. Albertz writes that examples of Priestly inclusion of the *gēr*, such as participation in the Passover (Exod 12:14–17) and sacrifice (Num 15:14), merely indicate a “controlled religious integration,” even if this integration paved a path toward conversions. Albertz, “From Aliens to Proselytes,” 61–67, citation on 61. For a general perspective that the *gēr* in H is not a proselyte, see J. Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), esp. 65.

45 Jacob Milgrom, “Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel,” *JBL* 101 (1982): esp. 173 and 175. Neither does Milgrom consider this absorption of the woman an actual conversion. See also Milgrom, “The Alien,” 18. Here, Milgrom suggests that the only “conversion” taking place is that of following Israel’s God, and that there is no way to become “Israelite.” A woman’s absorption into the Israelite people through marriage to a Judean man could be constituted as a type of “conversion,” once within the Hellenistic period, according to Shaye Cohen. Shaye J.D. Cohen, “Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew,” *HTR* 82 (1989): 25.

46 For an overview of form and dating concerning the Septuagint and Old Greek translations, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Revised ed. (Minneapolis; Assen: Fortress Press; Royal Van Gorcum, 2001), 134–39. Only if the Book of Chronicles dates within the period of Hellenistic Judaism, then feasibly Sara Japhet’s argument that “Chronicles already uses the term [*gēr*] in its later sense” may prove accurate (referring

divided itself into two camps where the meaning of the *gēr* is concerned within the Septuagint, now represented variably as either a *prosēlutos* or a *paroikos*.⁴⁷ According to K. G. Kuhn: “The final development of ‘proselyte’ as a tt. [title] to denote the Gentile who becomes a full Jew by circumcision irrespective of his national or social position did not take place in Palestine but in the Judaism of the Graeco-Roman *diaspora*.”⁴⁸ Kuhn considers that the term to represent the *gēr* as a proselyte, a Gentile convert to Judaism, is the *prosēlutos*, a new Greek word introduced into the Septuagint.⁴⁹ On the other hand, more recently Matthew Thiessen has argued against a meaning of “proselyte or convert to Israelite religion” where the *prosēlutos* in the Septuagint is concerned.⁵⁰ Instead, he concludes that often the term *prosēlutos* is used synonymously with *paroikos*, and is frequently used where it can only mean a “sojourner,” as in a resident alien, and not a proselyte.⁵¹ Thiessen argues that no single conclusion can be drawn with regard to the *prosēlutos* in the Septuagint, since each book derives from a different translator, and that even the Pentateuch itself may not put forward one unified approach. Examples raised by Thiessen such as Exod 23:9 and Deut 10:19, whereby Israelites are represented as *prosēlutoi* in Egypt, do indeed pose a problem to a certain meaning of *prosēlutos* as convert.⁵² Israelites would certainly not consider themselves as “proselytes” in Egypt, for such a usage in this case would imply idolatrous Israelite conversion to the worship of Egyptian gods.

to 2 Chr 2:16 [Eng. 17]; 30:25). See Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*, rev., BEATAJ 9 (Frankfurt; Berlin: New York; Paris: Peter Lang, 1997), 346.

47 Additionally, in the Septuagint the *gēr* is represented on one occasion as a ζένος (Job 31:32) and twice as γειώρας (Exod 12:19; Isa 14:1).

48 K.G. Kuhn, “προσήλυτος,” in *TDNT*, vol. 6, ed. Gerhard Friedrich; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 730.

49 Christiana de Groot has been another proponent of the theory that the *prosēlutos* represents the proselyte. See, for example, de Groot van Houten, *The Alien*, 180–81.

50 Matthew Thiessen, “Revisiting the Προσέλυτος in ‘the LXX,’” *JBL* 132 (2013): 333.

51 Thiessen’s argument critiques the foundational conclusion of W.C. Allen that a *paroikos* represents a resident alien and a *prosēlutos* represents a Gentile convert to Judaism. The article under question is W.C. Allen, “On the Meaning of ΠΙΡΟΣΗΛΥΤΟΣ in the Septuagint,” *Expositor* 4.10 (1894): 264–75.

52 Thiessen, “Revisiting,” 342–43. With regard to Exod 22:20; 23:9; Lev 19:34; and Deut 10:19, in which Israelites are described as *prosēlutoi*, the counter-argument is made by de Groot van Houten that “[b]ecause the term in the motivating clause had to be the same as the term in the prohibition in order for the motivating clause to make sense, the Israelites are described as προσήλυτος in Egypt in these four instances.” de Groot van Houten, *The Alien*, 181; see also Allen, “On the Meaning,” 271.

Nevertheless, examples of the *gēr* represented as a *prosēlutos* in Exod 23:12; Deut 14:21; and 23:8, do in fact align with earlier conclusions. Thus at best Thiesen could only argue for Exodus and Deuteronomy the same as that which he suggests for the *gēr* representations within Genesis, Leviticus, and Numbers, which is that results are “inconclusive.”⁵³ The *gēr/prosēlutos* in the Pentateuch portion of the Septuagint seems in flux. Clearly some sort of mechanism is present for the term to represent a proselyte, as in a Gentile convert to Judaism, in later texts. For example, Matt 23:15; Acts 2:11; 6:5; and 13:43 all refer to *prosēlutos* either in the singular or plural, within contexts that signify Gentile converts to Judaism. And, while Josephus does not use this particular term, the *prosēlutos* is found in the works of Philo, on occasions that model the notion of a convert and draw from scriptural tradition (e.g. *Spec. Laws* 1.51–53, 308–309).⁵⁴ Despite acknowledging that one cannot definitively argue a meaning of “proselyte” for every usage of *prosēlutos* within the Septuagint, this creation of a new term expressly designed to translate the *gēr* into another language indicates an evolution in the meaning of the *gēr* in light of Hellenistic influence both within and outside of Judea.⁵⁵

This evolution reaches its final form in which the *gēr* refers to a Gentile convert to Judaism, or Judean proselyte, within rabbinic writings of the early centuries CE. The proselyte *gēr* within the context of rabbinics is variably described as having been circumcised, baptized, accepted as a Judean, and having offered sacrifice. This *gēr* who represents a proselyte can stand alone in a text, such as the proselyte who prays while offering the first fruits tithe in the synagogue, described in m. Bik. 1:4. The term may also appear as part of several different compound terms, in particular the *gēr šedeq*, which refers to a “righteous proselyte.” The *gēr šedeq* has become Judean out of a true motivation to following YHWH and Torah. The *gēr*, or *gēr šedeq*, is considered an opposite to the *gēr tōshāb*, which is the term used within rabbinics to represent the biblical “resident alien.” Other secondary terms are also used to describe both the proselyte (such as *gēr ʿemet*, a “true proselyte” or a *gēr ben bārīt*, a “proselyte child of the covenant”), and the resident alien (such as *gēr shaʿar*, a resident alien at the gate).⁵⁶ It is only within this period, beyond the scope of

53 Thiessen, “Revisiting,” 344.

54 Kuhn, “προσήλυτος,” 731–732.

55 It should be noted that no occasion of *prosēlutos* or *paroikos* exists within the Greek manuscripts at Qumran. See Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (vol. 1, Part 1 of DSSC, in consultation with Emanuel Tov (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

56 Summaries concerning the term *gēr* used to represent a proselyte within rabbinical writings may be found in the following works: Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus:*

the DSS, that the *gēr* may be differentiated to describe either a male (גר) or a female (גיורת) proselyte.⁵⁷ It can also be noted that within rabbinic literature, a freed slave who was Gentile by birth is also regarded to be a convert to Judaism.⁵⁸ The main distinction is that the freed slave (עבד משוחרר) is just below the free convert to Judaism (גר) in terms of precedence (b. Hor. 13a). Some even argue that a slave is not “Israelite,” but is in fact nationless,⁵⁹ although arguably this individual has made a conversion to the point of relinquishing Gentile impurities. Such distinctions clarify that a *gēr* is neither a slave, nor a freed slave.

The above outline clearly shows a marked change in the term *gēr* from a resident alien to a Gentile convert (or proselyte) to Judaism, from the late Second Temple period and onward. For this reason scholarship has demonstrated a keen interest in the meaning of the *gēr* in all of the above texts and their various contexts. This external evidence suggests that a study of the *gēr* in the DSS will also demonstrate a change in meaning for the term.

1.2 Problem and Significance

1.2.1 *Problem and Significance Part I: Who Is the Gēr in the DSS?*

Even though scholarship has deduced two basic interpretations for the scriptural *gēr*, namely an earlier meaning of a “resident alien” and a later meaning

An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period, trans. F.H. Cave and C.H. Cave (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1969), 320; Kuhn, “προσήλυτος,” 737; George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927), 338–41; Joseph R. Rosenbloom, *Conversion to Judaism: From the Biblical Period to the Present* (Cincinnati, Ohio: Hebrew Union College Press, 1978), 50–53; Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. –A.D. 135)*, Revised English ed., eds Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986), 169–72.

57 Textual examples for the female proselyte include m. Yebam. 6:5; 8:2; 11:2; m. Ketub. 1:2, 4; 3:1, 2; 4:3; m. ‘Ed. 5:6. See Schürer, *History of the Jewish people*, 170, n. 78.

58 Upon purchase of a Gentile slave, he is circumcised and immersed. If he is to be freed, at that time he is immersed again and given a writ of manumission. See Bernard J. Bamberger, *Proselytism in the Talmudic Period*, with a foreword by Julian Morgenstern and a New Introduction by The Author (New York: Ktav, 1968), 124–32; and also Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1985), 36.

59 Both Paul Virgil McCracken Flesher and Catherine Hezser argue that within the Mishnah, slaves lose features of identity. McCracken Flesher argues that they lack any sense of “ethnicity” (what the present study terms “kinship”), see Paul Virgil McCracken Flesher, *Oxen, Women, or Citizens? Slaves in the System of the Mishnah*, *BJS* 143 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 40. Hezser argues that slaves appear as “blank slates,” see Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 53, 117.

of a “proselyte,” as in a Gentile convert to Judaism, no unified opinion exists concerning whether the *gēr* as found in the DSS represents either the former or the latter of these definitions, or even something different. The reason for this hesitancy is primarily due to the socially closed nature of the sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS, as observed above. The closed nature and higher purity standards of the sectarian movement leave scholars doubting that the movement would permit the inclusion of a Gentile convert to Judaism.

However, if the sectarian movement truly follows such high levels of social closure, the scrolls’ repeated use of the term *gēr* invites further explanation. What is a *gēr* doing in the DSS, within the time period in which feasibly the term could mean a Gentile convert to Judaism? This section outlines a number of current theories, which demonstrate both intrigue and uncertainty on the topic of the *gēr* in the DSS.

To date, no monograph and only a little over half a dozen articles exist in which scholars have closely compared occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed. An overview of these articles will show mixed results but for one element that remains clear: even in cases where scholarship deems the term *gēr* within the scrolls to represent a Gentile convert to Judaism, only a few instances of the term are taken into consideration and the research is incomplete or inaccurate. Overall, no consensus exists for all thirteen occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed, indeed in part because no study exists whereby all occasions of the term in scriptural rewriting of the scrolls have been considered. All thirteen occasions are as follows: CD (Damascus Document) VI, 14–VII, 1; CD XIV, 3–6 (with the *gēr* occurring twice, once in line 3 and once in line 6); 4Q423 Instruction^g Frag. 5, 1–4; 11QT^a (11Q19) Temple Scroll XL, 5–6;⁶⁰ 4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple Frag. 1, 1–8; 4Q377 Apocryphal Pentateuch B Frag. 1, I, 1–9; 4Q169 Peshar Nahum Frags. 3–4, II, 7–10; 4Q159 Ordinances^a Frags. 2–4, 1–3; 4Q174 Florilegium Frag. 1, I, 1–4; 4Q279 Four Lots Frag. 5, 1–6; 4Q498 Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments Frag. 7; and 4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back Frag. 45.⁶¹

60 The section on the Temple Scroll in Chapter 3 will include one additional example of a *gēr* *in absentia* between the Deuteronomic scriptural predecessor and the scriptural rewriting of the Temple Scroll. The thirteen occasions of the *gēr* employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS remain the focus; this example is included for the purpose of further emphasizing that the *gēr*, when present in the text of the Temple Scroll, represents a Judean convert.

61 These occasions where the *gēr* is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS (excluding 4Q159) can be found within Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*, 182. See the section on 4Q159 in Chapter 2 of the present study for an explanation regarding that passage’s exclusion from the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*.

Philip Davies (1994) takes into particular consideration the *gēr* of CD XIV, 3–6, whom he suggests is “a proselyte to the sect, and thus one in the process of initiation into it, who does not yet have a full place in ‘Israel’ or ‘Aaron.’”⁶² However, in his view, this “proselyte” *gēr* is merely an existing Judean in process of initiation into the sect, and not a Gentile.⁶³ Davies concludes thus because he interprets the regulations to stipulate that the Jew and non-Jew boundary shall never be crossed. This boundary is implied, according to Davies, from regulations that command sectarians to keep away from Gentiles, such as CD XI, 14–15 which prohibits spending the Sabbath in close proximity to Gentiles (גוים).⁶⁴ Davies concludes that this *gēr* enters the sect by voluntary admission, and “presumably passes through a stage prior to full membership.”⁶⁵ Davies suggests that these “proselytes” represented “a point of transition on the boundary.”⁶⁶ Their admission would be due to ideological commitment.

John Lübbe (1996) considers the *gēr* located within the texts 4Q169 pNah; 11QT^a; 4Q174 Flor; and the two occurrences located within CD, VI, 14–VII, 1 and XIV, 3–6. He concludes that the *gēr* is a “non-Jew of more permanent residence” who is a slave of the “sectarians,” and who has been religiously dedicated just like any other possession of a member joining the movement (equating the *gēr* with those servant-type figures in CD XI, 2 and CD XII, 10–11).⁶⁷ Lübbe determines that the members affiliated with CD would have dedicated their possessions in the same fashion as that which is described in 1QS, the Rule of the Community. Lübbe comes to this conclusion because he argues that a “sound rule in lexicography” is to “apply an established meaning wherever feasible and not to admit a new meaning, unless the established meaning is patently inadequate in any particular context.”⁶⁸ And, in the Hebrew Bible, Lübbe establishes the meaning for the *gēr* to denote “a person of a particular sociological group, viz a person who resides amongst others, to whom he is not akin.”⁶⁹ Lübbe

62 Philip R. Davies, “The ‘Damascus Sect’ and Judaism,” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen, JSOTSup 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 75.

63 Francis Schmidt in fact follows a similar idea as he considers the *gērîm* to be Judean (non-Gentile) converts in the process of entering the movement, who are the demarcation into impurity along with women. Schmidt concludes thus concerning the *gērîm* based on 1QS VI, 13, which stipulates that community members will come from Israel. Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple*, 145.

64 Davies, “Damascus Sect,” 74–5.

65 Davies, “Damascus Sect,” 75.

66 Davies, “Damascus Sect,” 76.

67 Lübbe, “Exclusion of the *Ger*,” 181–82.

68 Lübbe, “Exclusion of the *Ger*,” 177.

69 Lübbe, “Exclusion of the *Ger*,” 176.

deduces from a text such as Deut 24:14 that discusses the treatment of hired labour, which can include *gērîm*, that an identity as a slave must be the reason for the *gēr*'s admittance into the assembly of the group. This slave status would also account for the *gēr*'s exclusion from the group's privileges: this *gēr* would be excluded from the "future temple," to which he thinks both 11QT^a and also 4Q174 refer.⁷⁰

Katell Berthelot (1999) determines that the *gēr* of the texts of Qumran is neither accurately represented by the biblical notion of the "resident alien," nor the later rabbinical model of the "proselyte." Instead, she establishes a category for the *gēr* of the texts of Qumran which she identifies as the "stranger associated with Israel."⁷¹ This *gēr* is something of a "socio-tribal" category of Israel along the lines of the Levites, especially where CD is concerned.⁷² The *gēr* is only religiously integrated with Israel, in contrast to both someone born Judean or a stranger who has actually become a Jew.⁷³ Berthelot provides exception for two cases that may suggest the *gēr* takes on the meaning of a proselyte, namely 4Q174 Flor and 4Q169 pNah, although is not deemed authentically thus by the authors of the texts. Berthelot proposes the reason for these exceptions relates to the first century BCE dating for these texts, suggesting a possible resistance to Hasmonean forced conversions.⁷⁴ Berthelot deduces that the *gēr* of 4Q174 is only someone "claiming to have become Jewish."⁷⁵ Such an interpretation of conversion "fraudulence" explains why this *gēr* of 4Q174 is indeed excluded from the eschatological Temple. In the case of 4Q169, while Berthelot is inclined to believe that this *gēr* is attached (using the verb *הָלַץ*) in a "pure biblical style," she agrees it is possible that this *gēr* could also imply a "posing" proselyte, in similar fashion to the *gēr* of 4Q174.⁷⁶ The *gēr* of

70 Lübbe, "Exclusion of the *Ger*," 181–2. Hannah Harrington also follows Lübbe's conclusion, concurring that *gērîm* are "slaves of Jews who have joined the community (cf. CD 11:2; 12:10–11)." She continues by stating the following: "On the one hand, they became part of the sect's communal possessions when their masters joined the sect and must adhere to communal regulations; on the other hand, they cannot become full-fledged members because of their ethnic background." Hannah K. Harrington, "Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran," in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 196–97.

71 Katell Berthelot, "La notion de גַּר dans les textes de Qumrân," *RevQ* 19 (1999): 177. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.

72 Berthelot, "La notion de גַּר," 192.

73 Berthelot, "La notion de גַּר," 214.

74 Berthelot, "La notion de גַּר," 211–14.

75 Berthelot, "La notion de גַּר," 212–13.

76 Berthelot, "La notion de גַּר," 213.

4Q169, while attached to “Israel,” is still rejected by the authors of that text. Thus, where Berthelot is concerned, the *gēr* of the DSS is never actually a true “proselyte” nor is he of shared kinship with the other members in the movement. Finally, Berthelot observes that the texts of Qumran omit any sort of conversion ritual for new members, especially that ritual of circumcision, which would typically represent a Gentile’s conversion to Judaism.⁷⁷

Joseph Baumgarten (2000) takes into consideration the *gēr* of CD XIV, 4, 6; CD VI, 21; 4Q169 pNah 3–4, 11, 9; 4Q174 Flor Frag. 1, 1, 4; and 11QT^a XL, 6. Baumgarten concludes that the *gēr* is truly a proselyte, in the same sense as the *gēr* of rabbinic literature.⁷⁸ The status of the *gēr* is inferior to that of Israelites by birth, demonstrated in the *gēr*’s lower listing after other members (4Q169), and also in the *gēr*’s exclusion from (4Q174) or impediments on entrance into (11QT^a) the Temple precincts. Baumgarten seems to take the view that Gentile converts may join directly into the movement, albeit with presumably “more protracted and demanding” instruction in Torah commandments.⁷⁹

David Hamidović (2007) argues that the *gēr* of “biblical” texts can be identified as a tribe of Israel without actually being a native born Israelite.⁸⁰ For Hamidović, where the *gēr* of the sectarian movement is concerned, he is not to be regarded in the same fashion as in biblical texts. Instead, only the parts that transpose into the “Essene context” are retained.⁸¹ For example, Hamidović notes E. Qimron’s proposed reconstruction of 11QT^a XXXIX, 5, which incorporates a *gēr* into the assembly of Israel as of the fourth generation.⁸² Hamidović concludes that the Temple Scroll ultimately distances the traditional cultural integration between the *gēr* and the Israelite: i.e., the *gēr* is no longer in the company of an Israelite from the first generation of his installation in Israel within HB scriptural *gēr* occurrences. Instead, the *gēr* is relegated to fourth

77 Berthelot, “La notion de גֵר,” 214.

78 Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Proselytes,” in EDSS, vol. 2, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 700.

79 Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Proselytes,” 701.

80 David Hamidović, “À la frontière de l’artérité, le statut de l’étranger-résident (גֵר) dans les milieux esséniens,” in *L’étranger dans la Bible et ses lectures*, ed. Jean Riaud (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2007), 266.

81 Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 279. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.

82 Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 276–77. Citing Elisha Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*; bibliography by Florentino García Martínez, JDS (Beer Sheva; Jerusalem: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press; Israel Exploration Society, 1996), 56. The present study does not include this proposed occasion where the term *gēr* may be employed, since the study excludes all proposed reconstructions of *gēr* for which no concrete manuscript evidence exists (see introduction Section 1.3).

generation inclusion.⁸³ Thus he views members of the movement as imagining a status for the *gēr* that “conciliates the biblical base and their politico-religious project.”⁸⁴ Even though Hamidović admits that this *gēr* may exist within “Essene” groups that live in towns within Israel, this *gēr* is unlikely a Gentile convert to Judaism: Hamidović believes the *gēr* as a proselyte is only relevant in a context outside of Israel when the sanctity of the land is of little concern.⁸⁵

Terence Donaldson (2007) takes into consideration the five passages (and six *gēr* occasions) of CD VI, 21; CD XIV, 4–6; 4Q169 pNah Frags. 3–4, 11, 7–9; 11QT^a XL, 5–6; and 4Q174 Flor Frag. 1, 1, 1–7. He suggests that the *gēr* of these texts, save CD VI, 21 which he believes should be rendered as “resident alien,”⁸⁶ might be considered as a Gentile convert to Judaism, but only as an idealized and hypothetical possibility: “גֵר should be translated as proselyte rather than as resident alien, but the proselytes who appear in the texts are probably to be understood as hypothetical figures rather than as real community members. It is unlikely that the community actually incorporated Gentile converts.”⁸⁷ Thus, according to Donaldson, the sectarian movement would know that a concept of a Gentile convert existed and that certain Gentiles called themselves “Judeans,” but the movement itself did not legitimate such a concept. In addition, Donaldson supposes that if the *gēr* is found in an identifiable reuse of a Pentateuchal *gēr* passage, then the term is presumed to take on the understood “resident alien” meaning of that earlier passage. Donaldson’s study of the *gēr* in CD VI, 14–21 highlights this perspective: “The association of גֵר with ‘widows’ (אֵלמנות), ‘orphans’ (יתומים), ‘poor’ (עני), and ‘needy’ (אֲבִיון) is strongly reminiscent of Pentateuchal language.”⁸⁸ The second half of this supposition is to consider that the meaning of the *gēr*, when found existing as a new usage of the term distinct from direct scriptural rewriting, represents a meaning of proselyte. For example, with regard to 4Q174, Donaldson concludes that the authors “were not simply replicating biblical categories in an antiquarian sort of way but were using the term with the sense that it had acquired subsequently.”⁸⁹

83 Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 277–78.

84 Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 279.

85 Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 294–95.

86 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 205.

87 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 215.

88 Donaldson also finds that the passage lacks any other external “indicator of conversion,” which furthermore contributes to his conclusion. Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 205.

89 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 212. Donaldson is referring to the fact that the *gēr* in 4Q174 does not appear in the scriptural texts that have been conflated (Deut 23:3–4 [Eng. 2–3] and Ezek 44:9) to create the rest of the list in which the *gēr* appears.

According to Yonder Moynihan Gillihan (2011), the *gēr* is a “legal fiction,” representing a Gentile who will be excluded from Israel in an eschatological era. Where the *gēr* appears to be included as a Gentile convert to the movement, namely within CD; 4Q279 Four Lots; and 4Q169 pNah, in fact this appearance is merely an attempt on the part of the movement “to make sectarian halakah reflect scriptural law as completely as possible.”⁹⁰ Ultimately, a Gentile would never enter the sect, neither in the “contemporary” era nor in the eschatological future. Gillihan deduces that the sectarian movement responds with this attitude of exclusion because of an innate anti-Gentile ideology, evident in passages such as 4Q174 Flor Frag. 1, I, 3–4; 1QM War Scroll I, 1; 1QSa Rule of the Congregation I, 1–5; I, 22b–27a; and possibly I, 25b–II, 3a. These passages imply that Gentiles will be purged in the eschatological era, either by citing that the *gēr* or various foreigners will be excluded, or by omitting any reference to the *gēr*.⁹¹ Nevertheless, according to Gillihan, the *gēr* appears in certain texts of the sectarian movement, such as the *gēr* to be cared for in CD VI, 21, only because this figure appears in the Torah.⁹² In terms of how the movement would have perceived such a fictional *gēr* to exist, Gillihan proposes an idealized resident alien who was “a righteous Gentile who accepted his eschatological exclusion from Israel,” although likely no such figure resided among the sectarians.⁹³ Overall Gillihan’s proposal offers a uniform perspective toward the *gēr* by the sectarian movement.

Jutta Jokiranta (2014) considers numerous conceptualizations of *gēr* and conversion, and ultimately creates a new conceptualization, rather than of conversion, of “obligations/rights in *activities and participation, identity, and loyalty*.”⁹⁴ Jokiranta considers the *gēr* from those identified passages within 11QT^a; CD XIV; CD VI–VII; 4Q174 Flor; 4Q159 Ordinances^a; and 4Q169 pNah. With regard to the absence of the term “*gēr*” from S, Jokiranta does not support the theory that “the *ger* was dissolved and fully assimilated, by ‘proselytism,’ and treated similarly to other Judaeans members.”⁹⁵ However, Jokiranta concludes that “the *ger* is a ‘full’ member but low in the internal hierarchy.”⁹⁶ Thus,

90 Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, “The 𐤒 Who Wasn’t There: Fictional Aliens in the Damascus Rule,” *RevQ* 25 (2011): 264.

91 Gillihan, “The 𐤒 Who Wasn’t There,” 285–98.

92 Gillihan, “The 𐤒 Who Wasn’t There,” 305.

93 Gillihan, “The 𐤒 Who Wasn’t There,” 301–2.

94 Jutta Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing *Ger* in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, ed. Kristin de Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström (Leuven; Paris; Walpole, Maine: Peeters, 2014), 668.

95 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing *Ger*,” 676, see also 671–72.

96 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing *Ger*,” 675.

while avoiding the term “convert,” Jokiranta appears to consider the *gēr* in a similar fashion to the present study as someone who has changed ethnic identity, through the lens of the above-noted obligations/rights in activities and participation, identity, and loyalty. And, for Jokiranta, the category of identity includes the components of “ethnic [kinship], religious, political, familial, local and other components.”⁹⁷ With regard to 4Q169 in particular, Jokiranta argues that in this one text the *gēr* is on the “side of the errant,” yet only goes so far as to say that the passage highlights that “no-one remains unaffected by the counsel of the misleaders.”⁹⁸ In other words, it appears that the *gēr* of 4Q169 may not be a member of the movement, according to Jokiranta.

Kengo Akiyama (2016) writes a response that negatively critiques Gillihan’s conclusion that the *gēr* in the DSS is a legal-rhetorical fiction. Akiyama distills three basic assumptions from Gillihan’s work (there are “sectarian writings”; the writings contain one uniform view concerning the *gēr*; and, genealogical purity made conversion to Judaism impossible).⁹⁹ He problematizes each in turn with respect to the sectarian movement: the views of the movement may be reflected in texts extending beyond those sectarian texts; different attitudes toward the *gēr* may imply more than one uniform view concerning the *gēr*; and, an historical *gēr* may still have existed within the movement.¹⁰⁰

1.2.2 *Problem and Significance Part 11: of What Does Ethnicity and Conversion Consist?*

The above review of scholarship and its overall posited impressions regarding the *gēr* of the DSS demonstrates inconclusive research on the topic. In part, the *gēr* is poorly understood because further clarity is also needed to grasp what would permit or deny an outsider’s acceptance as a member of any Judean group. In other words, what is the nature of the change entailed in a new member’s acceptance? In a conversion movement from “other” to “same,” what is the nature of this “sameness”?

Martin Goodman describes the beginning of Gentile conversions to Judaism in the following manner: “Precisely when and why Jews began to believe that gentiles who came to join them and took up their customs should be treated not just as tolerated strangers but as Jews in their own right is uncertain ... There is much in favour of the hypothesis that this Jewish concept was adopted

97 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing *Ger*,” 668.

98 Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing *Ger*,” 675.

99 Kengo Akiyama, “The *Gēr* in the Damascus Document: A Rejoinder,” *RevQ* 28 (2016): 122–23.

100 Akiyama, “A Rejoinder,” 123–25.

in response to the universalism of Hellenism.”¹⁰¹ By “universalism” Goodman means that “anyone who wished to do so could become Greek by behaving in a Greek fashion,”¹⁰² which would entail choosing to follow Greek law. The parallel is that anyone who so chose could follow Judean (Torah) law. Thus, being “Israelite” or “Judean” was only something that one could choose to become after the influence of Hellenism upon Judea and the Judean Diaspora.¹⁰³ With the acceptance of the Greek polemic of a civilized society that followed a rule of law, as opposed to a barbaric society that did not,¹⁰⁴ came the phenomenon described by Michael LeFebvre as “legislative uses for native law writings.”¹⁰⁵ This phenomenon meant that for Judea, Torah became a legislative law code, as opposed to a law collection without legislative uses.¹⁰⁶ In so doing, according to LeFebvre this new legislative Torah minimized and separated its connec-

101 Martin Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), 160.

102 Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem*, 160.

103 On the topic of conversions as a matter of choice, John North describes the phenomenon, from the perspective of “religion” in the Mediterranean world, as the following: “one aspect of the major transformation of religious life in the whole Mediterranean area in this period was the establishment of a system of interacting competing religions between which the individual could, even in a sense had to, choose.” The present study will argue that “religion” (common culture) is only one feature that changes in a conversion, and furthermore that the Hellenistic desire to be civilized, as opposed to being “barbaric,” precipitated the first conversions for Judaism as early as the second century BCE. Nevertheless it is interesting to observe North’s discussion whereby he argues that early Christianity, as a missionary group, would have even further triggered other groups to compete to avoid having members choose to switch groups (i.e., convert) elsewhere. In other words, the phenomenon of conversions (and as shall be seen, mutable ethnicity) grows in strength throughout the Mediterranean over the full time period of the sectarian movement and beyond, and may find further motivating forces with time. See John North, “The Development of Religious Pluralism,” in *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, ed. Judith Lieu, John North, and Tessa Rajak (London: Routledge, 1994), citation 191.

104 One example of the importance of Greek law for Hellenism can be observed in Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.101–105, in which Herodotus creates a conversation between the Persian Xerxes, and Demaratus, the king of the Spartans. The autocratic rule of the Persians is pitted against Greek “law” as a master, which offers a sure and invariable command: “they have a master, and that master is Law, ... [w]hatever this master commands, they do; and his command never varies: it is never to retreat in battle, however great the odds, but always to remain in formation, and to conquer or die.” Herodotus, *The Histories*, Further revised ed., Aubrey de Sélincourt (London: Penguin Books, 2003), citation 450.

105 Michael LeFebvre, *Collections, Codes and Torah: The Re-Characterization of Israel’s Written Law*, LHBOTS 451 (New York; London: T & T Clark, 2006), 239.

106 Morton Smith describes the shift as the “canonization of the Law.” See Morton Smith, “Hellenization,” in *Emerging Judaism: Studies on the Fourth & Third Centuries B.C.E.*, ed. Michael E. Stone and David Satran (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 120.

tion to other Judean features of kinship and religious practice.¹⁰⁷ This move in permitting “Torah” to become a mutable feature of an Israelite/Judean within the context of Hellenistic Judaism is believed to be the underlying factor that instigated and permitted Gentile conversions, in a similar fashion to those changes between different groups permitted throughout the Greco-Roman world.¹⁰⁸

But while scholarship confirms that Hellenism’s influence concerning the acceptance of Torah as a legislative law instigated the ability for Gentiles to “convert” to Judaism, there is little or no consensus regarding what a conversion actually entails. In other words, scholars are not in agreement with regard to what features are mutable and open to “conversion” in this late Second Temple period of Judaism. LeFebvre concludes that features of kinship and religious practice have been minimized, and the feature of a society’s rule of law has been emphasized, from what previously was one nonlegislative Torah which united elements of religious practice, the God of the land of Israel, and kinship. One could argue that for LeFebvre, the rule of law itself is “mutable,” and represents the entity to which another can change. But these features of kinship and religious practice are still present, along with the rule of law as connected to a society or land. It is possible that mutability of other features, or combinations of the features, are what effectively permit the conversion.

Shaye Cohen agrees that the innovation of Gentile conversions happens within the context of Hellenistic influence, and furthermore that this innovation stems from a separation of the features of “Jewishness.” In his influential work *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*,¹⁰⁹ he identifies what he perceives to be the individual features of “Judaism,” and also the manner in which these features realign to permit a conversion to Judaism within the Hasmonean era. The realignment begins with a separation of the concept of citizenship, represented as a way of life affiliated with a geographic region, from shared Israelite kinship. This “way of life” was that *politea* decreed by Antiochus IV to happen in accordance with Judean ancestral laws as described in 2 Macc 11:25.¹¹⁰ Subsequently, a Judean feature that is this way of life—i.e., the newly legislative Torah ancestral laws—along with the religious practice of worshipping the God of Jerusalem, could be adopted.¹¹¹

107 LeFebvre writes the following: “It is neither blood nor ethnicity which determines the ‘good guys’ and ‘bad guys’ in these accounts. Nor is it (surprisingly) religion.” LeFebvre, *Collections, Codes, and Torah*, 238. The accounts named are from 1 and 2 Maccabees.

108 See the present chapter p. 3 for examples of other changes between groups.

109 Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*.

110 Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 127.

111 Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, esp. 109–10, 133.

For example, Cohen suggests that the earliest evidence of such an act of conversion is the circumcision and incorporation into the Hasmonean state of the Idumeans.¹¹² While some have interpreted the conversion of the Idumeans by Hyrcanus to be voluntary, which corresponds to the report given by Josephus in *Ant.* 13.257–258,¹¹³ others take the view that these circumcisions and related conversions were indeed forced. Steven Weitzman argues in an opposing vein that the circumcisions “forced” by Hyrcanus upon Idumeans and Itureans were performed to disguise “the absorption of local non-Jews as a continuation of the Maccabean drive to retake the land for Judaism.”¹¹⁴ Overall, Weitzman suggests that Hyrcanus accepted Gentiles to fill work gaps, but forced the circumcisions to avoid negative critique and mimic the circumcisions imposed upon Judeans by Mattathias (1 Macc 2:46). Furthermore, archeological evidence also suggests hostility between “Judea and its neighbors,” as the Hasmonean expansion was “accompanied with destruction.”¹¹⁵ In other words, Idumeans likely did not react to the Hasmonean expansion with voluntary acceptance. Either way, it is clear that these conversions involved circumcision and incorporation into the Hasmonean state, demonstrating a change in both way of life and also citizenship. Following Cohen’s argument, it is the mutable features of citizenship and religious practice that make a conversion possible, when separated from a shared kinship that remains immutable.

With respect to Cohen’s three features of “Jewishness” (citizenship with a connection to a land or region, religious practice of worshipping the God of Israel, and shared kinship) other scholars differ from his conclusion. Disagreement stems first from the fact that Cohen equates “a descent group linked together by common blood,” the feature defined in the present study as “kinship,” with an *ethnos*.¹¹⁶ This statement suggests that Cohen regards ethnic identity as coterminous with kinship alone. Philip Esler takes issue with Cohen’s favouring of kinship as the “prime test of ethnicity,”¹¹⁷ and instead prefers to define ethnicity by the features described by John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith: “a common *proper name*”; “a myth of *common ancestry*”;

112 Referring to Josephus, *Ant.* 13.257–258. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 110–19.

113 In particular, Cohen concludes that the “rural Idumaeans joined the Judaeans on their own initiative,” Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 110.

114 Steven Weitzman, “Forced Circumcision and the Shifting Role of Gentiles in Hasmonean Ideology,” *HTR* 92 (1999): 58.

115 For example, see the discussion as laid out in Abraham Faust and Adi Erlich, *The Excavations of Khirbet Er-Rasm, Israel: The Changing Faces of the Countryside*, International Series 2187 (Oxford: B.A.R., 2011), 247–58, citations from 256.

116 Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 133.

117 Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 72.

shared “*historical memories*” or “memories of a common past”; “elements of *common culture*” normally including “religion, customs, or language”; “a *link with a homeland*”; and “a *sense of solidarity*.”¹¹⁸ This definition of ethnicity is much broader, with the element of kinship present within the notion of “a myth of common ancestry.”

Similarly, Steve Mason draws heavily on the work of Josephus within the Greco-Roman world, and argues that conversion was “a movement from one *ethnos* to another, a kind of change in citizenship.”¹¹⁹ According to Mason, each *ethnos* may be defined by the following components:

[a] distinctive nature or character (φύσις, ἦθος), expressed in unique ancestral traditions (τὰ πάτρια), which typically reflected a shared (if fictive) ancestry (συγγενεία); each had its charter stories (μῦθοι), customs, norms, conventions, mores, laws (νόμοι; ἔθη, νόμιμα), and political arrangements or constitution (πολιτεία).¹²⁰

Within the above framework, those features identified by Cohen are included. One observes a notion of common kinship (the shared ancestry), religious practice (included within Mason’s “customs” and etc.), and citizenship and connection to land (the “political arrangements”). Nevertheless Mason also differs from Cohen: while Cohen separated the features and considered the feature of kinship to be immutable, Mason’s definition of *ethnos* blends the features so that each is equally mutable. Mason argues that for Josephus, the nature of conversion is best framed within the categories of “ethnic and political, with a strong philosophical tinge.”¹²¹ One can conclude that ethnicity is broader than kinship alone.

One sees that disagreement with Cohen also stems from his conclusion that kinship is immutable in a conversion to Judaism. This conclusion conflicts with an instrumentalist view of ethnicity, a view in which ethnicity may be seen as internal and chosen. This socially constructed, or “instrumentalist” pole has been heavily inspired in response to the work of Fredrik Barth, who argues

118 Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 43–44. Esler refers to Hutchinson and Smith, “Introduction,” 6–7. Excerpts from each of the elements of ethnicity are listed as they are found in Hutchinson and Smith.

119 Steve Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History,” *JStJ* 38 (2007): 491.

120 Mason, “Jews, Judaeans,” 484.

121 Mason, “Jews, Judaeans,” 510. Mason looks to *Against Apion* in this example, see *Ag. Ap.* 2.210, 259–261.

that “boundaries persist despite a flow of personnel across them.”¹²² In other words, ethnicity is indeed mutable, and in fact is produced “in the course of social transactions that occur at or across (and in the process help to constitute) the ethnic boundary in question.”¹²³ Drawing from the work of Barth, Richard Jenkins suggests that “ethnic identities ... are *practical accomplishments* rather than *static forms*. As such, they are immanently, although not necessarily, variable.”¹²⁴ Identities can change and therefore individuals can permeate across borders, which is the phenomenon of conversion presently under discussion within the time period of late Second Temple Judaism, influenced by a similar phenomenon in Hellenism.¹²⁵ For example, names were altered in genealogies to reconfigure Greek ethnic groups. And, as noted previously, barbarians could become Greek “by adopting Hellenic practices, customs and language.”¹²⁶ This practice of mutability was adopted when non-Judeans could become “Judean” by adopting “Jewish” law (Torah). All features of ethnicity as described above, including kinship, connection to land, and common culture in religious practice, would be equally mutable. Such a view can be seen, for example, in *Virtues* 102, where Philo describes the inclusion of non-Judeans from birth, once they have given up their former kinship relations, their na-

122 Barth, “Introduction,” 11. An anthropological example offered by Barth is that of the Yao people in China, which is an ethnic group whereby 10% non-Yao become Yao in each next generation, through a series of processes, including “adoption to kinship status.” Barth, “Introduction,” 22.

123 Richard Jenkins, “Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17 (1994): 198. Here, Jenkins is summarizing and expounding upon the work of Barth.

124 Jenkins, “Rethinking Ethnicity,” 218.

125 Identifying the genesis of Judean conversions within the context of Hellenistic influence does not mean to indicate that Barth’s notion of mutable ethnicity does not apply to pre-Hellenistic Israel in some way, but rather that accounts of individuals or communities choosing to “convert,” undergo circumcision, and become recognized as “Judean” in features of both kinship and culture, only happen in light of Hellenistic influence. The present study is not arguing regarding the nature of ethnicity for Israel in the ancient near east and pre-Hellenistic Israel; instead, the observation is simply being made that any sort of mutable ethnicity in the ANE is not the same as what became known as a “conversion.” For arguments concerning ethnicity in ancient Israel, see, for example, Diana Edelman, “Ethnicity and Early Israel,” in *Ethnicity and the Bible*, ed. Mark G. Brett (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1996), 25–55 (who suggests that nothing concrete can be known concerning ethnicity in ancient Israel), and Kenton L. Sparks, *Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel: Prolegomena to the Study of Ethnic Sentiments and Their Expression in the Hebrew Bible* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1998) (who believes that kinship is an important aspect of ancient Israelite ethnicity).

126 For these examples within Hellenism, see Hall, *Hellenicity*, 8 and 27. See also Chapter 5 for examples of changing identities within Roman tradition, as well.

tive land, and the temples of their foreign deities. To reiterate, kinship is not coterminous with ethnicity; rather, ethnic identity includes the feature of kinship but is also more expansive than kinship alone, incorporating all features of identity.

Since religious practice is now clearly one of the three most broadly identified features of Second Temple “Judeanness,” then an important matter concerns how to describe a concept of religious practice in this Hasmonean period through to the first century CE. The first concern is definitional. A key concern on the part of both Mason and Esler is that Cohen describes a separate “religious component” of Judeanness, in contrasting an identity of immutable kinship with mutable religious and political identities.¹²⁷ The reason for this concern rests in an argument that no concept of “religion” as an individual category existed yet during the Hasmonean period through to the first century CE.¹²⁸

Not everyone, however, takes such a late view. It may certainly be argued that a concept of “religion” was indeed in the process of formation during the Second Temple period, even if not yet fully formed.¹²⁹ Certainly, the argument has been made that a concept of religious practice was understood as a feature of conversion by the first centuries CE. Gary Porton argues that for the rabbinic texts of late antiquity, the kinship group consisting of “children of Israel” (בני ישראל) or “children of Jacob” was “created through a religious experience.”¹³⁰ Clearly such activities noted by Cohen as monotheistic worship of “the God whose temple is in Jerusalem”¹³¹ could be described as a “religious practice,” incorporated within the realm of “common culture.” Nevertheless, because the features of ethnicity are all interconnected, it becomes difficult to

127 Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 109–10. Esler observes that Cohen writes of “religion” as “existing as a realm of human experience,” Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 70; Mason critiques Cohen’s slide from “cultural” to “religious,” Mason, “Jews, Judaeans,” 494–95.

128 Mason describes the matter in the following manner: “After discussing government, the military, architecture, social and family life, such surveys explain that what we seek to understand as religion permeated all of these parts and more of ancient existence, without yet being identifiable with any one of them.” Mason, “Jews, Judaeans,” 482. Esler suggests that “religion” is only a post-Enlightenment concept. Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 70.

129 David Miller concludes the following: “Instead of attempting to defend a strong claim that a concept of religion existed, I am content with the weaker claim that religion was in the process of emerging as a distinct concept during the Second Temple period.” David M. Miller, “Ethnicity, Religion and the Meaning of *Ioudaios* in Ancient ‘Judaism,’” *CurBR* 12 (2014): 255.

130 Gary G. Porton, “Who Was a Jew?” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 2, ed. Jacob Neusner, *Handbuch der Orientalistik* (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1995), 206.

131 Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 109.

label a practice separately as “religious” as different from “custom” or “culture.” The present study thus uses the term “common culture” to acknowledge these practices that locate themselves both apart from, and also overlap with, features of kinship and citizenship or connection to a land, and within a broader concept of ethnicity.

The second concern is to reiterate the practice of circumcision as a key component of “common culture” entailed in a conversion. Circumcision is the very sign of the covenant between YHWH and Abraham and his ancestors, as described in Gen 17:9–11. Among texts that deny conversions, a critical reason entails the belief that circumcision is impossible after the eighth day after birth, based on Gen 17:12. The book of Jubilees is one that takes such a literal interpretation, with eighth day requirements stipulated in Jub. 15:14 and also 15:25–26.¹³² On the other hand, other Judean groups felt that circumcision could happen for adult converts. As has already been noted, the Idumeans and Itureans underwent circumcision, for example. Achior joins the “house of Israel” and undergoes circumcision, in Judith 14:10, as a second example. Scholars consider this ritual of circumcision as only one component, although likely a

¹³² Jub. 15:14 reads as follows: “The male who has not been circumcised on the eighth day—the flesh of whose foreskin has not been circumcised on the eighth day—that person will be uprooted from his people because he has violated my covenant.” Jub. 15:25–26 reads as follows: “This law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days, nor omitting any day of the eight days because it is an eternal ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. 26 Anyone who is born, the flesh of whose private parts has not been circumcised by the eighth day does not belong to the people of the pact which the Lord made with Abraham but to the people (meant for) destruction. Moreover, there is no sign on him that he belongs to the Lord, but (he is meant) for destruction, for being destroyed from the earth, and for being uprooted from the earth because he has violated the covenant of the Lord our God.” Translation from James C. VanderKam, trans., *The Book of Jubilees*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 88 Scriptorum Aethiopicum (Leuven: Peeters, 1989). Matthew Thiessen argues that the author of Jubilees considers conversion to be impossible. The emphasis on the eighth day circumcision as found in Jub. 15:25–26 “excludes the possibility that second-century B.C.E. Gentiles can become part of Jacob’s seed.” Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 85. It should be noted that Thiessen is reading Jubilees as a unified text by a single author, and does not take into account the proposal by James Kugel that Jub. 15:25–34 is fully added by a secondary “Interpolator.” James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*, JSJSup 156 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012), 257–59. Either way, in its final form, Jub. 15:14 also refers to eighth day circumcision. Thiessen argues that the eighth day emphasis of Jub. 15:14 should be preferred for the MT reading of Gen 17:14 as well, the antecedent passage. Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion*, 29.

definitive one, of conversion, noted by the fact that Godfearers followed other religious practices such as Temple worship, but did not undergo circumcision.¹³³

1.2.3 *Problem and Significance Part III: Summary and Moving Ahead to the DSS*

This section has demonstrated that overall, current scholarship does not prefer an interpretation of the *gēr* in the DSS as a Gentile convert to Judaism, who is included within the sectarian movement. In part this conclusion is due to the socially closed nature of the movement, and in part the conclusion is understandable in light of the fact that the features of “conversion” are also presently disputed. The shift from Torah as a nonlegislative “religious practice,” to a legislative and citizenship-forming law brought about by Hellenistic influence, in some fashion allowed Gentiles to become “Judeans.” Yet the underlying features that are open to “converting,” i.e., the features that are mutable, are unclear. Certainly contemporary scholarship has observed the three features of common culture in the covenantal sign of circumcision, citizenship which includes a notion of connectedness to a land, and a shared notion of kinship, to feature strongly in late Second Temple “Judeanness.” But which of these features is mutable or not is disputed. Because all of the features fall within the overarching concept of ethnicity, should this mean that all three features would be mutable and part of a “conversion”?

Where does that leave the *gēr* of the DSS? As has been observed, the DSS regulate that members of the sectarian movement should stay away from Gentiles, such as that regulation in CD XI, 14–15 to keep away from Gentiles on the Sabbath. In such a case, how could a *gēr* appear on multiple occasions within the contemporary membership lists, as he does in CD XIV, 3–6 for example,

133 See, for example, Kuhn, “προσῆλυτος,” 731; see also Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 10; Paula Fredriksen, “Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2,” in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark D. Nanos (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 238; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Who Was a Jew?* esp. 23–25, 37; Cohen, “Crossing”; John J. Collins, “A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century,” in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, “Others” in Late Antiquity*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs, Literary editor Caroline McCracken-Flesher (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 163–86. Circumcision, as a practice of common culture, could also be seen as a critical element of ancient conversion, because of its outward and visible nature. Zeba Crook has argued that within ancient conversions, “the primary component is loyalty expressed outwardly.” Zeba A. Crook, *Reconceptualizing Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean* (Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2004), 245. More on circumcision and its importance in the late Second Temple period will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the present study.

if this *gēr* is a Gentile? The regulations do not seem solely reflective of an idealized or eschatological era in which the *gēr* would be either hypothetically included (per Donaldson), or excluded (per Gillihan). Instead, many of the regulations appear to do with the everyday functions of the movement. In this case, if the *gēr* is a Gentile, movement members would be perpetually causing themselves to be impure. The fact remains that with the *gēr* present on thirteen different occasions within the DSS that employ the technique of scriptural rewriting, it then seems reasonable to consider this individual as a non-Gentile, at least on those occasions the *gēr* is included within the movement. In other words, in light of the known presence of Gentile conversions and their newly-defined convert status as a “*gēr*” within rabbinic texts, it seems likely that an element of mutability may also be present within the DSS. Why would the term appear so many times if the *gēr* was a Gentile? Therefore, the questions remain: how would that mutability or “conversion” be articulated? In what way is the former Gentile no longer a Gentile within the DSS? And how does the notion of circumcision become involved, keeping in mind that no clear conversion rituals are described for the admission of new members in either D or S rule traditions? Conversions and notions of mutable ethnicity have been considered already within many Judean environments of the late Second Temple period and beyond. If scholarship can establish the identity of the *gēr* in the DSS as a Gentile convert, and determine what sort of mutable nature would permit (or immutable nature would deny) such a conversion, the findings would provide an important template of comparison against these and other late Second Temple and early Judean communities.

1.3 Response: Methodology

This study addresses the question of the *gēr* in the DSS and the sectarian movement’s levels of permeability toward outsiders with a two-step method. The first step involves a text and literary study of all occasions of the term *gēr* within the DSS, with the exception of those occasions in the DSS where the term appears in texts that closely mirror what will become scripture of the Masoretic Text.¹³⁴ These DSS under consideration, in which the term *gēr* is employed, all

¹³⁴ Occasions of the term *gēr* occurring in texts that closely mirror that which will become scripture of the Masoretic Text (MT) can be found in the following (here called “biblical texts”): Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert* (vol. 3, Part 1 of DSSC, in consultation with Eugene C. Ulrich (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 173). The occasions of *gēr* in Abegg’s volume for the most part mirror closely the MT, except for a scant few examples of light rewriting that nevertheless do

utilize the technique of scriptural rewriting (see below for descriptions of the terms “scripture” and “scriptural rewriting”). The goal of this part of the study is to discover how the *gēr* might change between texts, which is why the study is limited to those texts that utilize the technique of scriptural rewriting. In texts that remain uniform, no changes can be observed. The *gēr* has already served as a proven indicator of change in the past in the Hebrew Bible and rabbinic texts, highlighting the sociohistorical shift from “resident alien” to “convert,” and thus this figure may continue to serve in this capacity. The literary study of the term *gēr* in and of itself may offer sociohistorical observations.

The first step will take place at the textual level, analyzing the *gēr* as the term contrasts among different texts: occasions where the term has been used within the scope of scriptural rewriting in the DSS; scriptural passages from the Masoretic Text which are identifiable as comparative texts; and occasionally other DSS that utilize scriptural rewriting which are similar to passages that employ the term *gēr*. At this point, a few definitions are in order.

The first term to define is that of “scripture.” A solid working definition of scripture for this study is that general definition given by Molly Zahn, who affiliates scripture with “any text or group of texts considered sacred and authoritative by a particular religious tradition.”¹³⁵

not change the overall meaning of the text, and do not provide enough rewriting to offer a point of comparison that would highlight a change in meaning between the rewritten text and the MT version. For example, the phylactery 8Q3, Frags. 17–25, 9 (Deut 10:19) adds the descriptor בְּעָרֶיךָ (“in your cities”) to the *gēr*, making the verse read “And you shall love the *gēr* in your cities, because you were *gērîm* in the land of Egypt” (translation my own). One would be tempted to argue the addition of “cities” to the verse suggests an authorship by the Damascus tradition, the tradition affiliated with the rule of D which describes members living in cities (e.g. CD XII, 19). Even if this were the case, however, overall this level of rewriting is too minimal to assess the meaning of the *gēr*. One further example, which could feasibly provide one sole occasion within Abegg’s list that is better suited to scriptural rewriting as opposed to the category of “biblical” scripture, is 8Q3 Frags. 17–25, 13. Here, Baillet, Milik and de Vaux argue that the phylactery transcribes יהיה אחת תורה אחת וְלִגְרֵךְ לִי לְנִזְכָּרִי וְלִגְרֵךְ (“There shall be one law for the foreigner and the *gēr*,” translation mine), which would effectively demonstrate a substitution of אֲזֵרָח (the native born) with נֹכְרִי (the foreigner), in this verse from Exod 12:49. However, the word reconstructed as נֹכְרִי is very uncertain, being reconstructed right where two fragments join. Furthermore, most of Exod 12:48–49 is missing in 8Q3, and the space available would not fit the full extent of text, so any analysis would be most hypothetical in that the full context cannot be understood. M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumran: Textes*, DJD 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 153–54.

135 Molly M. Zahn, “Talking About Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, BZAW 419 (Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2011), 97. The study uses this definition, all the while

The second term, and in this case, set of terms, to define are those of “rewritten scripture” and “scriptural rewriting.” Anders Klostergaard Petersen describes “rewritten scripture” as the following: “that particular type of intertextuality which exists between an authoritative scriptural antecedent and its subsequent reuse in a type of rewriting, in which there is a close textual relationship between the scriptural predecessor and the rewritten work.”¹³⁶ This definition implies that the rewritten work may not necessarily be esteemed as “scripture” itself, which is an appropriate application within the scope of the present study. For example, one of the texts used within the present study is the Damascus Document, which is a rule text and is clearly an authoritative text because of its existence in multiple (fragmentary) copies at Qumran. However, the Damascus Document may not be regarded as “scripture” itself by the sectarian movement. The work is a rule text, but does not claim divine authority for itself. For that reason the present study considers the terms “rewritten scripture” and “reinterpreted, or rewritten text” to be interchangeable. Most important, Peterson defines rewritten scripture as a “textual strategy” and not a clearly-defined genre.¹³⁷ To be as clear as possible that the present study also regards rewritten scripture as a “textual strategy,” or even a “textual technique,” and not a genre with a set number of included texts,¹³⁸ this study will furthermore recast the descriptor “rewritten scripture” (which could be construed as a proper noun describing a set genre) as the verbal adjective “scriptural rewriting.”

The definitions “rewritten scripture” and “scriptural rewriting” lead to another question, which is the matter concerning to what “scriptural predecessor” the scriptural rewriting of the DSS is actually referring. Because in this time period there is yet no closed canon of scripture,¹³⁹ the present study resists the term “rewritten Bible” (or “biblical rewriting”). Nevertheless, the authorita-

keeping in mind Steve Mason’s consideration that no category of a “religion” yet existed within the Hasmonean era. Mason, “Jews, Judaeans,” 480–82. As mentioned above, the present study defines “religious practice” within the feature of “common culture.”

136 Anders Klostergaard Petersen, “The Riverrun of Rewriting Scripture: From Textual Cannibalism to Scriptural Completion,” *JSJ* 43 (2012): 485.

137 Petersen, “Riverrun of Rewriting,” 484.

138 For an overview of the progression of the terms rewritten Bible and rewritten scripture as both genre and subsequently category (similar to “textual strategy”), see the Introduction in Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, SDSS (Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–18, esp. 9–13.

139 See Timothy Lim’s discussion regarding the earliest canonical lists and his argument that the closing of the canon for rabbinic Judaism likely occurred between 150–250 CE. Timothy H. Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*, AYBRL (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2013), 35–53.

tive scriptural predecessors being compared in this study are those scriptural books which will become the majority canon, meaning the Masoretic Text (MT) of the Hebrew Bible.¹⁴⁰ Because thirty-five percent of the corpus of Qumran “biblical texts” make use of a proto-Masoretic text,¹⁴¹ and this Masoretic tradition followed a progressive trend of “diminishing textual variation,”¹⁴² it is reasonable to liken the MT of the Hebrew Bible (canon) with whatever proto-majority scriptures existed at the time of the sectarian movement. Therefore when referring to “scripture” within the present study, the referent is with regard to the MT of the Hebrew Bible. In the present study, the specific element to be compared will be the figure of the *gēr* within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, with the *gēr* of scripture of the MT, contrasted by such means as additions, confluents, omissions, or substitutions.

This first step of the study will not include any occasions where the term *gēr* has been hypothesized within scriptural rewriting in the DSS but for which no material manuscript evidence exists. Such exclusions include the following hypothesized textual reconstructions: “your offspring shall be a *gēr*” in 4Q464, Frag. 3, 11, 4,¹⁴³ derived from Gen 15:13; “the Levite, and the *gēr*, and the orphan, and the widow,” within 4Q159 Frag. 1, 11, 3, derived from both Num 18:30 and Deut 14:29;¹⁴⁴ and the proposed fourth generation *gēr* of 11QT^a XXXIX, 5, derived from Gen 15:13–16.¹⁴⁵ Also covered within this exclusion is the book of Jubilees, which contains one passage with what would likely be a reference to a *gēr* in Jub. 50:7: “You will work for six days, but on the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord your God. Do not do any work on it—you, your children, your

140 See Emanuel Tov’s discussion regarding the Masoretic tradition representing a common and authoritative form of the Hebrew Bible from the second century CE onwards. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 22–23.

141 Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 22–39, 115. A proto-Masoretic text contains the consonantal framework of the MT.

142 Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 34–35.

143 E. Eshel and M. Stone reconstruct a reading of Gen 15:13, based on the opening of line 3 (בְּאִשֶׁר אָמַר לְאַבְרָהָם) and the opening of line 4 (וְעֵבְרוֹם וְעֹנִי), which taken together could imply a slightly variant reading of Gen 15:13. However, lines 2 and 5 do not relate in any way to verses 12 nor 14 respectively, so it is impossible to know how closely this passage would follow Gen 15:13. E. Eshel and M. Stone, “4QExposition on the Patriarchs,” in *Qumran Cave 4, XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*; in consultation with James C. VanderKam, DJD 19 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 222.

144 See the section on 4Q159 in Ch. 2, Section 2.3.2.4, n. 115.

145 See Hamidović’s discussion on the matter in the introductory chapter, Section 1.2.1. Note that Yadin also considers such a reading to be possible. See Yigael Yadin, *Introduction* (vol. 1 of *The Temple Scroll*; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 247; Yigael Yadin, *Text and Commentary* (vol. 2 of *The Temple Scroll*; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 166.

male and female servants, all your cattle, or the foreigner who is with you.” The passage included above is James VanderKam’s translation which draws primarily on the Ethiopic translation, which is the only full version of the book. There is no textual evidence for this passage extant at Qumran.¹⁴⁶ Finally, as has been implied above, the present study is not making any claims regarding the *gēr* employed within scripture in the DSS mirroring that which will become the MT.

The second step of the study’s method involves a sociohistorical comparison between the findings made from the textual analysis of the *gēr* in the sectarian movement, with epigraphic and papyrological evidence from another related type of group(s). Because the sectarian movement is arguably responding, along with late Second Temple Judaism more generally, to conversions inspired by a Hellenistic cultural milieu, it will be appropriate to draw upon a comparison to Greco-Roman associations as the related “group(s).” Even though observing textual changes within various rewritings can highlight sociohistorical changes made over time (in this case, in particular concerning the term *gēr*), a comparison with other types of evidence is an important step to confirm the findings. Jonathan Hall articulates the matter in the following manner: “[t]he signification of the written word is seldom transparent—despite the claims of the author—and needs to be gauged contextually by reading that particular document against the background of other literary and non-literary evidence.”¹⁴⁷

Similarities have been noted between regulations as found in D and S on the one hand and Greco-Roman associations on the other. For example, Moshe Weinfeld and others identify similarities between the codes of Greco-Roman associations, alongside various components of the organizational rules of D and S.¹⁴⁸ Among a number of regulations, Weinfeld observes similarities in the

146 Jubilees, a book whereby fifteen copies of manuscript evidence in Hebrew have been located at Qumran, would be included within the scope of the present study’s rendering of both scripture and scriptural rewriting. Jubilees itself is likely regarded as scripture by members within the sectarian movement, due to the multiple copies located on site. The book’s retelling of Genesis 1 to Exodus 12 make the account one of scriptural rewriting, too. The passage matches that of Exod 20:10 in the Septuagint and Old Latin. See Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology*, JSJSup 117 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 1; VanderKam, *Jubilees, an Edition*, vi–xxxii, 326, n. Jub. 50:7.

147 Hall, *Hellenicity*, 24.

148 Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Fribourg, Suisse; Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). A monograph that includes a detailed summary of other sectarian movement and Greco-Roman association comparative works, and on its own considers the “covenanters” to have a civic ideology, approximating the model of a state, is the following: Yonder

instructions on acceptance of new group members. For both Greco-Roman associations and also D and S regulations, joining candidates undergo examination, registration, and acceptance by vote.¹⁴⁹ Furthermore, Philip Harland describes Greco-Roman inscriptions whereby “fellow members of an association, who appear to be unrelated in a literal sense, address one another or name themselves in familiar terms using the term ‘brother’ (*adelphos*).”¹⁵⁰ The study of the occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting will find that frequently the *gēr* is also named as a sectarian movement “brother.” Of course, “sisters” also exist within Greco-Roman inscriptions. However, as noted above in Section 1.1.2 on the history of scholarship on the *gēr*, the figure represented a male individual until beyond the era of the DSS. The *gēr*, as a brother, does indeed appear to share in the same kinship as other members of the sectarian movement. A comparison of these overlapping elements of brotherly language between DSS and Greco-Roman associations will either strengthen or weaken the theory of brotherly language representing a notion of shared kinship among members, representative also of a larger concept of shared and mutable ethnicity. Because the *gēr* appears to have taken on a shared kinship with other brothers of the sectarian movement, to explore notions of brotherhood between the sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS and Greco-Roman associations, which relate in behaviour and overlap in time period, seems reasonable.

It is by means of this second step, that of a sociohistorical comparison of the DSS occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting to other examples where familial language represents possible newly forged kinship liaisons, that a new understanding of the DSS movement’s social structure(s) and attitudes toward Gentiles is confirmed. Concerning the *gēr* in the DSS, this figure represents a “convert,” whether included as a Judean, or excluded as “yet a Gentile.” The comparison will highlight that

Moynihan Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters’ Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context*, STDJ 97 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012). By way of another example, Martin Hengel also observes similarities between the sectarian movement (described as the *yahad*) and groups within Hellenistic circles. For example, he observes the Hellenistic ideal of shared possessions, practiced among the “Essenes,” and also draws upon other similarities such as the practice of examination by members of the sectarian movement, similar to Greek young men joining associations. Martin Hengel, “Qumran and Hellenism,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000), 48–51.

149 Weinfeld, *Organizational Pattern*, 21–23.

150 Philip A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 32.

where Greco-Roman associations are concerned, brother language also appears to represent a newly forged shared notion of kinship among association members who share a sense of ethnic identity.

1.4 Chapter Outlines

Chapters 2–4 represent the first step of literary and textual analysis. The term *gēr* in the texts is the literary feature guiding the study; a sociohistorical comparison will be drawn only in Chapter 5. Chapter 2 briefly introduces each of the thirteen occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS and confirms the actual textual inclusion of the term where necessary, as most excerpts are fragmentary. Next, the chapter reviews how scholars have dated the texts in which the term “*gēr*” occurs and how they have understood the texts’ provenance. This exercise observes how each document compares chronologically to determine whether each fits within the timeline of the sectarian movement. The chapter includes a brief overview of the movement’s time frame and compositional relationship between CD and 1QS. In particular, regarding provenance, the chapter assesses whether each text may correlate with the D (Damascus Document) or S (Serekh ha-Yahad, the Rule of the Community) rule traditions, which comprise the two major rule perspectives within the movement. Because the D and S rule traditions have already been established to demonstrate different degrees of social closure, the study keeps this question of provenance in mind, in case the meaning of the *gēr* is consequently found to show differences between the traditions. It is possible that the texts may also not relate to either D or S. Charting correlations between the texts where the term *gēr* has been employed and D or S may reveal differences in attitudes toward the *gēr* within the movement.

Chapter 3 compares the DSS occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting. The chapter starts with the textual occasions and from there casts points of comparison to other texts, since this study is based on observations made from changes between texts. As previously described, this part of the study proceeds on the notion that “scriptural rewriting” reflects a tradition of a recognizable scriptural predecessor, with various levels of scribal manipulation present.¹⁵¹ The “manipulation” may take varied forms, such as textual additions, conflation, omissions, or substitutions. Even in the cases where the employed *gēr* occasions are located within works that appear primarily “to have been derived not from Scripture, but simply from the exi-

¹⁵¹ White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 12–13.

gencies of communal life"¹⁵² such as the community code of D, recognizable "scriptural" parallels can also be observed, permitting differences between materials to stand out. At this textual and literary level, what is happening to the *gēr* between texts? In other words, what changes made to the term *gēr* between scriptural rewriting in the DSS and scriptural predecessors indicate changed attitudes toward (heretofore) outsiders? The chapter puts forward preliminary observations concerning the meaning of the *gēr* within each text.

Chapter 4 assesses the findings from Chapters 2 and 3 to forge conclusions based on those provenance, literary, and textual findings concerning the identity of the *gēr*, and more broadly, the identity of a sectarian movement member. This introduction chapter observed that generally, late Second Temple "Judeanness" has been found to emphasize the following three features: a shared notion of kinship; citizenship which includes a notion of connectedness to land; and common culture in the practice of circumcision. The introduction asked which of these features might be mutable in order to enable a Gentile's conversion to Judaism. If all three features are classified within a broader structure of "ethnicity," then it seems that all three features could demonstrate either mutability or immutability. The findings from Chapters 2 and 3 coincide with these three features of ethnicity and will be collated accordingly.

The first feature of shared kinship in brotherhood stems from the frequency with which the *gēr* is found to be synonymous with a brother. Many of the texts also draw a connection between sectarian movement members and a connection to "land," even though this land is described in nonconcrete terms, making up the second feature of citizenship and land. The third feature consists of common culture. In particular, if the study argues that the *gēr* may represent a Gentile convert to Judaism, what do these texts say about the important act of circumcision which represents the covenant to exclusive relationship with $\Upsilon\eta\omega\eta$? The study at this point can look further afield to other texts that relate to the traditions of D and S to see what is written regarding circumcision, and relate these findings to the texts under consideration where the term *gēr* has been employed. The findings from this chapter will suggest that a sectarian movement member has an ethnic identity strongly rooted in these three

¹⁵² Sarianna Metso has successfully argued that within the Qumran legal text tradition, "certain halakhic traditions emerged independently from Scripture, and they were secondarily connected with the texts of the Torah." For example, the oath to be sworn by incoming members as written in the secondarily expanded 1QS v, 7–20 contains scriptural references that are not present in the earlier versions of the oath, found in 4QS^b 1x, 6–13 and 4QS^d 1, 5–11. Sarianna Metso, "Creating Community Halakhah," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint: Presented to Eugene Ulrich*, ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006), 279, 281–92, 299.

features, and that it is the mutability or immutability of these features that permits or denies a Gentile convert to Judaism within the movement.

A sociohistorical comparison to Greco-Roman associations, which is the second step of the present study's approach, takes place in Chapter 5. In particular, it is the first feature of shared kinship through brotherhood language which will be used as a point of comparison, because the term is used frequently to denote fellow group members both in the sectarian movement and in Greco-Roman associations. It will be shown that cultic associations appear to bring member "brothers" into a shared ethnicity by means of familial and adoption language, making the reality of "brotherhood" kinship reasonable also for membership in Judean groups such as the sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS.

The conclusion will highlight that the *gēr* is a Judean convert within the DSS, and that a notion of mutable ethnicity is involved in conversions. The *gēr* will indeed prove a useful indicator to demonstrate how conversion works in one example of a movement within the later Second Temple period. The *gēr* is a Gentile convert to Judaism, accepted within the sectarian movement in the texts correlated with the D tradition. However, where texts correlated with the S tradition are concerned, even though the *gēr* represents that same Gentile convert to Judaism, the convert is now excluded from the movement. Sectarian movement members within the S tradition have themselves become "supra-Judeans" of a more stringent covenant seemingly unavailable to converts. Attitudes toward circumcision appear to influence these outcomes. Thus the study will find that the *gēr* is always a Judean convert, whether included as a sectarian movement member, or excluded as "yet a Gentile."

Provenance and Dating of the *Gēr* in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The aim of this study is to discern possible meanings for the term *gēr* within the DSS. The study proceeds by means of an examination of the term *gēr* where it is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, followed by a sociohistorical comparison. In order to do such a study, a preliminary task exists whereby DSS that employ the term *gēr* must be assessed to verify whether they correlate with the sectarian movement more broadly, and also whether they correlate with either of the two primary rule traditions belonging to this movement more specifically. This chapter addresses that preliminary task, with a review of the provenance and dating of the DSS in which the term *gēr* has been employed within the context of scriptural rewriting. In addition to establishing a date of composition for each text to confirm that it may indeed fit within the parameters of the sectarian movement behind the D (Damascus Document) or S (Serek-ha Yaḥad, the Rule of the Community) traditions, this chapter assesses whether each text may align specifically to one of these traditions of D or S. As outlined in the previous chapter in Section 1.1.1, the D and S rule traditions within the DSS clearly highlight differences in social closure within the sectarian movement. Determining a possible D or S provenance to each text will test the differences in social closure between the traditions of D and S, in relation to attitudes toward the *gēr* to be studied afterward. Charting correlations with D or S may reveal differences in attitudes toward the *gēr* within the sectarian movement. It is also possible that not every text will correlate with D or S. This specific query has yielded divergent theories in the case of some texts, and those outcomes must be reassessed. This query has never before been undertaken in the case of certain other of the selected texts, and the evidence must be assessed for the first time.

In order to accomplish this preliminary task, the chapter begins with a brief overview of the dating, provenance, and compositional relationship of the D and S rule texts and the sectarian movement in which they are found. It will be seen that only the dating of the movement can be established with any real certainty and not an identification with any particular existing group (e.g., Zadokites or Essenes). Consequently, it is better to assess texts for their possible relationship to the D and S traditions as they are evidenced, rather than to other hypothetical groups. Second, the chapter proceeds with a brief overview

of the manner in which the provenance and dating of each text is deduced. Finally, the texts will each be assessed and categorized according to both their established correlation with D, S, or something else, and also to their chronological ordering within those correlations. Because the excerpts are fragmentary to varying degrees, each text entry will begin with a verification of the actual textual inclusion of the term *gēr*, and will incorporate text-critical assessments to confirm the reading of the phrase. For the most part, the DJD editions of the texts and their translations are used alongside a comparison of photos provided by The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library; alternatives or supplements are identified.¹ The *gēr* in the text is always left untranslated. The chapter will discover the following: one text appears to influence the D and S traditions; three texts correlate with the sectarian movement overall, but a clear choice in correlation with either the D or S traditions remains indeterminate; and the remaining texts all correlate with one or the other of these two primary traditions of the sectarian movement.

2.1 Overview of the Provenance of the Sectarian Movement and the Damascus and Serekh Traditions

In the effort to discern dating and provenance for each text under consideration with the sectarian movement and subsequently with either the D or S rule traditions, a preliminary step exists: an assessment of the dating and provenance of the movement itself, as well as the compositional relationship between the D and S rule traditions. The general sectarian nature of the movement (including the maintenance of higher purity standards), along with an acknowledgement of noted differences in social closure between D and S traditions, have been discussed previously in the introductory chapter.² What follows now is a brief overview concerning the dating and provenance of the movement, including the status of the relationship between the D and S traditions, based on past and present scholarship. Potential implications of these findings on the present study are also assessed.

2.1.1 *The Sectarian Movement: Deposed Zadokite Priests?*

Earlier Qumran scholarship dated the presence of the Teacher of Righteousness, considered the founder of the sectarian movement according to CD I, 11,

1 A few changes to translations have been made: בני ישראל is always translated as “children of Israel.” Other changes are noted where they occur.

2 See the introduction chapter of the present study, Section 1.1.1.

sometime around the era of the Maccabean revolt and the mid-second century BCE. This dating was based on a literal reading of CD I, 5–11 which interprets the Teacher's rise to have taken place three hundred and ninety years after Jerusalem fell to Babylon (587 BCE), in addition to twenty years of further searching.³ Even when the number “390” was no longer considered an historical number by the standards of modern history, the mid-second century BCE and the era of the Maccabees was still considered a reasonable time frame because the members of the sectarian movement appeared to identify themselves as deposed priests, being the “sons of Zadok” (CD III, 18–IV, 11; 4Q266 Frag. 5, I, 16; 1QS V, 2–3; V, 9). The Qumran site seemed ideal as a settlement site for those priests deposed from the Jerusalem Temple by the Maccabees,⁴ especially since Roland de Vaux dated a period “1a” of habitation at the site from circa 130–100 BCE, which would fit with the theory of a post-Maccabean Temple priest migration.⁵

Subsequently, scholarship has determined that membership within the sectarian movement is not literally comprised of Zadokite priests. First, the term “sons of Zadok” is a later textual tradition within the DSS.⁶ Furthermore, the

3 Solomon Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Edited from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Geniza Collection Now in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge* (vol. 1 of *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 12.

4 See, for example, Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1958), 95–101 (it may be noted that Cross comes to the same conclusion later on, cf. Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd ed. [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995]), 100–105; Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 14; J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*; trans. J. Strugnell, SBT (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959), 83; Jacob Neusner, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism: The Haskell Lectures, 1972–1973*; critique and commentary Mary Douglas (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 50.

5 De Vaux uncovered one coin at the site of Qumran dating to the period of John Hyrcanus I (135–104 BCE), and one dating to the period of Judah Aristobulus (104–103 BCE). de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 19.

6 Sarianna Metso argues that the “sons of Zadok” have been secondarily added within 1QS, because the term is missing from the parallel texts of 4QSB, ^d. Metso, “Creating,” 283–89. Heinz-Josef Fabry also observes a textual development of Aaronide and Zadokite traditions within the DSS; Fabry concludes that “an original Aaronitic dominance was gradually superceded by a Zadokite one.” Heinz-Josef Fabry, “Priests at Qumran: A Reassessment,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, ed. Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 90 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 249. Charlotte Hempel also concludes that “sons of Zadok” is a later tradition than “sons of Aaron” within the DSS. Charlotte Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar, JSJSup 122 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 207–24.

reference to sons of Zadok within CD III, 21–IV, 1 is borrowed in a symbolic fashion from Ezek 44:15.⁷ And finally, archaeological scholarship now suggests that the site was not taken over by the sectarian movement until the first half of the first century BCE, 100–50 BCE.⁸ Certainly, some manuscripts of D and S date within the second century BCE, (4QS^a dates to somewhere within the second half of the second century BCE, and 4Q266 represents an “idiosyncratic Hasmonaean semi-cursive hand”).⁹ However, the evidence suggests that members of the movement are clearly not Zadokite priests who were deposed from the Temple, eradicating the need for a mid-second century date for the movement’s genesis. The actual date for those manuscripts need not be mid-second century, but could range from late second century to within the first century BCE.¹⁰ Had scholarship persistently established the sectarian movement to consist of Zadokite priests, certainly the presence of a *gēr*, as a Gentile convert to Judaism, in the texts and in the community would be most unusual. However, generally the Zadokite theory is no longer endorsed, due to the above-noted recognition of redaction history and a later dating for the movement than originally thought. The present study is free to imagine all possibilities for the *gēr*.

2.1.2 *The Sectarian Movement and Prevailing Dating*

Corroborating the notion of a later date than the mid-second century BCE for the movement’s genesis, contemporary scholarship places the Teacher of Righteousness in the late second century or early first century BCE, and suggests that “the high tide of his movement was the first century BCE.”¹¹ Michael Wise uses historical references, in particular references to identifiable names

7 On this passage, Maxine Grossman writes the following: “The primary concern here is not for a hereditary or ritual priesthood but rather for the members of the community who have taken on a metaphorical priestly identity.” Maxine Grossman, “Priesthood as Authority: Interpretive Competition in First-Century Judaism and Christianity,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*, ed. James R. Davila, STDJ 46 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 127.

8 Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, SDSS (Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2002), 47–72.

9 Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 3 (pp. 3–6 provide an overview of the physical descriptions of all manuscripts pertaining to the Rule of the Community); Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*; transcriptions by Jozef T. Milik, contributions by Stephen Pfann and Ada Yardeni, DJD 18 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 2.

10 See Section 2.2.2 of the present chapter that describes the paleography dating system of Frank Moore Cross, whereby a “Hasmonaean” script could date anywhere between ca. 150–30 BCE.

11 Michael O. Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and The *Floruit* of His Movement,” *JBL* 122 (2003): 86.

of historical rulers, in order to date the movement of the Teacher of Righteousness, the figure he affiliates with the sectarian movement.¹² He bases his evidence on the theory that the Teacher was a figure affiliated to the sectarian compositions located at Qumran. Therefore, to chart the dating and frequency of the compositions themselves would consequently chart the rise and fall of the Teacher's movement.¹³ Because there are no historical references or allusions between the dates 30 BCE and 70 CE noted in any writings located at Qumran, it is in this fashion that Wise concludes that the Teacher's movement had fallen out of popularity or ceased to exist by this time.¹⁴ Taking a somewhat different approach, John Collins also places the origins of the Teacher's movement toward the end of the second century BCE, although he cautions against formulating the conclusion that "the Teacher must have been active at the peak of the literary productivity of the sect."¹⁵ Collins focuses on whether or not individuals identified within historical allusions might be contemporary to the Teacher. He concludes that the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE) is a more likely historical context for the sectarian movement rather than a priestly dispute and the Maccabean revolt.¹⁶

The present study agrees with the notion of a late second century or early first century dating for the genesis of the movement, because texts belonging to the movement, and relevant to the present study, will be found to exist in that time period. However, the present study would amend the date suggested by Wise of the movement's downfall (roughly 30 BCE onward). Over the course of this chapter, a few manuscripts correlated with the D and S traditions will be found to date into the first century CE. And, the site of Qumran is known to have been settled until its destruction by the Romans in 68 CE.¹⁷ Thus it appears that the movement still carried on, and copied manuscripts, after the end of the first century BCE, even if the movement may have been waning, or perhaps transforming into something else.

2.1.3 *The Sectarian Movement: Essenes?*

While a commencement period of the late second or early first centuries BCE is established, the provenance of the sectarians behind this movement

12 Wise, "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness," 65–67.

13 Wise identifies sectarian writings as those "works whose language and concept demonstrably evidence origin with the Teacher or his movement." Wise, "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness," 59.

14 Wise, "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness," 85.

15 Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 99.

16 Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 120–121.

17 Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, see Ch. 4, 47–72.

is still uncertain, once the Zadokite theory is negated. Presently, a lingering theory regarding the identity of the movement is that they are in fact the sectarian group known as Essenes. Even though the scrolls never self-identify as “Essenian,” this theory has maintained an audience because of the literature of Pliny the Elder, Philo, and Josephus, whose roughly first century CE descriptions of “Essenes” match in certain ways to the movement as it is understood through the Damascus and Serekh rule texts.¹⁸ However, these Latin and Greek sources do not match what is described in the rule texts in all aspects, including the issue of locale, the sharing of possessions, and the matter of sexual abstinence or celibacy.

For example, on the topic of locale, Philo writes that Essenes live in villages (*Good Person* 76; *Hypothetica* 11.2); Josephus writes that the Essenes live in colonies in a number of cities (*J. W.* 2.123); and Pliny the Elder insists that the Essenes live in solitude to the west of the Dead Sea (*Nat.* 5.73). S describes communities of ten men (1QS VI, 1–8) and alludes to a desert location (1QS VIII, 14), which is a citation from Isa 40:3, but never mentions living in villages or cities. D refers to groups living either in cities (CD XII, 19) or camps (CD VII, 6; XII, 22–23; XIV, 17). The accounts do not all match, apart from the fact that multiple residence sites seem normative (and Pliny’s account does not preclude this possibility).

On the topic of shared possessions, Philo suggests the Essenes share their possessions and resources (*Hypothetica* 11.4). S makes various references to the notion of shared wealth, such as members submitting wealth (1QS I, 12); members sharing in law and possessions (1QS V, 2; VI, 19–20; VI, 22); and members receiving punishment if caught lying concerning possessions (1QS VI, 25). D, on the other hand, does not legislate in this regard.

Finally, on the topic of sexual abstinence or celibacy, once more accounts do not all match, between the Latin and Greek sources, as well as between these sources and the rule texts themselves. Philo suggests that no children, adolescents or women are permitted within the Essenes (*Hypothetica* 11.3); Josephus describes both a group of Essenes who marry strictly for the sake of producing offspring, as well as Essenes who do not marry (*J. W.* 2.160–161; *J. W.* 2.120); and Pliny the Elder implies that the Essenes live celibate lives, in writing that they renounce love (*Nat.* 5.73). When this topic of sexual abstinence or celibacy is contrasted against the two primary rule texts found at Qumran, D makes

18 English translations of the passages that follow which refer to Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Elder’s Essene accounts are collated within Geza Vermes and Martin D. Goodman, eds., *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

regulations dealing with the varied topics of women, marriage, and children (CD V, 7–10; VII, 6–7; XIII, 16; XIII, 17–18; XVI, 10–12). In contrast, S makes no mention of women and children.

On these topics of locale, shared possessions, and sexual abstinence or celibacy, the accounts of Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Elder on occasion match with D and on occasion with S, but never describe the full picture of either D or S to a satisfactory extent. These findings suggest numerous possibilities. One possibility is to suggest that the sectarian movement is something completely other than the Essenes. Too many of the Essene descriptions reported in the Greek and Latin accounts referenced above might draw from secondary knowledge, be made up completely, or be stylized to please a Hellenistic audience,¹⁹ thus corrupting the reliability of these sources. As noted above, a second option is to believe that the similarities are close enough to argue a plausible Essene identity for the sectarian movement.²⁰ A third possibility is to suggest that the Essenes may actually be an outgrowth of the sectarian movement.²¹ This possibility makes sense in light of the fact that the accounts of Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Elder all date to roughly the first century CE, which would place the accounts toward the end of the movement and the destruction of the site. Meanwhile, the rule texts of D and S stem in large part from the first century BCE. It is feasible that the groups behind the D and S traditions, especially that of S,²² could have become the “Essenes” of the later accounts. In other words, the sectarian movement could be “pre-Essene.” In this case, members of the movement are technically not the same Essenes as those described in the first

19 For example, Steve Mason argues that the account of marrying Essenes provided by Josephus is wholly made up, and argues that Josephus has set up the Essenes to portray Roman values that will appeal to an audience in Rome. Mason believes the persons behind the sectarian movement, and the Essenes as described by Josephus, to be different groups. Steve Mason, “What Josephus Says About the Essenes in His *Judean War*,” in *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson*, ed. Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins, *Studies in Christianity and Judaism* 9 (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2000), 429, 447–50.

20 For example, John Collins argues that despite the incomplete correspondence between the Greek and Latin accounts and the rule texts themselves, “the Essene identification remains plausible.” John J. Collins, “Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 164.

21 See, for example, Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, *RelSoc* 45 (Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2007), 243–66.

22 The present study concurs with the view put forward by Collins that the Greek and Latin accounts correspond more closely to the tradition behind S. This observation need not impact the argument that follows below concerning a “parent” tradition behind either D or S. Collins, “Sectarian Communities,” 164.

century sources, and to make such a connection is neither accurate nor necessary for the present task. To know whether the sectarian movement was Essene would help to verify the questionable historicity of the Greek and Latin sources and the nature of the Essenes in the first and second centuries CE and beyond, but the present study does not need the accounts of Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Elder to assess the texts as they correlate with the traditions of D and S.

2.1.4 *The Relationship between D and S: Chronology*

Because it is apparent that no firm connection may be made between the sectarian movement and any preexisting category or group, it is much better to simply consider the provenance of D and S on their own literary and textual terms. While scholarship has acknowledged the differences between these two rule traditions, the status of their exact relationship remains unclear. Under discussion is the matter concerning how the two rule documents relate to one another. The question has been probed by analyzing whether D or S might hold priority as a literary tradition one over the other. Arguments have been made in favour of both options, with reasons relating to redaction criticism and also to other literary observations.

The tradition of D has long been considered a parent tradition over S.²³ For example, Charlotte Hempel finds evidence in the D manuscripts of later redaction work, the purpose of which is to “bring the communal legislation of the Laws into line with S.”²⁴ Hempel argues that the reference in CD XV, 8 to “the many” (הרבים) in “the overseer over the many” (המבקר אשר לרבים) is a redaction to bring the passage further in line with numerous references to “the many” in 1QS, such as VI, 11–12, “the overseer over the many” (האיש המבקר על הרבים). The argument rests on the idea that CD XV, 8 would have been originally simply “the overseer” or “the overseer over the camp” (המבקר אשר למחנה) as is found in CD XIII, 13, and was only changed subsequently to align with the later text of 1QS.²⁵ Hempel specifically calls this type of redaction “Serekh redaction.”²⁶ A “Serekh redaction” suggests that S is a secondary tradition which becomes incorporated into the D manuscripts, making D a parent text that developed an offshoot in S. Furthermore, this “Serekh redaction” demonstrates a close tie

23 See the overview provided by Collins on the topic of a possible diachronic relationship between D and S (or S and D). Philip Davies, Charlotte Hempel, and John Collins are among those who preference D as a parent text to S. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 5–6.

24 Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, STDJ 29 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1998), 83.

25 Hempel, *Laws*, 81–85.

26 Hempel, *Laws*, 83.

between the Damascus Document (D) texts and the specific “*yahad*” movement named in S. For literary reasons, S has also been considered a secondary work to D. Some have interpreted the Serekh community to be a rift of individuals who left the Damascus group, led by a man of lies (CD XX, 14–15), who wanted a more rigorous rule.²⁷

As a second theory, some favour instead the argument that the tradition of S precedes that of D.²⁸ Evidence for this theory may also be drawn by means of literary dependence. For example, Reinhard Kratz has noted that the reference in 1QS VII, 12 to “Whoever walks naked before his fellow without being forced shall be punished (for) six months” (ואשר יהלך לפני רעהו ערום ולוא היה) (אנוש ונענש ששה חודשים חודשים),²⁹ is supplemented with a literary addition in the D counterpart to this stipulation, 4Q266 Frag. 10, 11, 9–10. This D counterpart reads as follows: “He who goes about [naked in the house] in the presence of his fel[low, or out in the field in the presence] 10 of p[eo]ple, shall be excluded for six [months]” ([ואשר יהלך לפני רע] [הו ערום בבית או בשדה הלך ערום לפני] 10).³⁰ The D counterpart appears secondary because it adds further stipulations to the rule as it is found in S, by adding the specificity of locale for the violation and adding further specificity to the punishment.³¹

Arguments in favour of S preceding D have been made by means other than redaction criticism and literary dependencies, too. For example, Eyal Regev argues in favour of the establishment of the group behind the Rule of the Community appearing first, because that rule text uses the term הרבים (“the many”) to describe members at a much higher frequency than the Damascus Document does, and argues that the organization described by “the many” is more

27 John Collins and Eyal Regev offer overviews on the theory of a schism and those who have favoured such an argument (e.g. Gabriele Boccaccini; Philip Davies; Florentino García Martínez; Jerome Murphy O'Connor). Collins and Regev do not favour the argument, although for different reasons (see below). Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 48–50; Regev, *Sectarianism*, 192.

28 See the overview of Collins on the topic of the debate regarding a diachronic relationship between D and S. J.T. Milik, Eyal Regev, and Reinhard Kratz are among those scholars who preference S as a parent text to D. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 5–6.

29 The final *kaph* in יהלך is actually erroneously written in medial form in 1QS.

30 Text and translation from Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 74–75.

31 Reinhard G. Kratz, “Rewriting Within and Outside the Bible,” paper presentation, Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Qumran Section; San Francisco, (21 November 2011). Kratz explains his argument for the priority of S over D in fuller detail in a study of the penal codes between D and S in the following publication: Reinhard G. Kratz, “Der Penal Code und das Verhältnis von Serekh-Ha-Yachad (S) und Damaskusschrift (D),” *RevQ* 25 (2011): 199–227.

basic than the network of camps described in CD.³² Regev believes that the term became appropriated by the movement affiliated with D after it was first used in a more simplistic way by the earlier movement affiliated with S. In fact, Regev takes the extreme position that D is an “entirely different movement” from that of S.³³

The present study does not take such a radical view that D is an entirely different movement from S, considering the obvious literary linkages between the two rule texts. Even if S follows D, the existence of the two groups need not be due to a schism. Collins points out that since both rule texts continued to be copied from the later second through the first centuries BCE, and even into the early first century CE in the case of 4QD, it seems that both groups simply existed and grew in tandem.³⁴ It may never be determined whether D or S came first, but for the purpose of the present study, whether the fact is one or the other does not matter. Critical instead is the point that both D and S advance simultaneously. A close study of the rule texts reveals that simultaneous progress of both traditions does indeed occur. Hempel refers to legislation concerning a “quorum of ten,” as observed in 1QS VI, 3, “And in every place where there are ten men” (ובכול מקום אשר יהוה שם עשרה אנשים), and CD XIII, 2b, “And where there are ten” (ובמקום עשרה).³⁵ Hempel believes the quorum of ten represents “a floating tradition that was incorporated into both D and S where it evolved in different ways.”³⁶ The common outcome from these theories is that clearly the D and S traditions are used and copied contemporaneously over the span of the sectarian movement.

For the present study, then, knowing that the D and S traditions progress contemporaneously and that evidence exists of either borrowing or drawing on common tradition, highlights the fact that there is an ongoing relationship between the two traditions, despite their differences. The Damascus and Serekh traditions can both be qualified as subsets within the overarching classification of the “sectarian movement.” To know whether D or S was an earlier tradition could potentially highlight that changes toward the *gēr* within the movement

32 The term הרבים occurs thirty-four times in 1QS, and “only four occurrences in CD and another five in all the Cave Four fragments that have no parallel in CD.” Regev, *Sectarianism*, 188.

33 Regev, *Sectarianism*, 192–93.

34 Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 79.

35 The Charlesworth edition contains a *khet* rather than a *he* transcribed for עשרה.

36 Charlotte Hempel, “1QS 6:2c–4a—Satellites or Precursors of the Yahad?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem, (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011), 39.

take place due to changes in time. But, overall, scholarship on the matter is divided, and the present study does not aim to solve that question. And, even if one tradition were found to be earlier, because a contemporaneous movement is evidenced within both traditions and one does not become eclipsed by the other, implications regarding time frame between D and S seem minimal for the present study. Consequently the study observes the dating of relevant texts merely to ensure they fall within the time frame of the overall sectarian movement. In addition, to know that the two traditions of D and S progress contemporaneously permits any of the texts under consideration to date earlier or later within either the D or S traditions.

To summarize and extract a few implications from Section 2.1, the rule texts of the Damascus Document and Rule of the Community exist in multiple copies within the Qumran literary corpus, which suggests two dominant traditions within the sectarian movement. The prior chapter discerned that texts existing in multiple copies may suggest special importance. Other rule texts that exist in individual copies only, such as 1QSa and 4Q265, are not included in the present study, because it is difficult to establish their importance. Furthermore, the literary relationship between these two rule texts is complex, evidenced with simultaneous progression and borrowing between the two rules. Just as the literary relationship between the texts is complex, so too are any potential social reconstructions within the movement. While it has been discerned that the groups behind the two rule texts are neither actual Zadokite remnants, nor exactly equal to the “Essenes” as described by Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Elder, clearly they are a type of sectarian group that has divided itself into two streams, one being more ascetic than the other. Nevertheless, these two streams are close enough in outlook and proximity that they share some sort of common tradition. Did the S tradition represent those who resided at the Qumran site, or that and other more secluded sights? It is possible, although not assured. Certainly it seems that the D tradition developed in clusters of individuals who dwelled in more public and urban areas within Judea. All members seemed dissatisfied with the Temple cult. Certainly the movement was also reactionary toward differences in halakic interpretation, and may have held lingering anti-Hasmonean sentiment. These general proposals concerning the social reality of the movement provide the backdrop against which to explore both the meaning, as well as the exclusion or inclusion, of the *gēr*. A summary of these general proposals includes one overarching sectarian movement within the late second and first centuries BCE, and with different streams responding to the needs of both idealism (S) but also realism (D).

Finally, it should be noted that while the study assesses whether each text has a stronger connection to the D or S traditions, some overlap may exist

between a text's correlation to these traditions. Overlap is to be expected based on the above discussion regarding the simultaneous progression of the D and S rule texts (2.1.4). It is noted in advance, therefore, that connections to D or S may not be absolute, even when a connection to the sectarian movement overall seems fairly certain. Nevertheless, differentiating between the traditions may help to discern whether different attitudes exist toward the *gēr* based on the different outlooks of D or S. And, although the provenance of each text is sought prior to discerning the meaning of the *gēr* in each text, this manner of proceeding is for the sake of organization and not to discern results preemptively.

2.2 Means of Establishing Provenance and Dating of the Texts

Establishing the provenance and dating of scriptural rewriting that employs the *gēr* within the DSS is based on three tools: identifying literary devices that include historical references, theological motifs, or particular terminology or wording; assessing styles of handwriting; and aligning texts within elements such as the particular orthography style associated with sectarian movement texts. Each tool has both positive and negative abilities to assess the provenance and dating of these texts. However, when the sum of their findings is added together, a more reliable whole may become clear.

2.2.1 *Literary Devices*

Within the texts under consideration in the present study, some will contain historical references, such as to various monarchs and rulers, which can help to offer an earliest possible dating, or *terminus post quem*. Texts may also refer to certain theological motifs, such as an eschatological era, which may indirectly indicate historical clues. Different types of eschatologies may hint at different time periods. For example, George Brooke suggests that messianism that is specifically Davidic, such as what is seen throughout the second half of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, may represent a Qumranic literary output in response to the reign of Herod (37–4 BCE), to “compensate for the earthly abuse of kingship” and instead extol “God as king.”³⁷ However, a messianic expectation of the Davidic line may also be in response to “dissatisfaction with the

37 George J. Brooke, “Crisis Without, Crisis Within: Changes and Developments Within the Dead Sea Scrolls Movement,” in *Judaism and Crisis: Crisis as a Catalyst in Jewish Cultural History*, ed. Armin Lange, K.F. Diethard Römheld, and Matthias Weigold (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 98–101.

kingship of the Hasmoneans, the heirs of the Maccabees,” according to John Collins.³⁸ He suggests a first century BCE dating, but because the Hasmonean era ended in 63 BCE, likely an earlier date than Herod is implied. Finally, texts may utilize particular terminology or wording that links them together or links them to one of the rule traditions. However, literary devices alone may not be decisive, therefore dating and provenance must also be established by other means.

2.2.2 *Paleography*

Paleography, the study of handwriting for changes to a script over time and locale, is also used to discern provenance and dating. The present study draws on the well-known delineation of scribal periods as established by Frank Moore Cross. He identifies his three periods as the following: 1) Archaic, ca. 200–150 BCE; 2) Hasmonean, ca. 150–30 BCE; and 3) Herodian, ca. 30 BCE–70 CE.³⁹ Concerning the breakdown of the DSS manuscripts located at Qumran according to this typology, Cross concludes that “the vast majority of the MSS from Qumran fall into Periods 2 and 3, especially the latter half of Period 2, and the latter part of Period 3.”⁴⁰ Based on this typology, most of the Qumran texts fall between 90 BCE and 70 CE. This method for dating the texts of Qumran has also been met with critique. Michael Wise argues that since not all of the Qumran documents’ locations of origin are known, one cannot properly take account of geographic differences. Such lacunas will inhibit the dating of scribal handwriting with any certainty.⁴¹ Wise argues that the typology of Cross used to assess dating of a text cannot apply to the DSS, because, for the time period of the scrolls, “we have no dated literary comparanda.”⁴² Furthermore, even if a paleographical date can be established for a text, it still only indicates the date at which the manuscript was copied, and not necessarily the actual date of composition.

38 John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 158. Collins offers the first century BCE anti-Hasmonean Psalms of Solomon 17:5–6 as an example.

39 Frank Moore Cross, “The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran,” in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, ed. Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, 1975), 168.

40 Cross, “Oldest Manuscripts,” 168.

41 Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness,” 56–59.

42 Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness,” 55–56.

2.2.3 *Orthography Style*

As noted at the outset of the chapter, a provenance for each text is also established, along with a proposed date of composition. A correlation of a text with either the D or S traditions is made by observing literary similarities. Of course, one must first assess the texts to see whether they correlate more generally with the sectarian movement at all. In addition to deducing provenance of the texts where the term *gēr* has been employed by general thematic means, orthographic markers are also used. In particular, what Emanuel Tov describes as a Qumran scribal practice is used frequently within DSS research. He has distilled the Qumran scrolls into two main groups of identifiable texts, one which contains particular orthography and grammatical forms such as *plene* spelling and a free textual approach, and one which lacks these particular forms and resembles the orthography of the MT, using a careful and conservative scribal approach. The texts with the particular orthography and freer approach are associated with the sectarian movement documents. Tov has concluded that the compositions deemed to stem from the sectarian movement “are written almost exclusively in the Qumran orthography and language.”⁴³ Tov suggests these scrolls need not only have been written on site at Qumran, but were most likely written elsewhere as well.⁴⁴ As with the preceding two techniques described to deduce provenance and dating, this third technique has also been met with criticism. Eibert Tigchelaar has proposed that “the variety between the manuscripts can better be described with the model of a spectrum, than in clear-cut categories ... Tov’s ‘Qumran scribal practice’ is such a cluster.”⁴⁵ Tov’s scribal practice may be described as a “cluster” but not necessarily a clear-cut indication of sectarian movement authorship.

Difficulties are noted within each of the various means described. However, a combination of overlapping clues from all three means of establishing dating and provenance can provide a more accurate result. With that in mind, the study now moves to this assessment of scriptural rewriting where the term *gēr* has been employed.

43 Emanuel Tov, “The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls,” *Textus* 13 (1986): 38.

44 Tov, “Orthography and Language,” 46.

45 Eibert Tigchelaar, “Assessing Emanuel Tov’s ‘Qumran Scribal Practice,’” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller, STDJ 92 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 203.

2.3 An Assessment of the Occasions Where the Term *Gēr* Has Been Employed

2.3.1 *A Text That Influences Damascus (D) and Serekh (S) Traditions: 4Q423 Instruction⁹ Frag. 5, 1–4*

] 1 ה[את משפט קורח ואשר גלה אזנכה
] 2 [ברו נהיה]ה[קו]ג[]ג[] ככה[כל ר]וש אבות[יכ]ה[]ד[ונשיא עמכה
] 3 הו[א] פלג[נ]חלת כל מושלים ויצר כל[מעש]ה בידו והוא פעולה
] 4 [מעשיהמה ידע וישפן]ט כולם באמת יפקוד לאבות ובנים[לגרי]ם עם כל אזרחים

- 1 [] the judgement of Korah. And as he opened your ear
- 2 [to the mystery that is to come] your ... [every he]ad of [your] fathers [] and leader of your people
- 3 [h]e divided the [p]ortion of all rulers and fashioned every [dee]d by his hand, and the wages of
- 4 [their deeds he knew. He will judg]e all of them in truth and visit upon fathers and sons,[upon *gērîm*] together with every native born.

A textual reference to *gērîm* is located within 4QInstruction, a lengthy wisdom instructional work. Within Torleif Elgvin’s text and translation, while the *gimel*, *resh*, and *yod* have been reconstructed, Elgvin is still confident that it is *ים לגרים* which would be present, due to the pairing with “every native born, lit. all natives” (כל אזרחים), reminiscent of numerous scriptural predecessors.⁴⁶ The recognizable vertical stroke of a *lamed* and the top left horizontal overhang

46 Text and translation are those of Torleif Elgvin, located in DJD xxxiv. In a comparison between the transcription editions of Elgvin and Eibert Tigchelaar for the four lines of interest to this study, namely 4Q423 Frag. 5, 1–4, differences are fairly minimal. The study will not consider the superscript of line 1a, which in fact Tigchelaar, apart from the word פן (“lest”), describes as “barely legible.” In line 4, Elgvin reconstructs מעשיהמה ידע (“their deeds he knew”), which Tigchelaar does not reconstruct. The grounds upon which Elgvin has made this reconstruction seem sound, as he draws on similar language from 1QS iv, 15–16 and 1QS iv, 25. Elgvin keeps the *lamed* within the reconstructed portion of ם[לגרי], while Tigchelaar keeps the *lamed* without, ל[גרי]ם. For scriptural predecessors, Elgvin lists Lev 16:29; 24:16; and Num 15:30. Finally, it should be noted that for the sake of consistency between all text excerpts, Elgvin’s use of capitalization of the third person m. s. pronoun has been removed. Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*, STDJ 44 (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001), 142–3; Torleif Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction⁸,” in *Qumran Cave 4, XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (Musar le Mevin): 4Q415ff.*; by John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, in collaboration with Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, DJD 34 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 518–21.

of a final form *mem* are visible upon consultation of The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library.⁴⁷ The final form *mem* furthermore assists in the reading of *gērîm*, as it establishes that the “thing” to be paired with the natives is also in the masculine plural form. The m. pl. term *gērîm* is the natural pairing.

A dating for the original composition of 4QInstruction itself is a more difficult matter, and numerous dates have been proposed. As for the manuscript itself, 4Q423 is written in a middle or late Herodian script and thus likely dates to the early first century CE, even though this late time frame will not be upheld for the work as a whole.⁴⁸ 4Q423 Frag. 5, 2 refers to “[every he]ad of [your] fathers [] and leader of your people” (וּנְשִׂיאַ עַמְכָּה וְיֵשׁ אֲבוֹתַיִם [יְהוָה]). Elgvin suggests that these leaders are “the contemporary leaders of Israel who do not share the secrets of God’s mysteries, and who will be judged by God along with all others.”⁴⁹ He hypothesizes that this contemporary period may, in fact, be the Hasmonean era (164–63 BCE) and the leaders may thus be Hasmonean leaders. Elgvin considers the Hasmonean era to be likely for the dating of 4QInstruction because he argues that the eschatological message of the text is apocalyptic and not restorative, “which indicates a distance from the Maccabean-Hasmonaean establishment.”⁵⁰ Within this hypothesis, then, the authors of 4QInstruction would be advocating an end-time as they perceive no hopeful outcome under the contemporary Maccabean establishment. An opposing view has been forwarded by Matthew Goff, who concludes that 4QInstruction was not written contemporaneously with the Hasmonean era. Instead, he argues for a date of composition preceding the Maccabean revolt, thus in the early second century BCE (i.e., prior to the initial revolt of 167 BCE).⁵¹ Goff does not believe that the text refers to the mainstream cult or Temple as being in jeopardy. He proposes a second option as well, which would be a first century BCE dating for the text, “when this [Hasmonean] crisis was no longer of immediate interest.”⁵²

Of these various propositions, a second century dating in roughly the first half of the Hasmonean era seems likely, because 4QInstruction definitely shows signs of sectarianism. Out of 4QInstruction’s repeated use of the phrase

47 See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library 4Q423 photographs “B-359335” and “B-359336,” deadseascrolls.org.il.

48 Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction^g,” 506–7.

49 Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction^g,” 519.

50 Elgvin, “423. 4QInstruction^g,” 520, n. 33.

51 Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, VTSup 116 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 66.

52 Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 66.

רז נהיה, “the mystery that is to come,” John Ashton makes the keen observation that

any group that attaches special importance to an extra revelation above and beyond the Law, such as the רז נהיה, is properly speaking sectarian, because it thereby diverges from those whom we may call, with some hesitation, the representatives of mainstream Judaism.⁵³

Sectarianism began to flourish in response to the Maccabean Revolt and the Hasmonean period from 164/3 BCE, according to Albert Baumgarten.⁵⁴ This data contradicts Goff’s theory, which argues for either a pre- or post-Maccabean date, and instead confirms Elgvin’s findings of a second century BCE time frame in response to the founding of the Hasmonean era.

The comment concerning the רז נהיה provides a segue to additional scholarly observation on the dating of 4QInstruction, and also its provenance. Jean-Sébastien Rey notes that this “mystery that is to come,” or “mystery of existence,” according to Rey, suggests a preference for a philosophical ontology rather than a theological one pertaining to a religious community.⁵⁵ As for 4QInstruction, Rey situates its composition to be contemporary with that of Sirach due to syntactical and lexical particularities,⁵⁶ and hypothesizes that these texts may have even arisen from a same wisdom school.⁵⁷ This suggestion would give 4QInstruction a date of composition somewhere in the second century BCE,⁵⁸ and aligns to a certain extent with (or possibly even precedes) the Hasmonean and second century findings discussed above. By means of a lexical study, Rey concludes that there is a connection between 4QInstruction, the Rule of the Community, and the Hodayot.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, he concludes

53 John Ashton, “‘Mystery’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Fourth Gospel,” in *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*, ed. Mary L. Coloe and Tom Thatcher, SBLEJL 32 (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 59.

54 Albert Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects*. See esp. 1–41.

55 English translation is that of the present work. Rey translates רז נהיה as “le mystère de l’existence.” Jean-Sébastien Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, STDJ 81 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009), 32.

56 For example, the usage of לְמִנְהָ with the meaning of פֶּן, a particularity common to 4QInstruction and Sirach. For all examples, see Rey, *4QInstruction*, 17–21.

57 Rey, *4QInstruction*, 31.

58 Rey, *4QInstruction*, 339.

59 Rey adds to the findings already identified by Tigchelaar regarding shared vocabulary between 4QInstruction and the Treatise on the Two Spirits in 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, in finding that connections also exist between 4QInstruction and 1QS x and XI. See Rey, *4QInstruction*, 22–24; Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 196–200. These findings disagree

that 4QInstruction is still anterior to these other texts.⁶⁰ A connection is also observed between 4QInstruction and the Damascus Document tradition. Concerning the reference to revealing a daughter's blemishes prior to marriage, Rey observes that the passages in 4Q271 Frag. 3, 8–9 and 4Q415 Frag. 11, 6 must have either a direct literary dependence one from the other, or both stem from a common source.⁶¹

In sum, regarding the provenance and dating of 4QInstruction, and for reasons relating to both thematic rapport with sectarianism and also linguistic analysis, the composition of the text appears to date within a second century BCE time frame. While this date is early for the sectarian movement proper, nevertheless there are direct textual similarities between 4QInstruction and both the Rule of the Community and Damascus Document. In this manner, 4QInstruction is in some way an “early influencer” of both the D and S traditions.

2.3.2 *Texts Correlated with the Damascus (D) Tradition*

2.3.2.1 **Damascus Document Manuscripts: Cairo Genizah, 4QD, and 6QD**
Broadly speaking, the Cairo Genizah CD work consists of two manuscripts, A and B, the contents of which can be organized as Laws (CD IX–XVI) and Admonition (CD I–VIII; XIX–XX).⁶² Charlotte Hempel has suggested that the Admonition has a “sectarian character,” whose purpose is to “guide the readers as to the way in which one should read these Laws.”⁶³ Hempel suggests that the Laws, distinguished in the strata of Halakah, Community Organization, Miscellaneous Halakah, and Miscellaneous Traditions and Redactional Material, are overall “not a sectarian composition.”⁶⁴ Nevertheless, Hempel argues that more redactional activity has occurred within the communal legislation portion of the Laws,⁶⁵ suggesting sectarian movement activity within this strata. Cairo Genizah manuscript text A, which encompasses the CD passages of interest VI, 14–VII, 1, which is part of the identified sectarian Admonition, and also XIV, 3–6, which falls into the redacted Community Organization stratum

to an extent with Goff, when Goff concludes that “no citation of 4QInstruction is evident in the *yahad* literature, with the possible exception of the text common to 1QH 18 and 4Q418 55.” Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 65, n. 218.

60 For his conclusions, see especially Rey, *4QInstruction*, 31, 335.

61 Rey, *4QInstruction*, 155. For Rey's own transcription and translation of the passage, see 146–148.

62 Hempel, *Laws*, 1.

63 Hempel, *Laws*, 20.

64 Hempel, *Laws*, 20–21.

65 Hempel, *Laws*, 23.

of the Laws, has been dated to the 10th century CE.⁶⁶ Of the total eight 4QD manuscripts analyzed by Joseph Baumgarten and Jozef Milik,⁶⁷ the present study of the *gēr* will bring to the fore 4Q266, 4Q267, 4Q268, and 4Q269. The study also takes into consideration 6Q15, which is another fragmentary text of the Damascus Document, assessed by Maurice Baillet.⁶⁸ Obviously, these texts correlate with D and the D tradition, being early attestations of what is found in different form and variation in the later medieval manuscripts. Thus the following sections regarding CD VI–VII and CD XIV will be spent primarily confirming that the fragmentary 4QD and 6QD texts match with those of CD,⁶⁹ in order to ensure the presence of the term *gēr* within these manuscripts found at Qumran.

2.3.2.1.1 CD VI, 14–VII, 1

	אם לא ישמרו לעשות כפרוש התורה לקץ הרשע ולהבדל	14
	מבני השחת ולהנזר מהון הרשעה הטמא בנדר ובחרם	15
	ובהון המקדש ולגזול את עניי עמו להיות אלמ[נ]ו[נ] ת שללם	16
	ואת יתומים ירצחו ולהבדיל בין הטמא לטהור ולהודיע בין	17
	הקודש לחול ולשמור את יום השבת כפרושה ואת המועדות	18
	ואת יום התענית כמצאת באי הברית החדשה בארץ דמשק	19
	להרים את הקדשים כפירושיהם לאהוב איש את אחיהו	20
	כמהו ולהחזיק ביד עני ואביון וגר ולדרוש איש את שלום	21
	VII, 1 אחיהו	
14	... unless they take care to perform according to the exact (requirements of) the Torah during the time of evil and to separate (themselves)	
15	from the sons of the pit and to refrain from the wicked wealth (which is) impure due to oath(s) and dedication(s)	
16	and to (being) the wealth of the sanctuary, (for) they (the sons of the pit) steal from the poor of his people, preying upon wid[ow]s	
17	and murdering orphans—and to distinguish between the impure and the pure and make known (the difference) between	

66 Schechter, *Jewish Sectaries*, 9. Schechter makes this suggestion due to paleography.

67 Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 1.

68 Maurice Baillet, "Document de Damas," in *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*; by M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, DJD 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 128–31.

69 To reiterate, readings from CD are taken from Baumgarten and Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)."

- 18 the holy and the profane, and to observe the Sabbath day in its exact
 detail, and the appointed times
 19 and the day of the fast as it was found by those who entered into the
 new covenant in the land of Damascus,
 20 to offer up the holy things in accordance with their detailed require-
 ments, to love each man his brother
 21 as himself, to support the poor, destitute, and *gēr*; *vacat* and to seek
 each man the peace
 VII, 1 of his brother.

The first passage under consideration, CD VI, 14–VII, 1, finds parallels in 4Q266 Frag. 3, II, 19–Frag. 3, III, 2 (parallel to CD VI, 14–VII, 1), 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 1–5 (parallel to CD VI, 19–VII, 1), as well as 6Q15 Frag. 4, 1–4 (parallel to CD VI, 20–VII, 1).⁷⁰ It is in CD VI, 21 specifically that one finds the first reference to the *gēr*, listed within a series of stipulations that outline “the exact (requirements of) the Torah” for members to follow. To reiterate, this chapter’s analysis of CD concerns itself with any variants of possible significance in the interpretation of the *gēr* between CD and the overlapping 4QD and 6QD fragments. Of primary concern is the fact that the textual location of the term *gēr* of CD VI, 21 is damaged and not extant in the matching fragment remains. However, the overlap between the existing text in the 4Q and 6Q fragments (4Q266, 4Q269, and 6Q15) and the text of CD shows that the majority of textual variants relate to minor orthographic or grammatical differences. For example, a variant within 4Q266 Frag. 3, III includes כָּל בָּאִים (lit. “all those who come”) in line 24, as opposed to the reading in CD VIII, 1 which exhibits *plene* spelling and the construct form כָּל בֹּאֵי.⁷¹ These changes are minor and do not constitute a change in meaning. Therefore the present study is confident in the conclusions of Milik, Baumgarten, and Baillet that the term is present in 4QD and 6QD as in CD VI, 21.

Concerning 4Q266, Frag. 3, III, 1–2, which is the parallel to CD VI, 20–21, the lines have been fully reconstructed. Curiously, the DJD edition reconstructs רַעְוָה (“his friend”) instead of אַחִיָּהוּ (“his brother”), as in CD VI, 20. However, since the DJD English translation in fact shows “his brother,”⁷² matching with CD, this discrepancy is likely an error within the DJD volume. Regarding the dating of 4Q266, Baumgarten concludes that “the idiosyncratic semi-cursive

70 Only the portions of these fragments that overlap the excerpt from CD VI, 14–VII, 1 are cited. In full, 4Q266 Frag. 3, II parallels CD V, 13–VI, 20; Frag. 3, III parallels CD VI, 20–21, VII, 4–5, and 17–VIII, 3; and 4Q269 Frag. 4, II parallels CD VI, 19–VII, 3. With regard to 6Q15, the entirety of the fragment (lines 1–5) parallels CD VI, 20–VII, 2.

71 Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 45.

72 Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 44.

handwriting of 4Q266 should be dated to the first half or to the middle of the first century BCE.⁷³

Concerning 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 1–5 which parallels CD VI, 19–VII, 1 and thus overlaps with the reference to the *ġĕr* of CD VI, 21, some text remains even though the reference to the *ġĕr* is reconstructed. Within the remaining text, the variants appear as either scribal error or minor grammatical variant. In CD VI, 21 where it reads וְגַר עֵינֵי וְאִבְיוֹן וְגַר (“to support the poor, destitute, and *ġĕr*”), Milik’s transcription, in 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 3, shows בְּעָן (lit. “as far as” with a *bet* prefix, likely a *bet* of specification), instead of the בַּיַד (“the hand”) present in CD VI, 21. Second, in CD VI, 21–VII, 1 where one reads וְלִדְרוֹשׁ אִישׁ אֶת שְׁלוֹם אָחִיָּהוּ (“and to seek each man the peace of his brother”), Milik’s transcription in 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 4, shows בְּשָׁלוֹם אָחִיָּהוּ (“the peace of his brother”), with a *bet* of specification and definiteness shown only by means of the pronominal suffix present in the absolute of the construct phrase. This marker of definiteness differs from that of CD VI, 21, אֶת שְׁלוֹם אָחִיָּהוּ (“the peace of his brother”), with definiteness indicated by the definite direct object marker. These variants altogether are minor. The present study concurs with Milik and Baumgarten that the term *ġĕr* is present in 4Q269, as it is in CD VI, 21, despite the corrupted manuscript evidence at the location where one would expect to find the term. With regard to dating of the 4Q269 manuscript, Baumgarten observes that the manuscript “exhibits an early Herodian formal hand” and thus has a dating in the late first century BCE.⁷⁴

Finally, concerning 6Q15, in which Frag. 4, 1–4 parallels CD VI, 20–VII, 1, the fragment only contains a word or so from each line, but these words (or fragments thereof) are clearly visible on The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library photographs.⁷⁵ Overall they agree with the reading in CD, apart from the variant spelling in CD VI, 20 which contains the form כְּפִירוֹשִׁיהֶם instead of כְּפִירוֹן שִׁיָּהֶם (same in 4Q269 Frag. 4, II, 2).⁷⁶ Baillet also notes that, apart from Fragment 5 (which contains material not present in CD), and the occasional

73 Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 30.

74 Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 124.

75 The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, 6Q15 photographs, “B-482257” (full spectrum color image recto) and “B-482258” (infrared), deadseascrolls.org.il.

76 This difference is noted in Baillet, “Document de Damas,” 130, as well as Maurice Baillet, “Fragments du Document de Damas. Qumrân, Grotte 6,” *RB* 63 (1956): 520. Finally, Elisha Qimron also makes this observation in Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (Heb. החיבורים העבריים: יהודה: מדבר מגילות), vol. 1, Between Bible and Mishnah (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010), 13.

plene spelling, the other fragments (1–4) differ little from CD.⁷⁷ Baillet observes that the calligraphy corresponds to the first century CE.⁷⁸

2.3.2.1.2 CD XIV, 3–6

3 וסרד מושב כל המחנות יפקדו כלם בשמותיהם הכהנים לראשונה
 4 והלויים שנים ובני ישראל שלשתם והגר רביע ויכתבו בשמותיהם
 5 איש אחר אחיהו הכהנים לראשונה והלויים שנים ובני ישראל
 6 שלושתם והגר רביע

- 3 The rule for the assembly of all the camps: They shall all be mustered by their names; the priests first,
- 4 the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the *gēr* fourth. And they shall be inscribed by their names,
- 5 one after the other [lit. each one after his brother], the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel
- 6 third, and the *gēr* fourth.⁷⁹

The second CD passage under consideration is the excerpt CD XIV, 3–6. This passage is a part of the Community Organization strata of the Laws, which is the section that appears to have undergone a certain amount of editing by the sectarian movement.⁸⁰ CD XIV, 3–6, which describes the hierarchical enlistment and inscription of “the rule for the assembly of all the camps” (וסרד מושב כל המחנות), lists the *gēr* twice. The hierarchical listing of the assembly members in CD XIV, 5–6 is identical to its first appearance in lines 3–4. 4Q267 Frag. 9, v, 6–11 overlaps with this entire passage, while 4Q268 Frag. 2, 1–2 overlaps with CD XIV, 5–6.⁸¹

A point of concern is that 4Q267 Frag. 9, v, 7–8 omits the first of the two references to the *gēr* from the hierarchical listing. Instead of the listing identified in CD XIV, 3–4 of “the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the *gēr* fourth” (הכהנים לראשונה והלויים שנים ובני ישראל שלשתם)

⁷⁷ Baillet, “Document de Damas,” 129.

⁷⁸ Baillet, “Document de Damas,” 129.

⁷⁹ For reasons of consistency, a translation of “assembly” has been selected instead of that of “settlement,” used in the Charlesworth edition for the word מושב.

⁸⁰ For example, Hempel considers that הרבים, “the many,” of 4Q266, Frag. 10, 11, 6b–7 has been added secondarily, to bring the Laws of the Damascus Document into alignment with 1QS. Hempel, *Laws*, 81–85. See also the present chapter Section 2.1.4.

⁸¹ In their entirety, 4Q267 Frag. 9, v, parallels with CD XIII, 22–XIV, 10; 4Q268 Frag. 2 parallels CD XIV, 5–6.

והגר רביע), one finds “the priests first, the Levites] second, and the Israelites [th]ird” (הַכֹּהֲנִים [לְרֵא] וְהַלְוִיִּים [וְנָה וְהַלְוִיִּים] שְׁנַיִם וְזָבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל [שׁ] לְשֵׁיִם). However, the *gēr* is cited in 4Q267 Frag. 9, v, 10, which parallels the second listing of the term in CD XIV, 6. Most likely the 4Q267 scribe accidentally omitted the first *gēr* reference.⁸² The second key point to note concerning the 4Q267 fragment is that the term *gēr* is actually present in the extant manuscript fragment. Baumgarten categorizes the 4Q267 manuscript, like 4Q269, as an “early Herodian formal hand.”⁸³

4Q268 Frag. 2, paralleling CD XIV, 5–6, is reconstructed identically to 4Q267 Frag. 9, v, 8–10. Of the specific hierarchical list in question, only the word וְהַלְוִיִּים remains, with the rest being reconstructed. Paleographical dating suggests a dating of the manuscript fragment in the early first century CE.⁸⁴

To summarize, the Damascus Document is a foundational rule text to the sectarian movement, whose formation occurred as early as the late second century BCE and flourished within the first century BCE. The manuscripts of interest within the present study date anywhere from the first half of the first century BCE until the early first century CE. The textual inclusion of the *gēr* with regard to CD VI, 21 and CD XIV, 3 and 6 has been confirmed.

2.3.2.2 11QT^a Temple Scroll XL, 5–6

וְעִשִּׂתָּהּ חֲצַר שְׁלִישִׁית [סוֹבֵבֶת אֶת הַחֲצַר 5
 הַתִּכּוֹנָה] וּלְבָנוֹתֶיהֶם וְלִגְרָמִים אֲשֶׁר נִלְדוּ [וְ] בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל 6

5 [] and you shall make a third courtyard [and surround the
 6 central courtyard ...] for their daughters and for *gērîm*, who were bor[n
 in Israel.]

The passage wherein the term *gēr* has been employed is located in 11QT^a Temple Scroll XL, 5–6, with line 5 being the point at which regulations concerning a third Temple court commence.⁸⁵ Yigael Yadin observes that this column “is

82 David Hamidović, who hypothesizes that the missing first usage of the term could imply either a *gēr*'s nonintegration into the sectarian movement's “future project” or assimilation of *gērîm* with Israelites, concludes that it is still simplest to suppose a copy error. In this regard, his conclusion matches that of Hempel. Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 283; Hempel, *Laws*, 135.

83 Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 96.

84 Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 118.

85 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2, 169.

one of those that were found in extremely poor condition.”⁸⁶ Consequently a brief discussion is in order. The present work supplements Yadin’s edition to a certain extent with Elisha Qimron’s subsequent 1996 critical edition of the text, in which Qimron offers a greater amount of reproduced text.⁸⁷ Yadin’s earlier version does not suggest Qimron’s reconstruction of *סובבת את החצר* (“surround the central courtyard”), nor his reading of *בישראל* (“in Israel”). Presumably Qimron deduces the central courtyard reconstruction from the similar phraseology of line 7 *עד הדור השלישי* [רָחַב סביב לחצר התיכונה 7] *שש מאות אמה* (“[until the third generation *vacat* wi]de around the central court six hundred cubits”), and considers it to mean the third courtyard under discussion. As for the reading “in Israel,” one can see a trace of *aleph* and the horizontal line of *resh* preceding it, and enough room for the remaining letters, on the Temple Scroll photo provided by the Israel Museum.⁸⁸ However, the present work prefers Yadin’s reconstruction of *נולדו* over Qimron’s revised reconstruction to *נולדוים* in his subsequent 2010 volume.⁸⁹ Based on the Israel Museum Temple Scroll photo, it is impossible to ascertain a reading of *van* or (*hireq*) *yod mem*, as the manuscript rips at that location. Nevertheless, as implied by Yadin’s reconstruction and shall furthermore be observed in Chapter 3, the unique phraseology of *אשר ילד* (to beget, to be born) mirrors that observed in Deut 23:9 [Eng 8] (*אֲשֶׁר-יֵלְדוּ*). It is sensible to mirror the third person plural ending (albeit perfect instead of imperfect aspect) of Deut 23:9 with consonant-vowel *van*. Finally, all text reconstructions clearly read *ולגרים* (“and for *gērīm*”) and consequently there is no doubt concerning the presence of the *gēr* to be included in the third courtyard of Temple Scroll’s ideal Temple.

What can be said with regard to the dating of the Temple Scroll? The work exists in two firm manuscripts, 11QT^a (11Q19) and 11QT^b (11Q20), and possibly also the small fragment 11QT^c (11Q21).⁹⁰ Despite the fact that all three

86 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2, 168.

87 Qimron, *The Temple Scroll*. The present study uses the base Hebrew text and English translation provided by Yadin, supplemented or supplanted (when an alternate is provided) with the expansive reconstructions to the Hebrew by Qimron, except where noted concerning the root *ילד*. English translation of Qimron’s reconstructions is offered by the present study.

88 Viewed at The Israel Museum, The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls, “The Temple Scroll,” dss.collections.imj.org.il.

89 Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:179.

90 While 11Q21 deals with matters of the Temple and Jerusalem, similar to 11Q19 and 11Q20, because overlaps with the rest of the Temple Scroll are somewhat limited, it is not possible to conclusively establish the exact relationship between 11Q21 and the Temple Scroll. For example, 11Q21 could be a different version of the Temple Scroll, or could perhaps be a source for the Temple Scroll, but not necessarily a copy of the Temple Scroll

manuscripts of 11QT^a, 11QT^b, and 11QT^c date from the Herodian period, scholarship dates the composition of the Temple Scroll to the Hasmonean period, primarily due to the written content.⁹¹ The Temple Scroll opens with a retelling of the Sinaitic covenant renewal and tabernacle building of Exodus 34 and 35, followed by the Temple plan and related laws, the Laws of the King, and finally a rewriting of Deuteronomy 18–22.⁹² Lawrence Schiffman observes that the Laws of the King represent the Temple Scroll's "most sustained example of original composition," which suggests that clues to the contemporary period may lie within certain monarchic stipulations.⁹³

Both Yadin and Schiffman find the section dedicated to the Laws of the King (found within 11QT^a LVI, 12–LIX, 21) best suited to the Hasmonean King John Hyrcanus I, who reigned between 134–104 BCE.⁹⁴ Yadin suggests that

"as witnessed by the manuscript tradition of 11Q19 and 11Q20." See James H. Charlesworth and Andrew D. Gross, "Temple Scroll-Like Document," in *Temple Scroll and Related Documents*, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, PTS DSSP 7 (Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 227–33, citation from 228.

- 91 Yigael Yadin originally thought that both PAM 43.975 and also PAM 43.366 were additional fragments from Temple Scroll manuscripts. While 43.975 was indeed affirmed as Temple Scroll and subsequently identified as 11QT^b, 43.366 was later discerned to be a Reworked Pentateuch (4Q365a). This detail is important because it leaves both of these two major manuscript samples dating to the Herodian period, and none actually dating to the Hasmonean period, which was the case with 4Q365a. The work of both scribes identified in 11Q19, Scribe A responsible for columns I–V and Scribe B responsible for VI–LXVII, dates to the Herodian period. 11Q21 also makes use of a late Herodian formal script. See all of the following: Qimron, *The Temple Scroll*, 1, 4–5; Lawrence Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Nature of Its Law: The Status of the Question," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 40–42; Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1, 17, 386; Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2, 11, 18; Charlesworth and Gross, "Temple Scroll-Like Document," 227.
- 92 Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll," 42–43; Yadin describes the themes of the Temple Scroll more generally in a tri-fold fashion as the "plan of the Temple," the "Statutes of the King," and "the laws assembled in Deuteronomy." Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1, 387.
- 93 Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll," 49.
- 94 While Yadin suggests that the Temple Scroll could possibly date also to the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE), he prefers John Hyrcanus as the identified king. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1, 386. Other scholars have suggested Alexander Jannaeus as the king in question, and have even suggested a king as late as Herod the Great (37–4 BCE). Barbara Thiering, "The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll," in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987*, ed. George J. Brooke, JSPSup 7 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 104–6. Considering the relationship between the Temple Scroll and CD that will be discussed shortly, the choice of Herod as the king in question seems far too late.

certain regulations written in the Temple Scroll (beyond solely the Laws of the King) influenced Hyrcanus to change his regulations to be in accordance with those of the Temple Scroll. Yadin explains that the author of the Temple Scroll “generally deals with commands and subjects that ran contrary to contemporary practice.”⁹⁵ Thus, Yadin believes that 11QT^a xxxiv’s regulations concerning the use of rings to fasten animals in Temple slaughter subsequently influenced John Hyrcanus to adopt the practice, a practice which Yadin notes is “attested by the codified rabbinic laws.”⁹⁶ In a similar vein, Schiffman describes the Temple Scroll as “a polemic against the existing order, calling for radical change in the order of the day, putting forward reforms in areas of cultic, religious and political life.”⁹⁷ To demonstrate that this polemic reacts against the monarch Hyrcanus and not another, Schiffman notes that the Temple Scroll argues against the use of mercenaries, which were “used extensively by John Hyrcanus.”⁹⁸ In order for the scroll to concern itself not only with current practices of Hyrcanus but also influence his future practices, Schiffman suggests that perhaps the Temple Scroll was written no earlier than the second half of Hyrcanus’s reign, meaning roughly between 119–104 BCE.⁹⁹

Now that the dating of the Temple Scroll has been roughly established to be somewhere between 119 and 104 BCE, what can be said regarding the provenance of this document? Yadin observes that the Temple Scroll is similar to stipulations in CD, such as the regulation prohibiting sexual intercourse within the Temple city.¹⁰⁰ Each regulation approaches the topic from a slightly different angle, however. CD XII, 1–2 regulates to “Let no man lie with a woman in the city of the sanctuary to defile 2 the city of the sanctuary with their pollution” (אל ישכב איש עם אשה בעיר המקדש לטמא 2 את עיר המקדש בנדתם), while 11QT^a XLV, 11–12 expresses the matter from a somewhat more indirect fashion: “And if a man lies with his wife and has an emission of semen, he shall not come into any part of the city 12 of the temple, where I will settle my name, for three days” (ואיש כיא ישכב עם אשתו שכבת זרע לוא יבוא אל כול עיר 12 המקדש) (אשר אשכין שמי בה שלוש ימים). Does this thematic connection imply that the Temple Scroll correlates with the sectarian movement that lies behind D?¹⁰¹

95 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1, 388.

96 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1, 388.

97 Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 51.

98 Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 49.

99 Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 49.

100 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1, 398.

101 Schiffman notes that Tov correlates 11QT^a with the unique features of Qumran scribal practice, features such as *plene* spelling and a relaxed scribal style. However, in this case, the later date of the manuscript from the composition poses a challenge with regard to

The two examples between the Temple Scroll and CD concerning prohibition against Temple city sexual intercourse, while they share a literary theme, do not demonstrate a specific literary dependence.¹⁰² Nevertheless, some sort of obvious connection exists between the D tradition and the Temple Scroll.

Because it is now established that the Damascus Document, as a foundational work of the sectarian movement, originates from the late second or early first century BCE, and the Temple Scroll to 119–104 BCE, the latter document’s genesis could be described as “correlated with formative D.” The Temple Scroll does not appear to align with S.

2.3.2.3 4Q377 Apocryphal Pentateuch B Frag. 1, I

[הב]	ב	[להבדיל	בין]	1
[עצם	השמים]	זת	ה]	2	
[צדקתי	לעני	כול]	3			
[ה	להנחיל	לעני]	4			
[הגויים	פ]	5				
[שפט	תי	ב]	6			
[ה	ב	ה	כ]	7		
[ה	חוי	הכנעני	החתי	האמורי	היב]	8
[ארץ	טובה	ורחבה	מא	רצות	עמ]	9

- 1 [] .hb.[]b[] to separa[te between]
- 2 [] the very heavens []wt h[].[]
- 3 my righteousness to the eyes of all.[] .[]
- 4 []h to give as a possession before the eyes of []q.[] eight []
- 5 [] the nations .p[] t ... [] between the .[]
- 6 [] . and I [will judge] be[tw]een a man and his friend, between a father and his son, and between a man and [his] gēr[]
- 7 []k ... [] .h b.hh ky ... b to all Is[rae]l to šl[] and he will testify wls.[]
- 8 [the] Hivite, the Canaanite, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Jeb[u]s[ite], the Girsch[ite]]....
- 9 [a land]better and wider [than the la]nds of [o]ther peoples

drawing firm conclusions based on features such as Qumran scribal practice. Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll,” 39. Schiffman, in n. 10, refers to Tov, “Orthography and Language,” 55.

102 Schiffman has noted, concerning other texts, that shared themes do not necessarily indicate literary dependence. Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, ed. John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein, SBLSS 2 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 97.

4Q377 apocrPent.B Frag. 1, 1, 6 is the present study's primary line of interest in this text which has been most frequently studied to analyze its retelling of the Sinai and Horeb theophany narratives, and the nature of Moses within those narratives.¹⁰³ Even though a key portion of the phrase, namely **ובין אב לבנו** ("between a father and his son, and between a man and [his] *gēr*"), shows some uncertainty in the letters, one can be confident that James VanderKam and Monica Brady have reconstructed the text accurately and the *gēr* exists in this passage.¹⁰⁴ According to VanderKam and Brady:

To the left of *lamed* in **לבנו** only traces of letters remain but they are consistent with **בנו** which the context suggests. The context also favours reading the next word as **ובין**. The last visible word, where one might have expected **לאש[תו]** (so Wacholder and Abegg), has traces of a *lamed* but the next letter does not resemble an *alep*. Rather, its inverted 'v'-shape indicates a *gimel* (so Strugnell). Also, the next letter is not a *šin*, only a vertical stroke from the right side of the letter remains.¹⁰⁵

After analyzing 4Q377 Fragment 1, the present study concurs that the inverted "v" base of the *gimel* is clearly present and looks similar to that of the *gimel* of **הגויים** of line 5.¹⁰⁶ In addition, while the vertical stroke of the *lamed* of the proposed **לגרו** is missing, the horizontal line and hook are somewhat evident and

103 Studies have primarily attempted to determine the nature of Moses in the text. The general consensus is that within the 4Q377 rewritten Sinai and Horeb narratives, Moses is a unique messenger of God who appears *like* an angel, and yet is not an actual angel. For example, Emile Puech argues that Moses is "like an angel who speaks from the very mouth of God, but he is not an angel" (translation mine). See Emile Puech, "Le Fragment 2 de 4Q377, *Pentateuque Apocryphe B: L'Exaltation de Moïse*," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 469–75, esp. 474. Ariel Feldman suggests that it is Moses's role at Sinai and his uniqueness as God's messenger which is emphasized in 4Q377. Ariel Feldman, "The Sinai Revelation According to 4Q377 (*Apocryphal Pentateuch B*)," *DSD* 18 (2011): 155–72, esp. 170. Wido van Peursen argues that within the retelling of the Sinai and Horeb narrative, the main issue at stake is that of observing the commandments. Wido van Peursen, "Who Was Standing on the Mountain? The Portrait of Moses in 4Q377," in *Moses in Biblical and Extra-Biblical Traditions*, ed. Axel Graupner and Michael Wolter, *BZAW* 372 (Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2007), 99–113, 100–101, 111. See below, however, for the slightly different perspective of Crispin Fletcher-Louis, who argues that Moses takes on an angelic quality.

104 James VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, DJD 28 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 205–17.

105 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 209.

106 Thank-you to the Israel Antiquities Authority, to a grant from The Canadian Friends of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and to Professor Sarianna Metso for the opportunity to study 4Q377 at the Scrollery in person in August 2012. I am particularly indebted to the

look similar, albeit smaller, than the clear לרעהו earlier in the same line. Overall one can confirm that this line encompasses the parallel structure of judging between a man and his friend, a father and his son, and a man and his *gēr*.

While such a phraseology in its entirety is new, numerous similar passages exist, one of which ultimately determines a provenance for the work. The passages include Exod 18:16 “and I judge between a man and his friend” (וְשִׁפְטֵתִי בֵּין); (אִישׁ וּבֵין רֵעֵהוּ); Num 30:17 “between a man to his wife; between a father to his daughter” (בֵּין אִישׁ לְאִשְׁתּוֹ בֵּין אָב לְבֵתוֹ); Deut 1:16 “between a man, his brother, and his *gēr*” (בֵּין אִישׁ וּבֵין אָחִיו וּבֵין גֵּרוֹ); and also Jer 7:5 “between a man and his friend” (בֵּין אִישׁ וּבֵין רֵעֵהוּ).¹⁰⁷ 4Q377 Frag. 2, II, 6–7 contains the similarly-phrased רעהו איש עם רעהו (“a man will speak with his friend”), suggestive of Exod 33:11.¹⁰⁸ To this list of similar passages one may add CD VII, 8–9, which inserts a citation of Num 30:17 and the repeating בין pattern. Thus 4Q377 correlates closely with D, due in part to this repeated בין refrain of “between Person X and Person Y.”

Other indicators may be observed of a sectarian movement provenance, and connection to the D tradition specifically. In particular, VanderKam and Brady note that the spelling in 4Q377 is the same *plene* spelling used in “many Qumran texts.”¹⁰⁹ This information regarding full spelling suggests the

IAA because they took the multispectral photos of 4Q377, as a part of the scrolls digitization project, especially for my work with this fragment.

107 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 210.

108 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 215; Puech, “Le Fragment 2 de 4Q377,” 369. It may be noted that in this same fragment and column, Elisha Qimron reads לַגְּ[וּל] אִישׁ תּוֹשֵׁב at the beginning of line 4. A reading of *tōshāb* (temporary foreign resident) would be an avenue to research if the word was certain, due to the close relationship between, and sometimes the combination of, the terms *gēr* and *tōshāb*, such as that seen in Gen 23:4 or Lev 25:47. Qimron looks to passages such as Deut 31:12, in which the *gēr* is also present in the assembly, making a connection to the assembly (הקהל) described in line 3. Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (Heb. מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים), vol. 3, Between Bible and Mishnah (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2014), 143. However, more likely is Strugnell’s proposed reading of לכול דבריו ומשפטיו, mentioned in a note in the DJD volume as making “excellent sense in the context.” VanderKam and Brady also note that a similar reading exists in 1 Kgs 6:38. VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 215, see notes for line 4. The DJD volume officially recognizes only the *lamed* and *shin*, which are indeed the only two fairly visible letters in The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library photographs, especially 4Q377 photographs “B-299535” and “B-370749,” deadseascrolls.org.il. VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 213. A *mem* might precede the *shin*, which would also confirm Strugnell’s proposed reading. Certainly the letter preceding the *mem* is not a *vav*, according to Qimron’s reading, as the letter is fuller and somewhat square shaped in size.

109 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 206.

Qumran orthography system as described by Tov, also linking the document with the sectarian movement. In fact, many peculiar forms pointed out by Tov as a Qumran orthography that marks mostly sectarian compositions are to be found within 4Q377, including the *plene* forms כִּיָּא, כּוּל, and מוֹשֶׁה.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, as noted by Crispin Fletcher-Louis, the literary theme of Moses taking on an angelic role, or at least, a mediator role, is present in another scroll with a possible sectarian movement provenance aside from 4Q377.¹¹¹ He suggests 4Q374 portrays a “Qumran provenance” (meaning sectarian movement) for a “particular version of a wider tradition,” namely, an allusion to the Aaronic blessing that is also evident in 1QSb and 1QS II, 1–4.¹¹² In 4Q374, this allusion is seen in the mirroring of an allusion to Num 6:25 in Frag 2, II, 8 now indicating Moses’s shining face.¹¹³ The shared theme of Moses as a (possibly angelic) mediator within 4Q377 and 4Q374 may demonstrate a sectarian movement provenance for both, in light of the latter text’s joint allusions to Moses and Aaronic blessing, which is evident as a theme throughout sectarian movement material. Finally, the familial reference in 4Q377 to a man and his son is more reminiscent of the family-style living arrangement observed in D, than the absence of family references observed in S.

Concerning dating, VanderKam and Brady conclude, based on the shapes of the letters, that “the script is a formal one from the Hasmonaean period, to be dated to 100–50 BCE, with a date earlier in this fifty-year period more likely.”¹¹⁴ The dating of the text based on the lettering also suggests that the text is composed, or at least transcribed, near the height of the movement’s life span.

110 Tov, “Orthography and Language,” esp. 35–36, 39; as noted by VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 206–7.

111 Fletcher-Louis takes the view that Moses may be viewed as angelic in these texts, which goes beyond the view of other scholars, who instead argue for elevated status but not actually an angelic nature. Nevertheless, Fletcher-Louis describes this angelic quality in part as a mediator role, in particular pertaining to 4Q377, bringing his view closer in line with a basic view that Moses has an elevated status. See Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2002), 136–49, and on a mediator role in 4Q377 esp. 145–46.

112 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 140.

113 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 140.

114 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 206.

2.3.2.4 4Q159 Ordinances^a Frags. 2–4, 1–3¹¹⁵

1 ואם [ל]גֵר או לעֹקֵר מִשְׁפַּחַת [ת גר]
 2 לעיני ישׁ[ראל ל]אֵי יעבודו הגיים בזר]
 3 מצרים ויצו עליהם¹¹⁶ לבלתי ימכר מִמְכַרְת עבד

- 1 And if [... to a] *gēr* or the offspring of the famil[y of a *gēr* ...]
- 2 in the presence of Isr[ael.] They [may no]t serve non-Jews. With a *zr*[...]
- 3 Egypt and he commanded them not to be sold in a transaction of slavery.

¹¹⁵ It has been proposed by Francis Weinert, and reconsidered by both Katell Berthelot and David Hamidović, to reconstruct 4Q159 Frag. 1, 11, 3 by inserting the figures of “the Levite, and the *gēr*, and the orphan, and the widow” (הלוי והגר והיתום והאלמנה) at the end of the line, as those who will come to the threshing-floor (הבא לגור). Such a reconstruction borrows phraseology from Num 18:30 and Deut 14:29. The rationale is that the following line refers to “whoever in Israel owns nothing, that person can eat some and gather for himself” (line 4), and passages such as this one that involve gleaning generally include the *gēr*, as seen in Lev 19:9–10; 23:22; and Deut 24:19–22. However, there is no way to know that any or all four entities should be listed as those who can glean, since the passage is not borrowed closely enough from any one source. And, since there are no other manuscripts of 4Q159 against which to compare, unlike the *gēr* between the CD and the 4QD and 6QD fragments, this hypothetical reconstruction cannot be verified. Thus the present study proposes only one *gēr* occurrence for 4Q159, namely that of Frags. 2–4 which is discussed in this section. Francis Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation for an Essene Community Outside of Qumran?” *JStJ* 5 (1974): 190; Berthelot, “La notion de גֵר,” 180–81; Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 269–70.

¹¹⁶ Strugnell notes that עליהם is a scribal error which instead should be translated as “concerning them,” i.e. עליהם. J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 (1970): 178 (all direct citation translations from the French are my own); Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules: 4Q159 = 4QOrd^a, 4Q513 = 4QOrd^b,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and F.M. Cross, PTS DSSP 1 (Tübingen; Louisville: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 154, n. 17. Elisha Qimron in his 2014 publication suggests an alternative version of אהיהם (“their brothers”). Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:25. Leon Levy photographs, however, despite some manuscript corruption and tearing at that letter, show signs of an *ayin* and not *aleph*. There is no stroke in the bottom right hand quadrant of the letter, where a stroke would be required for the consonant *aleph*. See especially The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, 4Q159 photographs, “B-363432” and “B-363431,” deadseascrolls.org.il. The emended reading of עליהם is maintained.

The present occasion where the term *gēr* has been employed relies on the transcription and translation of Lawrence Schiffman.¹¹⁷ Despite the transcription and translation in 4Q159 Ordinances^a Frags. 2–4, 1, “And if [... to a] *gēr* or to the offspring of the famil[y of a *gēr* ...]” ([ל]גַּר אוּ לְעוֹקֵר מִשְׁפַּחַת גַּר) (ואם), no reference to a *gēr* in 4Q159 is to be found in Martin Abegg’s DSS concordance.¹¹⁸ This absence is due to the fact that John Allegro’s original reconstruction of the text of Frags. 2–4, 1 is “And if [...] they *cut off* the guardian of a famil[y ...]” (ה)גַּדְאוּ שׁוֹקֵד מִשְׁפַּחַת (ואם).¹¹⁹ Strugnell and Yadin subsequently suggested the current reconstruction that would correspond to a likeness with Lev 25:47.¹²⁰ Yadin is the first to suggest this reading, in 1968, seeing that “some of the ‘Ordinances’ in the following lines are related to Lev 25:35 ff.”¹²¹ In Strugnell’s reconstruction from 1970, he comments that reading line 1 as לעוֹקֵר instead of the Lev 25:47 rendering of לעֵקֵר is simply “one of the numerous cases in which the *qutl* is attested at Qumran while the Masoretic Hebrew has a *qitl*.”¹²² Indeed, when one consults the photographs from The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, a partial *gimel* and the *resh* are clear for the *gēr*. Also clear are *vav*, *qoph*, and (possibly) *resh*, followed by a partial *mem*, *shin*, *pe*, and the right side stroke of a *khet*.¹²³ This reading fits well with the remainder of the Leviticus 25 rewriting that follows. It is now evident that 1) the passage clearly refers to a *gēr*; 2) the passage reformats Lev 25:47–55;¹²⁴ and 3) both items 1 and 2 have become the general scholarly consensus.

The above comment concerning *qutl* morphology denotes a connection to the *plene* spelling exhibited by the sectarian movement. What further can be argued regarding the provenance of 4Q159? The nature of the ordinances themselves provide clues. Ordinances from a variety of works have been rewritten in 4Q159. Frags. 2–4 contain four different legislative matters: lines 1–3 are the adaptation of Lev 25:47–55 and manumission regulations; lines 3–6 discuss the size of the movement’s regulatory council and their judgment system in accordance with Deut 17:8–13; lines 6–7 concern prohibitions regarding

117 Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules.”

118 Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*.

119 John M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I (4Q158–4Q186)*, DJD 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 8.

120 Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 197. In n. 50, Weinert comments that the change in reading to line 1 made by Yadin and Strugnell “greatly improves the sense of this line.”

121 Yigael Yadin, “A Note on 4Q 159 (Ordinances),” *IEJ* 18 (1968): 250.

122 Strugnell, “Notes en Marge,” 178.

123 See especially The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, 4Q159 photographs, “B-363432” and “B-363431,” deadseascrolls.org.il.

124 Other proposed reconstructions based on possible scriptural predecessors from Lev 25:47–55 will be discussed in Chapter 3. See, in addition, Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules,” 147, 155, n. 29; Berthelot, “La notion de גַּר,” 181.

wearing clothing of the opposite sex in accordance with Deut 22:5; and lines 8–10 regulate a case of a man challenging his new wife’s virginity, in accordance with Deut 22:13–21.¹²⁵ Schiffman aptly notes that there is “no organizing principle” in 4Q159, and concludes that this collection of assorted regulations is different from Jewish law found in the Mishnah.¹²⁶ Consequently, this conclusion implies that the authors of 4Q159 are not Pharisaic, the sectarian group most frequently affiliated as “ancestors” to the rabbis and the Mishnah as a rabbinic work.¹²⁷ Instead, perhaps the rules of 4Q159 could be linked with the sectarian movement, then, even though it is observed by Charlotte Hempel that 4Q159 uses “all-Israel” terminology not suggestive of a community separated from wider society (such as the reference to “Israel” in line 2 of the passage of interest to the present study).¹²⁸

A thematic argument may be made with regard to connecting 4Q159 with the sectarian movement overall. Moshe Bernstein looks to internal textual clues and reorders the fragments based on their contents, resulting with an ordering of Fragments 2–4+8 (which he subsequently calls “Fragment 2”), Fragments 1+9 (subsequently, “Fragment 1”), and finally Fragment 5.¹²⁹ This reordering is based on the fact that Fragment 2 concludes with material from Deuteronomy 22 and Fragment 1 refers to Deuteronomy 23, Fragment 1 concludes with material “related to” Exodus 32, and Fragment 5 “appears connected to” Exodus 33.¹³⁰ Based on this new ordering, a link is observed between Fragments 1 and 5 in the events of the sin of the golden calf, as Frag. 1, 16–17 refers to Moses and burning, possibly suggesting Exod 32:20, and Frag. 5, 4–5 derives from Exod 33:7 concerning Moses pitching a tent outside the camp. Bernstein suggests that this “peshet” (as observed in Frag. 5, 1) of an historical event may interpret the sectarians’ own departure to the desert “to isolate themselves from the sinful

125 Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 186; Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules,” 147.

126 Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules,” 148.

127 See, for example, Shaye J.D. Cohen, “From the Bible to the Talmud: The Prohibition of Inter-marriage,” *HAR* 7 (1983): 216–20.

128 Charlotte Hempel, “4QOrd^a (4Q159) and the Laws of the Damascus Document,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 376.

129 Bernstein comments that fragments were often organized “more or less” based on size, as opposed to the inner textual clues upon which he bases his decision. Moshe J. Bernstein, “4Q159: Nomenclature, Text, Exegesis, Genre,” in *Law, Peshet and the History of Interpretation* (vol. 2 of *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, STDJ 107 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013), 520.

130 Bernstein, “4Q159: Nomenclature, Text, Exegesis, Genre,” 521.

remainder of contemporary Israel.”¹³¹ The interpretation would be seen through the lens of Moses separating himself from the camp after the incident of the Israelites having sinned with the golden calf. Perhaps it is this idea of separation to which Allegro alludes when he concluded that the document contains relevance to “Essenism at large as well as to the peculiar circumstances of the monastic community at Qumran.”¹³²

Even though the present study has already argued against affiliating the sectarian movement to the Essenes specifically as does Allegro, can the sectarian affiliation of 4Q159 be connected to either the D or S traditions? Weinert points out that the nature of certain legislations among those found within Frags. 2–4 seem an unlikely fit for regulations existing at the actual site of Qumran.¹³³ For example, why include a regulation concerning women when archaeological evidence suggests scant presence of women on the Qumran site?¹³⁴ The evidence leads Weinert to conclude that 4Q159 should be cast “in a light similar to that of the Damascus Document which, although it manifests clear affinities with Qumran belief and was preserved there, gives evidence that its origin was in a different life situation than that at Qumran proper.”¹³⁵ This statement implies an affinity with the D tradition, which, as has been previously noted, describes life in camps and cities and legislates concerning women. While nothing precludes members affiliated with the S tradition from living in satellite groups, S does not legislate concerning women, making S an unlikely liaison to 4Q159.¹³⁶

Finally, when was 4Q159 composed? It is feasible that 4Q159 was composed sometime during the height of the D tradition in the mid-first century BCE. A date in the late first century BCE has been suggested for the manuscript itself, based on the document’s use of an early Herodian formal script.¹³⁷ Based on the Herodian script, the present study situates this text between 4Q169 pNah,

131 Moshe J. Bernstein, “4Q159 Fragment 5 and the ‘Desert Theology’ of the Qumran Sect,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul, et al.; assisted by Eva Ben-David (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 53.

132 John M. Allegro, “An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4Q Ordinances),” *JSS* 6 (1961): 71.

133 Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 205.

134 Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 163–87. Magness concludes that a disproportionately small number of adult female skeletons found at the Qumran site, and the “complete absence of infants and children among the excavated burials in the western sector,” are both suggestive that “the community at Qumran did not include families,” 173.

135 Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 206.

136 See Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 58, 65–69.

137 Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules,” 145; Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 187; Strugnell, “Notes en Marge,” 177.

which has a *terminus post quem* of 63 BCE, and 4Q174 Flor, which dates to the later first century BCE.¹³⁸ Allegro suggests that what becomes identified as 4Q159 has, in fact, “a beautifully shaped and proportioned book hand, bearing a marked resemblance, if not identical, with that of 4QFlorilegium.”¹³⁹ A date for a text can only be given within observable limits, and the limits of this knowledge where 4Q159 is concerned suggest a date in the second half of the first century BCE.

2.3.2.5 4Q279 Four Lots Frag. 5, 1–6

[ה]	1
[ר עהו הכתוב אחרי]]	2
[י וכוזות ¹⁴⁰ יחוס עליו וכ[כ]ה]]	3
[ולכה]נים בני אהרון יצא הגור[ל הראשון]	4
[איש לפי רוחו והגור[ל השני]	5
[והגורל הרביעי לגר[ים]	6

- 1 []h []
- 2 [] his [fe]llow who is inscribed after [him]
- 3 [] his [], and like lambs of pedigree upon him, and th[u]s []
- 4 [And for the prie]sts, the sons of Aaron, shall go out the [first] lot []
- 5 [] a man according to his spirit. And the [second] lo[t]
- 6 [and] the fourth lot for the *gēr[îm]*

4Q279 Four Lots is named after the very reference within Fragment 5 to four lots which will be distributed to various parties, of which the fourth lot (גורל) will go out to the *gērîm*. As for the word *gērîm* itself in Frag. 5, 6, despite the fact that Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes observe that “the trace of the *reš* before the lacuna is very faint,”¹⁴¹ the *lamed* and *gimel* of the noun are clearly visible. The presence of the *gēr* in this passage is assured. While the only other recipients of a lot for which manuscript evidence exists are “the prie]sts, the sons of Aaron” (וּלְכֹהֲנָיִם בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן), it is fairly certain that two other recipients

138 See the present chapter’s sections on these two texts.
 139 Allegro, “Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah,” 71.
 140 For this word unit, the alternative proposal by Qimron is preferred. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:55. The rest of the passage is per Alexander and Vermes.
 141 Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” in *Qumran Cave 4, XIX: Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*, DJD 26 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 221, “Notes on Readings,” line 6.

will be the Levites and the children of Israel. This deduction is derived from the parallel listing within CD XIV 3–6 of the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third, and the *gēr* fourth.¹⁴² The passage describing the lot distribution in 4Q279 is found within lines 4–6, although some discrepancy exists between scholarly reconstructions. Alexander and Vermes, in their reconstruction, place a second lot after לפי רוחו of line 5. Instead, Qimron reconstructs a second lot for Levites (והגורל השני ללוויים) and a third lot for the sons of Israel (והגורל השלישי לבני ישראל), and places both in line 5, one at the beginning of the line and one at the end.¹⁴³ In contrast, Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar reconstruct only the third lot in line 5 after לפי רוחו.¹⁴⁴ Nevertheless, while García Martínez and Tigchelaar do not actually reconstruct the second lot within line 4, the rest of their reconstruction suggests an agreement with both Alexander and Vermes as well as Qimron that the passage is following a similar hierarchical ordering as what is found in CD XIV.¹⁴⁵

One additional textual matter that will relate to the issue of the relationship between the *gēr* and other Israelites in 4Q279, to be discussed in Chapter 3, is the proposed reading ירוס ובכורות in line 3. This reading, proposed by Qimron, is an alternative reading to that used in the Alexander and Vermes DJD edition, which suggests ירוס ובכירות (“and greatness of pedigree”). Qimron’s alternative appears to reflect more closely what is in The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library. In particular, the infrared image B-365447 seems to show *kaph* twice, instead of *kaph* followed by *bet*.¹⁴⁶ The letter that follows, read by Qimron as *vav* and by Alexander and Vermes as *yod*, remains ambiguous, however. This outcome means that the uncertain unit could be something like what is proposed by Qimron, namely “and like lambs,” with a reading of כורות in the place of כירות. Qimron looks to antecedents such as 1 Sam 15:9:¹⁴⁷ included among the Amalekite possessions spared by Saul and the people are “lambs,

142 Alexander and Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” 221.

143 Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:55.

144 Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols., Paperback ed. (Leiden; Boston: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 635–37.

145 David Hamidović also considers that second and third lots would likely belong to Levites and children of Israel in this passage, based on the hierarchy already identified in CD XIV, 3–6, as well as 1QS II, 19–23’s hierarchical listing of priests first, Levites second, “then all the people” (וכול העם) third. David Hamidović, “4Q279, 4QFour Lots, une interprétation du Psaume 135 appartenant à 4Q421, 4QWays of Righteousness,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 172–73.

146 According to The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, 4Q279 photographs, “B-365447,” deadseascrolls.org.il.

147 Qimron refers to 1 Sam 14:9 but the intended passage seems to be 15:9. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:55.

and all that was valuable” (וְעַל-הַכְּרִים וְעַל-כָּל-הַטּוֹב). Importantly, Qimron also notes that the same form with full *holem*, albeit in the masculine plural (כּוֹרִים) is used in 4Q171 III, 5, when interpreting those who love YHWH as precious lambs.¹⁴⁸ The proposed new reading blends the notions of good and precious lambs (possibly also implying obedient individuals) with high “pedigree,” in other words, “and like lambs of pedigree.”¹⁴⁹ While an unusual reading, it is the most viable option.¹⁵⁰ Whatever the correct reading might be for this word unit, whether to do with “greatness,” “lambs,” or even another option, it is the element of “pedigree” that follows which will prove valuable for interpretation in Chapter 3.

Literary devices and paleographic clues assist in the dating of 4Q279. First, the reference within 4Q279 Frag. 5, 4 to “the sons of Aaron” is absent from both CD XIV, 3–6 as well as 1QS II, 19–23, both being passages which also place priests in a hierarchical listing.¹⁵¹ This reference to “the sons of Aaron” could be intended to function in the same fashion as the addition of “the sons of Zadok” to the text of 1QS v, 9, a phrase which is noticeably absent from the parallels in 4QS^b and 4QS^d. In 1QS v, 9, “the sons of Zadok” is added to the text in order for the movement’s members to clarify their place, according to Sarianna Metso, as “the true keepers of the covenant.”¹⁵² If the very composition of 4Q279 borrowed from the phraseology of CD XIV, 3–6, and if “the sons of Aaron” is indeed a textual addition to that phraseology with a similar-minded intent as in 1QS v, 9, then 4Q279 appears to be a work based on and created after the compositions of CD XIV and 1QS II.¹⁵³ In addition, line 4’s reference to “the sons of Aaron” hints at a form of Davidic messianism such as that observed in 4Q174 Flor. A dating in the second half of the first century BCE seems reasonable

148 Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:55.

149 English translation is proposed by the present study.

150 The other option, using *yod* instead of *vav* (וּכְבִּירוֹת), does not make sense: the noun כִּיר represents a “basin” (e.g. 11Q20 x, 5).

151 The excerpt from 1QS II, 19–23 reads as follows: “The priests shall cross over 20 first into the order (סֵדֶר), according to their spirits, one after the other. Then the Levites shall cross over after them, 21 then all the people shall cross over thirdly into the order, one after the other, by thousands, hundreds, 22 fifties, and tens, so that every single Israelite may know his standing place in the Community (יְהוּדָה) of God 23 for an eternal council.” The *kaph* from סֵדֶר is actually in medial form.

152 Metso, “Creating,” 289. See also Section 2.1.1 of the present chapter, for a description of the redactional history of “sons of Aaron” and “sons of Zadok.”

153 On the other hand, the phrase “the sons of Aaron” could be added secondarily within 4Q279, just as in 1QS v, 9. However, no multiple versions of 4Q279 exist, suggesting that “the sons of Aaron” as a phrase is written into the original composition of 4Q279, and as an addition to phraseology borrowed from the likes of CD XIV 3–6.

when considering the possibility of a messianic resurgence in response to the reign of Herod. The early Herodian formal script found in the manuscript for 4Q279, suggesting a date of ca. 30–1 BCE, does not contradict this theory.¹⁵⁴

With regard to provenance, 4Q279 has a closer affiliation to the D tradition than S in terms of the four-fold hierarchical listing which includes a *gēr*. The *gēr* is present twice in the listings of CD XIV 3–6, but is absent from 1QS II, 19–23.

2.3.3 *Texts Correlated with the Serekh (S) Tradition*

2.3.3.1 4Q169 Peshar Nahum Frags. 3–4, II, 7–10

- | | |
|----|--|
| 7 | מרוב זנוני זונה טובת חן בעלת כשפים הממכרת גוים בזנותה ומשפחות
ב[כש]פיה |
| 8 | פשר[ו ע]ל מתעי אפרים אשר בתלמוד שקרם ולשון כזביהם ושפת מרמה יתעו
רבים |
| 9 | מלכים [ו]שרים כוהנים ועם עם גר נלוה ערים ומשפחות יובדו בעצתם
נ[כ]בדים ומוש[לים] |
| 10 | יפולו [מז]עם לשונם |
-
- | | |
|----|--|
| 7 | (Nah 3:4) ‘Because of the multitude of the whoredoms of the well-favoured harlot, the mistress of witchcrafts, that selleth nations through her whoredoms and families through her witchcrafts.’ |
| 8 | [Its] interpretation [con]cerns those who lead Ephraim astray, who, by their false teaching and their lying tongue and lip of deceit, will lead many astray, |
| 9 | kings and princes, ¹⁵⁵ priests and people together with the <i>gēr</i> . Cities and families will perish through their counsel, n[ob]les and rul[ers] |
| 10 | will fall due to the cursing of their tongues. |

¹⁵⁴ Alexander and Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” 218.

¹⁵⁵ To the base text as provided by Allegro in DJD v, the present study follows Elisha Qimron’s addition of *vav* (“and”) to שרים in line 9. According to The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library photographs, there is a rip in the manuscript that could easily fit a *vav* at that location. The addition of *vav* would enable parallelism between “kings and princes,” “priests and people,” and “cities and families.” The English text has been altered slightly to follow. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I*, 38, 40; cf. Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (Heb. החיבורים העבריים: יהודה: מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים), vol. 2, Between Bible and Mishnah (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2013), 284; The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, 4Q169 photographs, especially “B-284383”; “B-280796”; and “B-284037,” deadseascrolls.org.il.

Concerning the passage where the *gēr* has been employed within 4Q169 pNah, John Allegro's suggested reading of גר נלוה (the *gēr* attached to them"), proposed by Strugnell and others. A decision can be made for reasons of grammar and scriptural parallel, despite ambiguity upon consultation of The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library.¹⁵⁶ However, line 10 prefers [מז]עם (akin to Hos 7:16) over Allegro's rendering of [מ]עם.¹⁵⁷ The *gēr* reference occurs in the midst of a number of terms and characters who may represent various veiled historical references. The broader narrative scope of these characters in 4Q169 is considered to the extent that the findings assist with determining the provenance and dating of the text. In the case of this text, conclusions made concerning allusions to historical events create a fairly clear guideline as to the text's *terminus post quem* (no sooner than 63 BCE). For this reason, features such as paleography and orthographic similarities need not feature prominently in determining date and provenance where this text is concerned. In Allegro's original work with fragments from 4Q169, the only observation he makes concerning the handwriting itself is that the "letters of the neat, characteristic book-hand of Qumran, are about 2 mm. square."¹⁵⁸

Two historical leaders may first be identified. From Allegro's first 1956 publication of part of 4Q169 and onward in scholarship, the theory has prevailed

156 Indeed, with The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library infrared photographs, it is hard to discern whether the letter in question is final form *mem*, or *he*. All that remains of the letter (the rest being ripped away) are two visible vertical tips arising off a faded horizontal line. The slight left-leaning brush stroke of these vertical tips appears like that of a *mem*, however, the vertical tips are slightly narrower than most occasions of final form *mem* in the column and more like *he*. However, a decision can be made apart from physical appearance. Shani Berrin considers the addition of the third person m. pl. possessive suffix, attached to a *niphal* participle, to be "awkward." In Chapter 3 of the present study, the גר נלוה (a *gēr* who has attached himself) will be likened to other scriptural examples, such as Isa 14:1. This other example follows the format of simple *niphal* without the pronominal suffix (נלוה), making Allegro's version the preferred reading. See Leon Levy 4Q169 photographs, especially "B-284383"; "B-280796"; and "B-284037," deadseascrolls.org.il; and, Shani L. Berrin, *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169*, STDJ 53 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 62, and n. 93. Elisha Qimron's edition of this scroll agrees with the reading גר נלוה. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:284.

157 Berrin recommends this preferred restoration, pointing out that Allegro's choice of מעם could not be translated as his suggested "because of what they say," because a spatial nuance of "with" would be required. Berrin, *The Peshar Nahum Scroll*, 62, and n. 94. Here, too, the reading by Qimron is in agreement with that of Berrin. The present study, in considering the photographs from The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, agrees that the space left by a rip could feasibly fit two letters. See Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:284, and the previous note for the particular infrared photographs consulted.

158 John M. Allegro, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect," *JBL* 75 (1956): 89.

that the “Lion of Wrath,” mentioned in 4Q169 Frags. 3–4, 1, 5, should be identified with the Sadducean-backed Alexander Jannaeus. Jannaeus ruled as high priest and king of Judea from 103 BCE until his death in 76 BCE. Allegro writes: “We have in this *pešer* the first identifiable proper names to come out of Qumran literature, and a concrete historical situation from which it is not difficult to identify its chief character, the Lion of Wrath.”¹⁵⁹ The “historical situation” to which he alludes is the interpretation of Nahum 2:13 in Frags. 3–4, 1, 7–8, with reference to the following:

the Lion of Wrath 7 [... ven]geance on the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things when he hangs men up alive 8 [...] in Israel before time, for of the man hanged alive upon a tree it [re]ads: ‘Behold I am against [thee.]’

The Pharisaic Jewish opponents of Jannaeus called on the help of the Greek Seleucid king Demetrius III to overthrow Jannaeus. Following this victory by Demetrius, many of the rebels changed their minds and returned their allegiance to Jannaeus. Subsequently, Jannaeus was able to defeat Demetrius. According to Josephus, Jannaeus then took revenge on eight hundred of these rebel Judeans with death by crucifixion. It appears that the account in 4Q169 corroborates this crucifixion narrative.¹⁶⁰ Once it is agreed that the Lion of Wrath represents Alexander Jannaeus, the historical identity of other figures in the text may also fall into place. If the Lion of Wrath is Jannaeus, then “Demetrius, king of Greece,” named in Frags. 3–4, 1, 2, must be Demetrius III Eucuerus, the Seleucid Greek ruler who reigned from 94–88 BCE. These two references begin to determine a time frame for the composition of 4Q169.

The identification of certain sectarian groups in relation to other historical allusions also assist in determining the dating of 4Q169. For example, the reference in Frags. 3–4, 1, 2 to the “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” (דורשי החלקות)

¹⁵⁹ Allegro, “Further Light,” 92.

¹⁶⁰ See Josephus, *Ant.* 13.372–83. The matching of the 4Q169 narrative with the historical event between Demetrius III and Alexander Jannaeus is described succinctly by Allegro in his original publication on 4Q169, Allegro, “Further Light,” 92; also, Hanan Eshel devotes a chapter to describing the conflict and identifying the key figures of 4Q169, as well as some of the opposing views to this theory, see Ch. 6 “The Pharisees’ Conflict with Alexander Jannaeus and Demetrius’ Invasion of Judaea,” in Hanan Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*, SDSS (Grand Rapids, MI; Jerusalem, Israel: Eerdmans; Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2008), 117–31; finally, John Collins also identifies Demetrius III and Alexander Jannaeus as the figures involved in this *pešer*, and describes the narrative’s purpose from the lens of sectarian “prophetic” fulfillment, see John J. Collins, “Prophecy and History in the Pesharim,” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Mladen Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 209–26.

is perceived as an allusion to the Pharisees:¹⁶¹ “Its interpretation [of Nah 2:12] concerns Deme]trius, king of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem by the counsel of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.” These Seekers are the Pharisaic Jews who entreated the help of Demetrius III in order to overthrow Jannaeus, a Hasmonean member backed by the Sadducees. It is also suggested that the Pharisee Seekers-after-Smooth-Things are equated with “the city of Ephraim,” according to Frags. 3–4, II, 2: “it is the city of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things at the end of days, who in ‘lies’ and falsehood[s] conduct themselves.”¹⁶² Thus the city of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, and the Pharisees are all one and the same. In such a case, “Ephraim” does not represent “genealogical non-Judahites” and “the geographical area inhabited by them,” but rather denotes the Pharisees as a “particular group of opponents,” according to Shani Berrin.¹⁶³ John Collins suggests that Frags. 3–4, IV, 5–6, in which the cup of “the wicked ones of Ephraim” comes after “Manasseh,” refers to “the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 BCE.”¹⁶⁴ In 63 BCE Pompey entered Jerusalem after John Hyrcanus II opened the city gates. After three months of siege, Pompey then entered the Temple and the holy of holies. Hyrcanus was to govern Judea, under Roman control. Because Hyrcanus’s mother Salome Alexandra had befriended the Pharisees, the Pharisees come to be equated to Hyrcanus, who is affiliated with the Roman Pompey. In this fashion, the “Pharisees” as “wicked ones of Ephraim” capture Jerusalem, and the text could describe this historical event. Collins suggests that some of these “prophecies” are “*ex eventu*” and are already an event in the past.¹⁶⁵ This information would answer the question regarding when the text was composed, and provide a date certainly sometime after Jannaeus’s rule of 103–76 BCE, and also likely

161 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 213.

162 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 214.

163 Berrin, *The Peshet Nahum Scroll*, 27. A different theory exists, forwarded by Gregory Doudna, which is that “Ephraim” actually represents “Israel” and “the expected victim.” In such a case, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things would also have to be “Israel” and not the Pharisees who gave advice to Demetrius, according to the narrative of Frags. 3–4, I, 2–3. According to Doudna, “there is nothing in the language itself of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in 4QpNah or in any other Qumran text that calls for a Pharisee identification.” Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Peshet Nahum: A Critical Edition*, JSPSup 35 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 656, see also 29. Based on the narrative conclusion, the more specific identifier of “Pharisees” is preferred.

164 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 215. “Manasseh” has often been considered to represent “Sadducees,” who might represent the Jerusalem Temple in this case, even if it was technically under Hasmonean control. On “Manasseh” representing the Sadducees, see for example Eshel, *Hasmonean State*.

165 Collins, “Prophecy and History,” 215.

after the siege of 63 BCE. A mid-first century BCE dating for 4Q169 fits within the dating for the height of the sectarian movement.

With regard to the question of 4Q169's provenance and any possible relationship with either the D or S traditions, an answer is fairly clear. Collins suggests that the *peshtarim*, with their already partially fulfilled prophecies, are intended to "reassure the members of the יחד that history was unfolding as had been foretold by the prophets, and that they would be vindicated in the not too distant future."¹⁶⁶ Collins's reference to the יחד is suggestive that there is a relationship between the *peshtarim* and the S movement. This suggestion relies on the fact that over fifty references to the noun "Community" (יחד) exist in 1QS, signifying a special connection between that word and the movement behind the S text tradition. And, while the term יחד does not appear in 4Q169 pNah specifically, it does appear in four other *peshtarim*, namely the following: 1Q14 Peshier Micah Frags. 8–10, 8 ("in the Council of the Community," בעצת (ה)יחד); 4Q164 Peshier Isaiah^d Frag. 1, I, 2 ("the Council of the Community," את (עצת) היחד); 4Q171 Peshier Psalms^a 11, 15 ("in the Council of the Community," בעצת היחד) and IV, 19 ("the Congregation of the Community," עדת היחד); and 1Q Peshier Habakkuk XII, 4 ("the Council of the Community," עצת היחד).¹⁶⁷ 4Q169 most likely connects to the יחד and S tradition by means of the indirect connection in genre to these other *peshtarim* which do contain the term, extant within the manuscript remains.

One question does remain, which is to consider why members of the sectarian movement, who did not care for the Pharisees, would write such a narrative. On the other hand, no sympathetic view is offered toward the Pharisee "Seekers-after-Smooth-Things." Allegro observes: "It is interesting to note that this *pešer* betrays no sympathy with the rebellious Pharisees who called in the foreigner, any more than with the Lion of Wrath himself."¹⁶⁸ It is possible that members of the S tradition composed this text partially as proof of their superiority over the Pharisees and to explain the sinful behaviours that will surely bring about continued future calamities.

2.3.3.2 4Q174 Florilegium Frag. 1, I, 1–4

1 [...] סד אויב [... ולוא יוסי]ף בן עולה [לענות]י כאשר בראישונה ולמן היום
 2 אשר
 2 [צויתי שפטים]על עמי ישראל הוואה הבית אשר [...] ל [...]ב[אחרית הימים
 כאשר כתוב בספר

¹⁶⁶ Collins, "Prophecy and History," 211.

¹⁶⁷ To this list Eyal Regev also adds 4Q174 and 4Q177 Catena A. Regev, "יחד," *ThWQ* 2: 121–130.

¹⁶⁸ Allegro, "Further Light," 92.

3 [. . .] מִקְדַּשׁ אֲדָנִי כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה יִמְלֹךְ עוֹלָם וְעַד הוּא הַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָבוֹא
שְׂמָה
4 [. . .] עַד¹⁶⁹ [עוֹלָם וְעַמּוֹנִי וְמוֹאָבִי וּמְזוֹר וּבֶן נָכָר וְגַר עַד עוֹלָם כִּי אֲדוֹשִׁי
שָׁם¹⁷⁰

- 1 [...] enemy [...] ‘And] the son of wickedness [shall no more afflict] him as at first, and as from the day that
- 2 [I commanded judges] (to be) over my people Israel’—that is the house which [...] in] the end of days, as it is written in the book of
- 3 [...] ‘The sanctuary, O Lord, which] thy hands have [es]tablished. YHWH will rule for ever and ever.’ That is the house ‘where there shall never more enter
- 4 [...] and the ‘Ammonite and the Moabite’ and ‘bastard’ and ‘foreigner’¹⁷¹ and *gēr* ‘for ever’, for my holy ones are there.

169 Elisha Qimron reconstructs [אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר בְּבָשָׁר] [שְׂרָו מִים] at the beginning of line 4, adding “a man with a blemish in the flesh” to the list of excluded individuals. However, the photographs from The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library show that the first word visible at the edge of the fragment is עוֹלָם and anything prior to that is speculation. See Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:289; and, The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, 4Q174 photographs, especially “B-496226”; “B-499655”; and “B-499656,” deadseascrolls.org.il.

170 Some discrepancy exists concerning line 4’s final phrase, which Allegro transcribes and reads as קְדוּשֵׁי שָׁם (“my holy ones are there”). The passage has also been transcribed and read as קְדוּשׁוֹ שָׁם (“his holy ones are there”), for example according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar, in addition to Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:289. In this case, a reading of a *vav* is suggested instead of the *yod*, implying a third person m. s. suffix instead of first person, effectively making YHWH a third person referent instead of a first person speaker. The present study agrees with the reading of Allegro, as the vertical stroke of the *yod* is indeed shorter than that of the *vav*, according to photograph B-499656 in The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library. Finally, a transcription of קְדוּשֵׁי שָׁם has been suggested by Katell Berthelot, but with a reading of “saints of the name.” In this case, the *yod* signifies a *tsere-yod* m. pl. construct ending, and one would point שָׁם (“name”) instead of שָׁם (“there”). Berthelot looks to אֲנֹשֵׁי הַשָּׁם as an indicator, as found in 1QSa 11, 2, 8 and 11, as well as in 1QM 11, 6. Regardless of how one chooses to transcribe and translate the passage however, it remains clear that the listed figures are excluded because they are not holy, while whomever resides in the “house” is holy. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I*, 53–4; Martínez and Tigchelaar, 2 vols., 352–3; Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:289; Berthelot, “La notion de גַּר,” 204–5.

171 The present study has chosen one alternative term in the translation: a “foreigner” is used to describe the נָכָר, instead of Allegro’s translation “alien,” which could be confused with the actual גַּר.

How does the *gēr* fit into 4Q174 Flor, a text described by Allegro as an eschatological work that performs midrash on several scriptural passages?¹⁷² George Brooke suggests that 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 1–4 refers to an eschatological sanctuary to which there is limited access.¹⁷³ 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 6 refers to a מקדש אדם (“a sanctuary of men”), which Brooke and others understand to be not an actual Temple building, but rather a “construction” of a group of people, an actual “sanctuary of men.”¹⁷⁴ The sanctuary, could, however, also represent an actual eschatological Temple.¹⁷⁵ Either way, Frag. 1, 1, 4 identifies those who should never be permitted to enter the sanctuary (described in line 3 as הַבַּיִת, “the house”): וְעַמּוּנֵי וּמוֹאבִי וּמִזְמוֹר וּבֶן נֶכֶר וְגַר עַד עוֹלָם כִּי אֵין קְדוּשֵׁי שָׁם, “and the ‘Ammonite and the Moabite’ and ‘bastard’ and ‘foreigner’ and *gēr* ‘for ever’, for my holy ones are there.” Among those excluded persons is the *gēr*.

To understand the eschatological nature of the document may help in determining the original date of composition of 4Q174. 4Q174’s end-time has a specific messianic expectation of the Davidic line restored, due to the citation from 2 Sam 7:10–14, in which YHWH prophesies through Nathan that David’s royal throne shall be established forever. The repeated use of the term “last days” (אַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים), appearing in Frag. 1, 1, lines 2, 12, 15, and 19, furthermore enhances the work’s concern with “the re-establishment of the House of David in the last days.”¹⁷⁶ Davidic messianism could be dated to either a later second or general first century BCE dissatisfaction with the Hasmoneans (per Collins), or more specifically to a later date within the same century (post 37 BCE, per

172 John M. Allegro, “Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim,” *JBL* 77 (1958): 350.

173 George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 136, 179.

174 Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law*, SJLA 24 (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 82; Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 136, 187. Brooke concludes that “the threefold description of the sanctuary describes its exclusive nature, the fact that it will not be desolated and that, proleptically, God constitutes it of men whose works of thanksgiving are the smoke-sacrifices of the sanctuary,” 187.

175 Joseph Baumgarten subsequently changes his mind (see previous note). Instead of the sanctuary in 4Q174 representing “the purified community of the latter days, rather than the Temple,” Baumgarten later suggests that “we must allow for the co-ordination of Qumran communal ideology with actual Temple regulations.” Baumgarten suggests that the sectarian movement is adding “impediments on the entrance of *gērīm* into the Temple precincts,” to stand in opposition to contemporary Temple practices which did not. Baumgarten considers *gērīm* to be proselytes (converts). Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa 1,” *JJS* 33.1–2 (1982): 216–17.

176 John M. Allegro, “Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature,” *JBL* 75 (1956): 176. Specifically, the theme concerning the end-time rise of the Davidic Kingdom may be observed in 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, lines 10–13.

Brooke).¹⁷⁷ The text itself is written in a Herodian script and can be dated to the end of the 1st century BCE or as late as the mid-first century CE.¹⁷⁸ The previously observed similarity between the handwriting of 4Q174 and that of 4Q159 Ordinances^a, which was found to date in the second half of the first century BCE,¹⁷⁹ suggests a time period within the later first century BCE.

Finally, what can be said regarding provenance and any possible relationship between 4Q174 and either of the two primary rule traditions of D and S? Allegro has observed links to both. For example, the phrase in 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 14 regarding “those who turn aside from the way” (סרי מדרך) can be found in various related, although never identical, forms in CD I, 13; II, 6; VIII, 4, 16; XIX 17, 29; 1QS IX, 20; and X, 21.¹⁸⁰ It is likely that 4Q174 borrowed the wording from either the D or S rule documents. Regarding the possibility of a specific connection to D, George Brooke has argued that 4Q174 is dependent upon CD III, 12b–VIII, 20, based on a number of parallels concerning content.¹⁸¹ For example, identical scriptural references are found in both texts: Amos 9:11 appears in CD VII, 16 and 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 12, and Isa 8:11 appears in CD VIII, 16 and 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 15. As another example, the phrase discussed above “last days” (translated by Brooke as “the latter days”) is found in CD IV, 4 and VI, 11.

However, although these examples noted by Brooke are convincing regarding certain textual dependency upon an excerpt of CD, some shared terminology between CD and 4Q174 observed by Brooke does not indicate a strict correlation of 4Q174 to the D tradition. For example, references to the sons of Zadok (in CD IV, 3–4 and 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 17–19) and to Belial (in CD IV, 13–18 and 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 7–9) also occur in 1QS (e.g. sons of Zadok in 1QS V, 2, 9; IX, 10–11; Belial in 1QS I, 24; II, 5, 19; X, 21). In particular, the occurrence of the *gēr* in both CD (VI, 21; XIV, 4, 6) and 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 4 does not suggest a connection between 4Q174 and the D tradition, despite the *gēr*'s absence from S. As was evident in 4Q169, a *gēr* was included in the text, but a greater correlation was found to exist with S. Altogether, despite usage of D, 4Q174 seems to correlate more closely with S in its sentiment. The sheer level of Temple exclusion indicates a

177 See Section 2.2.1 of the present chapter for an outline of Brooke's theory regarding a Davidic messianism relating to a time within Herod's reign.

178 Brooke provides an overview concerning the history of scholarship on the dating of the text based primarily on paleographical grounds, Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 83–84.

179 See the section on 4Q159 in the present chapter, Section 2.3.2.4. A similarity in handwriting between 4Q159 and 4Q174 need not upset the present conclusion that 4Q159 correlates with the tradition of D and 4Q174 with that of S (see below). The present chapter has already observed that the traditions of D and S progressed simultaneously and likely borrowed one from the other.

180 Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I*, 55; see also Allegro, “Fragments,” 353.

181 For the argument by Brooke, see *Exegesis at Qumran*, 205–209.

high level of social closure. While indeed the *gēr* is ranked last in CD XIV, he is still included, nevertheless. CD and 4Q174 seem to be in contradiction on that matter. And finally, the fact that 4Q174 also contains a reference לעצת היחד (“to the Council of the Community”) in Frag. 1, I, 17,¹⁸² suggests a closer relationship to the S tradition of the sectarian movement, rather than the group behind the D manuscripts.

2.3.4 Texts Correlated with the Sectarian Movement: Alignment with Damascus (D) or Serekh (S) Tradition Indeterminate

2.3.4.1 4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple Frag. 1

]ע[1
]יאוכל[י[2
]לתע[]מו[3
]מו[תמיד לכול[4
] [5
 יהיה כול הגר הנש[אר] 6
]אתישראל בגו[ים]ל[7
]עד ת[ר[8

1]' []
 2].ry[]he will eat[
 3]mw. tm[]lt'. []
 4]mw continually for all[
 5 [] vacat []
 6 yhyh any *hgēr* who remain[ns] (?)
 7 Israel among the nati[ons] for[]
 8 until t. r. []

4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple Frag. 1, 6, contains the phrase יהיה כול הגר הנש[אר] for which Timothy Lim suggests the following translation: “yhyh any *hgēr* who remain[ns] (?)”¹⁸³ If the first word may be regarded as complete, then it could be read as the 3ms imperfect of the verb יהיה, “to be.” In that case, the phrase would translate as “and it shall be that any *gēr* who remains.” Certainly

182 Allegro translates this phrase in the following fashion: “to the counsel of the community.” He is using the term in a non proper-noun sense.

183 Timothy H. Lim, “4QText Mentioning Temple,” in *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI, Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, ed. Stephen J. Pfann and Philip Alexander, DJD 36 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 255.

the reference to the *gēr* is quite clear, as evident on photographs from The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library.¹⁸⁴

Regarding establishing a date of composition for 4Q307, all that can be said is that the scribe wrote using a Hasmonean or early Herodian hand, suggesting a manuscript date sometime from within the later second century and throughout the first century BCE.¹⁸⁵

Concerning provenance, the word “all” (כול) exhibits the *plene* spelling identified by Tov as one of the markers of the special Qumran writing system, suggesting a connection between 4Q307 and the sectarian movement.¹⁸⁶ The fragmentary nature of the text makes any definitive correlation of 4Q307 with D or S traditions more difficult, however. Discerning a connection to the D or S traditions is made especially difficult since Lim observes that while the fragments are “all written in the same script and on the same skin,” it is still not certain whether they all pertain to one manuscript.¹⁸⁷ For that reason one can only look for thematic suggestions within the fragment at hand. Therefore while it seems that 4Q307 has a connection to the sectarian movement overall, a definite alignment between 4Q307 and the tradition of either D or S cannot be determined.

2.3.4.2 4Q498 Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments Frag. 7

]ה לִגִּיר[1
]וֹסִ[2

1]h to the *gēr* [
2]y.[

Among the total fragments of the document identified by Maurice Baillet as 4Q498 papSap/Hymn,¹⁸⁸ Fragment 7 refers to a לִגִּיר, concerning which Baillet considers both the *yod* and the *resh* to be uncertain.¹⁸⁹ He does not explain

184 See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, 4Q307 photographs, “B-295741” and “B-295175,” deadseascrolls.org.il.

185 Lim, “4QText Mentioning Temple,” 255.

186 In Tov’s table listing particular vocabulary words using Qumran spelling, כּוֹל is the first column identified. Tov, “Orthography and Language,” 50.

187 Lim, “4QText Mentioning Temple,” 255.

188 Maurice Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4:III (4Q482–4Q520)*, DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 73–74.

189 It should be noted that within The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, this fragment is listed as Fragment 8 in 4Q498 photographs, “B-499154” and “B-499155,” deadseascrolls.org.il.

his rationale for defining these letters as such. Having had the opportunity to look at the document itself, the present study concludes that all *vavs* and *yods* within the various fragments of 4Q498 are identical in appearance, which likely explains Baillet's hesitancy to firmly suggest one or the other, even though the letter itself is clear.¹⁹⁰ Looking at the *resh*, the fragment ends very abruptly at the edge of the letter, leaving its left-hand edge not fully in view, leading one to agree with Baillet that the letter is not entirely certain. The *lamed* and *gimel* are quite clear, however. The last letter of a word preceding the proposed לגיר, marked as an uncertain *he* by Baillet, is difficult to distinguish between either a *he* or a *khet*, but is clearly one of the two. Nevertheless, based on the relative clarity of the plate itself, and also the subsequent relationship to be discussed in Chapter 3 that links the לגיר of Frag. 7 to the לְגַר of Deut 26:12, it is safe to proceed with Baillet's text reconstruction.

What can be said concerning the dating and provenance of this fragment and work behind it? The fragments use a Herodian style, suggesting a turn-of-the-first-century CE dating. Baillet suggests לגיר as a *plene* spelling for לגר, citing as predecessors the *plene* spelling of וגירך from Deut 5:14 in 8Q3, along with הגיר from a Samaritan manuscript of Deut 10:19.¹⁹¹ The feature of *plene* spelling is once more reminiscent of Tov's Qumran scribal practice. 4Q498, through its use of *plene* spelling, may be correlated with the sectarian movement. Unfortunately no other conclusions can be drawn from the other fragments for thematic links, since Baillet observes that it is not certain whether all of the fragments are from one manuscript.¹⁹² The connection to the movement as a whole seems likely; but any connection to the D or S traditions is unknown.

2.3.4.3 4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back Frag. 45

] סרי [1
]ן אוד' [2
] הגרים עזו' [3
] ס'מיהם ל' [4

190 Thank-you to the Israel Antiquities Authority, to a grant from The Canadian Friends of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and to Professor Sarianna Metso for the opportunity to study 4Q498 at the Scroller in person in August 2012.

191 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 74. 8Q3 is a phylactery containing portions of Exodus 12, 13, and 20; and Deuteronomy 5, 6, 10, and 11. According to M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, the scribal handwriting appears to date from the first century CE. See Baillet, Milik, and de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes'*, 149–57, esp. 154–55.

192 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 73.

- 1] .ry [
- 2] n' wd [
- 3] the *gērîm* 'zw [
- 4] their ... [

4Q520 papUnclassified frags. (verso) consist of forty-five fragments which, while all originally contained writing on both sides, now conserve only the text on one side (the *verso*). Fragment 45 is the text of interest, in which the third line contains the key word הגרים, followed by the partially cut-off word]עזי. Having had opportunity to study the plate, the firm reading of גרים can be confirmed.¹⁹³ With regard to the definite article that Baillet suggests at the beginning of the word, only the left horizontal stroke of the letter *he* is available to the naked eye. The present study concludes that הגרים represents הגְרִים (the *gērîm*), as in 1 Ch 22:2, or even הגְרִים (“the ones who are sojourning,” also sometimes understood as “the resident aliens”), as in Lev 25:6; Lev 25:45; and Ezek 47:22, but not הגְרִים (“the Hagrites”), of Psalm 83:7.¹⁹⁴ The proper noun “Hagrites” occurs three times with an *aleph* (ההגְרִיאים or ההגְרִאים) as found in 1 Chr 5:10; 5:19; and 5:20, and only occurs once without the *aleph*, in the Psalm 83:7 passage listed above. An absence of *aleph* in הגרים of line 3 makes this option of the proper name unlikely. With regard to Baillet’s proposed letters *ayin*, *zayin*, and *vav* for the partial word following הגרים, the letter designated as *vav* could instead be a final *nun*.¹⁹⁵ The *ayin* and *zayin* are clear, however. Remaining unaware of any word עזי, the third letter more likely represents a *vav*, as proposed.

Concerning the provenance and dating of 4Q520, one observes *plene* spelling in בכול, located in Frag. 1, 2, suggesting an overall relationship between 4Q520 and the sectarian movement. Beyond that, charting specific ties to the traditions of D or S is made difficult by the fragmentary nature of the text. Baillet suggests that certain fragments from within those designated as 4Q520 might belong to other of the published fragments of DJD III.¹⁹⁶ This information could instruct regarding the dating and provenance of 4Q520 Frag. 45, since Baillet offers no individual assessment of 4Q520 itself on those matters. Qumran fragmentary manuscripts 4Q496; 4Q497; 4Q506; and 4Q512 are all

193 Thank-you to the Israel Antiquities Authority, to a grant from The Canadian Friends of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and to Professor Sarianna Metso for the opportunity to study 4Q520 at the Scroller in person in August 2012. The word is also visible on The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, 4Q520 photographs, “B-285436,” deadseascrolls.org.il.

194 Each of these options has been proposed by Baillet. See Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 312.

195 Thank-you to Chad Stauber for making this observation while studying the plate.

196 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 309.

listed as possible manuscripts to which certain of the 4Q520 fragments might belong.¹⁹⁷ Baillet does not give a rationale for these possible redesignations. However, if Baillet suggests that certain fragments from among 4Q520 and these other manuscript fragments could belong together, then whatever physical observations Baillet makes regarding those other manuscript fragments may also apply to 4Q520. Therefore, a brief consideration of these four other manuscripts may provide results concerning the provenance and dating of 4Q520. The consideration of these other manuscripts will not confirm that any 4Q520 fragments actually belong elsewhere; rather, the comparison is solely for the purpose of discerning the dating and provenance of 4Q520.

Baillet has made observations concerning the dating or provenance for each of the manuscripts 4Q496; 4Q497; 4Q506; and 4Q512. The first in the list, 4Q496 War Scroll papM^f, like 4Q520, is written on the *verso* of a papyrus.¹⁹⁸ The *recto* originally contained liturgical prayers; subsequently, the scroll was then reused by two other scribes who wrote on the *verso*, first a part of the War Scroll and then 4Q506 Words of the Luminaries.¹⁹⁹ The War Scroll component is written in a pre-Herodian hand, likely prior to 50 BCE. The scribal hand that wrote the second fragmentary work under consideration, 4Q506 Words of the Luminaries papDibHam^c, Baillet considers “quite evolved” and may date to the middle of the first century CE.²⁰⁰ The third fragmentary work, 4Q497 papWar Scroll-like Text A,²⁰¹ is published on the *verso* of the hymn or prayer fragments of 4Q499. Baillet dates the handwriting on the *verso* of this papyrus to approximately 50 BCE. The fourth and final work to mention is 4Q512 Purification Ritual B. It is the *verso* of the papyrus upon whose *recto*, written by a different hand, is 4Q503 Daily Prayers.²⁰² Baillet considers the handwriting of 4Q512 to consist of a Hasmonean calligraphy that dates to the beginning of the first century BCE.²⁰³

Comparing 4Q520 to the findings from these other four texts offers clues concerning the manuscript’s provenance and dating. One can assume that in suggesting a connection between 4Q520 and these other four manuscripts, Baillet also would date 4Q520, at least in terms of the manuscript date if not the actual original composition of the work, somewhere between roughly the mid-first century BCE to the mid-first century CE. A connection to the sectarian

197 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 309–11.

198 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 56–57. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.

199 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 57.

200 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 170.

201 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 69.

202 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 262.

203 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 262.

movement seems possible due to *plene* spelling in Fragment 1 and the sectarian nature of the other manuscripts compared, but a specific connection between 4Q520 and either the D or S traditions is impossible to discern.

2.4 Chapter Conclusions

The present study confirms the notion that there is a sectarian movement associated with the DSS located at Qumran, and that two primary traditions, correlated with the two primary rules of D and S, exist within this movement. The study determined not to associate this movement with the “Essenes” or other established sectarian groups, but instead to study the scrolls that employ the *gēr* using scriptural rewriting to see whether they would fit within the parameters of the movement overall, since not every manuscript is guaranteed to associate directly with this sectarian “Teacher’s movement.” Furthermore, the study determined to examine the scrolls that employ the *gēr* to see whether they would fit within the parameters of either the D or S traditions specifically. This chapter has performed that task.

The term *gēr*, while often partly corrupted, was confirmed in each case as the noun in question, located in either singular or plural forms, and sometimes with a definite article or other preposition or article attached. Furthermore, each text was confirmed to correlate with the sectarian movement, apart from one case (4Q423) whereby the text seems to serve as an early influencer for both the D and S traditions, and appears to precede the formative period of the movement. Concerning the remaining texts, correlations for the most part were established with either the D (Damascus) or S (Serekh) traditions, although in three cases a clear choice in correlation with either the D or S traditions remains indeterminate. What follows is a summary of the provenance and dating for the texts. Where thematic, historical, and literary allusions or clues allow, a date of composition is posited, and, failing that, the dates of the manuscripts are provided:

4QInstruction^g appears to precede and serve as an early influencer for both D and S, and its composition dates to second century BCE within a Hasmonean era time frame.

The **Damascus Document** belongs to the sectarian movement, whose formation was in the late second century BCE and whose “high tide” rests in the first century BCE. The textual overlaps are very close and assure the present study that the 4QD and 6QD fragments of interest match the readings of CD which include the term *gēr*.

Temple Scroll is composed between 119–104 BCE and correlates with the “formative D” tradition.

4Q377 Apocryphal Pentateuch B as a manuscript dates between 100–150 BCE and correlates with the D tradition.

4Q159 Ordinances^a when compared against other manuscripts, dates between 63 BCE and 37 BCE (i.e. mid-first century BCE) and correlates with the D tradition.

4Q279 Four Lots is composed in the later first century BCE, (i.e. post 30 BCE), and correlates with the D tradition.

4Q169 Nahum Peshier is composed post 63 BCE (i.e. mid-first century BCE) and correlates with the S tradition.

4Q174 Florilegium may be composed (when combining thematic clues alongside of the manuscript date) in the later first century BCE (post 37 BCE) and correlates with the S tradition.

4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple as a manuscript dates to the later second or first century BCE, and correlates with the sectarian movement. Specific connections to either the D or S traditions cannot be discerned.

4Q498 Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments as a (possible) manuscript is Herodian, dating between the mid-first century BCE to the mid-first century CE, and correlates with the sectarian movement. Specific connections to either the D or S traditions cannot be discerned.

4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back dates between the mid-first century BCE to the mid-first century CE, through a comparison of these fragments to other manuscripts. 4Q520 possibly correlates with the sectarian movement. Specific connections to either the D or S traditions cannot be discerned.

In this quest to determine the meaning of the *gēr* within the DSS, the next chapter studies the manner in which the *gēr* employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS changes between these occasions of scriptural rewriting, and scripture in the MT of the Hebrew Bible.

A Textual Study of the *Gēr* in the Dead Sea Scrolls

This study has undertaken an examination of the *gēr* within the DSS with the aim of discovering whether the term within the sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS represents a meaning of a “resident alien,” a “Gentile convert to Judaism,” or even something else. Discovering a meaning for the term within the context of the DSS will reveal the extent of Hellenistic influence and ethnic mutability on the sectarian movement as a group integral to understanding late Second Temple Judaism. The term *gēr* has been chosen for this study precisely because it has served as a proven indicator in the past within scriptural tradition to denote this shift in meaning from resident alien to convert.

The study began in Chapter 2 with the preliminary task of studying each occasion where the *gēr* is employed within scriptural rewriting the DSS. The texts in which the term was found were assessed to see whether they fit within the time frame of the sectarian movement overall, and to see whether they correlated with either of the two primary Damascus (D) or Serekh (S) traditions of the movement. The chapter also verified the reading of the term *gēr* itself within what are often fragmentary textual remains.

Chapter 3 now analyzes the occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS to compare the rewritten texts against identifiable scriptural predecessors. Occasionally, comparisons are also made where appropriate between the DSS that employ the term *gēr* and other scrolls. On this textual and literary level, the purpose of the chapter is to discern how the term *gēr* may change between textual interpretations. The chapter’s working method is to look for scriptural rewriting, that is, the recognizable reuse of scripture, that will highlight changes made to a text or idea over time. These changes may reflect sociohistorical perspectives at the time of the text’s rewriting, just as the changes previously noted surrounding the term *gēr* within scriptural tradition highlighted a change in meaning from “resident alien” to “convert.” Based on these literary findings, preliminary observations are made concerning the meaning of the *gēr* in each text. The chapter will discover that whether or not the *gēr* is included in the community behind the text, the manner in which the *gēr* changes between scriptural rewriting and textual predecessor indicates in general that this figure is a Judean convert. Shared kinship is the strongest feature prevalent; the feature of connection to land is also prevalent and often signals the shared kinship. Certain differences

in attitude toward the *gēr* will be noted between the texts that correlate with the D and S traditions.

As a manner of proceeding, the chapter analyzes the text in the immediate proximity to the references to the *gēr*, whether that includes a few lines, or the fragment or column. In a few cases, the manuscript is very fragmentary and prior research concerning scriptural predecessors is slim. In these cases, the fragments, or selected fragments, are analyzed more expansively to discover any overarching themes that may uncover the character of the *gēr* used in the text. Sometimes a scriptural predecessor will be observed by drawing upon short phrases or even one unique verbal form. Often various phrases or allusions from scripture seem to be collated together. To demonstrate definitively whether a scribe purposefully collated various texts or not would be a challenge, but readers who are left with a number of fragments to consider can only work with the left over “remains of events” and see what new collage is created. In so doing, the present work borrows from the anthropological theory of bricolage, developed by Claude Lévi-Strauss.¹ The “bricoleur,” according to Lévi-Strauss, works with “whatever is at hand” within a closed universe of instruments.² Items, or “events,” are saved which “may come in handy,” but each saved event does not have only one definite and determinate use.³ Thus the risk exists that using this process of looking to both the literal and figurative “remains” of texts (and in so doing relating them to scripture) may not always prove that a scribe had these same passages in mind as a predecessor. However, it has been demonstrated elsewhere in DSS research that scribes do seem to collate prior texts, even likely from memory.⁴ Thus the method of bricolage will be used where required, in the hope of identifying changes to texts

1 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind*, *La pensée sauvage*. English edition. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966), 30.

2 Lévi-Strauss, *Savage Mind*, 17.

3 Lévi-Strauss, *Savage Mind*, 18.

4 Aharon Shemesh looks to the Penal Code example of 1QS VII, 12–16 where he determines that seemingly unrelated regulations (walking naked, spitting, showing oneself, guffawing) are actually based on an interpretation of Deut 23:11–15, namely that nothing unseemly should be seen. Shemesh concludes that various scriptural verses will generate units of law within texts of the sectarian movement. Shemesh argues that “the authors of the scrolls memorized the biblical text and could recall it at will,” and that scripture served as a “natural framework” upon which to arrange material of the sectarian movement. While Shemesh is referring to legal material specifically, this same idea could be applied to other texts of the movement. Aharon Shemesh, “Biblical Exegesis and Interpretations from Qumran to the Rabbis,” in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, ed. Matthias Henze (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012), 484–6 (citation from 486).

indicated by the methods of scribal manipulation, such as additions, confluations, omissions, or substitutions.

Finally, discussion of the texts will occur in the same order as in Chapter 2, according to the established (or indeterminate) correlations with either the D or S traditions, in addition to their chronological date of composition within those categories. References are made to the relevant sections in Chapter 2 to find the text and translations.

3.1 A Text That Influences Damascus (D) and Serekh (S) Traditions: 4Q423 Instruction^s Frag. 5, 1–4

4Q423 Instruction^s Fragment 5 (text and translation in Section 2.3.1), in which the term *gēr* has been employed, describes in line 3 that “[h]e divided the [p]ortion of all rulers.” In 4QInstruction, the word “portion (lit. inheritance, נחלה)” is related to the “lot (גורל)” and its role in predestined inheritance. Elsewhere in 4QInstruction, 4Q418 Frag. 81, 4–5 discusses each person’s portion (איש נחלתו) in relation to casting lots (הפיל גורלכה). Armin Lange argues that 4QInstruction, alongside of the Hebrew Bible and other texts within early Judaism (e.g. Isa 34:17; 1QS IV, 26; 1QH^a XI, 23; XV, 37; 1QM XI, 9), use this motif as a metaphor of predestined fate. The casting of lots represents God’s use of the lot to determine the fate of humankind.⁵ In this fashion, inheritance and lots in 4Q423 Fragment 5 may relate to a notion of predestined inheritance, or lack thereof, of the mystery that is to come (רז נהיה). The preceding chapter outlined Torleif Elgvin’s theory that the “head of your fathers” and “leader of your people”—who are both presumably included in the subsequent reference to “all rulers”—are to be viewed as those contemporary leaders of Israel, who are not recipients of the mystery of existence.⁶ It appears that the entities of line 4, namely the fathers, sons, native born, and *gērîm*, are also included under this group of rulers. Even if not “rulers” themselves, these entities are certainly grouped among the rulers as blind followers of the Hasmoneans. These entities would thus also be among those who have had their נחלה divided. These

5 Armin Lange, “The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*, ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller, STDJ 35 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000), 39–48. Lange also observes that this metaphor was often related to inheritance and lots with respect to the distribution of land, as described in Joshua 13–19, see pp. 46 and 48.

6 Elgvin, “423. Instruction^s,” 519.

recipients of a predestined inheritance would nevertheless not be privy to the mystery that is to come for movement members, if Elgvin's interpretation is accurate. In other words, it appears that their predestined inheritance is not to receive of the mystery.

Allusions to Holiness Legislation (HL) also appear within 4Q423. The pairing of the *gēr* with the native born (אֲזָרָח) is a common feature throughout HL, such as Lev 17:15; 18:26; 19:34; 24:16; and 24:22. In a similar vein, Jan Joosten observes within HL pairings of the term *gēr* with other terms he deems to be synonymous to the אֲזָרָח native born, namely "Israelites" (lit. "the children of Israel" בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, e.g. Lev 17:12 and 20:2), as well as someone from the "house of Israel," בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, (e.g. Lev 17:8 and 17:10).⁷ Joosten suggests that the purpose of juxtaposing the *gēr* alongside any of these terms is to portray him as a foreigner resident alien as opposed to an אֲזָרָח native born Israelite or Judean. According to such an argument, feasibly 4Q423 could intend these HL-themed juxtapositions for this purpose of specifically defining the *gēr* as a resident alien. The scriptural allusions could signal a scriptural meaning that Joosten interprets to signify difference and not similarity.

By contrast, Katell Berthelot points out that the pairing in 4Q423 can also suggest, as she argues it does in HL, that the *gēr* and the native born are both equal before the Torah, and that the *gēr* is a part of Israel in some way.⁸ This perspective of equality before the law is apparent in these same HL passages that pair the *gēr* with any of the synonymous entities of native born, Israelite, or member from the house of Israel. Disobeying the law may lead to any of these entities of native born, Israelite, member from the house of Israel, or *gēr*, to be just as equally "cut" (בָּרַת) from the congregation or from YHWH's people, as in Exod 12:19; Lev 17:10; and Num 15:30. The resulting implication is that in some way the *gēr* and the native born are both of this same congregation and YHWH's people. HL's juxtaposition of the *gēr* with the native born seems much better intended to represent legal (cultic) equality between the native born and *gēr*, than Joosten's theory regarding a purpose of highlighting difference. This concept of equality between the *gēr* and native born of HL does not imply that the *gēr* of the postexilic HL has somehow become a Judean. Rather, the HL argues that the land must remain holy, therefore all inhabitants of the land whether Judean or resident alien must follow holiness laws in order to remain in the land, as is stipulated in Lev 18:24–30.

Such an understanding behind the underlying text of HL lends a more open stance of equality toward the *gēr* in its reuse within 4Q423, in a manner that

⁷ Joosten, *People and Land*, 29–92.

⁸ Berthelot, "La notion de גֵּר," 179.

could now represent something even more than mere equality before the law. The combined notions of spiritual allotment which in 4Q423 seems also shared with the *gērîm*, along with the HL juxtaposition of equality between the *gēr* and the *ʿezrāh*, create a new outcome for the *gēr*. This *gēr* appears to be included beyond merely a non-Israelite who must follow cultic regulations.

In sum, within 4Q423 Frag. 5, 1–4 is a wisdom passage referring to God’s predestined inheritance for followers of (possibly) Hasmonians. Allusions to HL, such as those found in Exod 12:19; Lev 17:10 and Num 15:30, also emerge with 4Q423’s juxtaposition of the *gēr* with the *ʿezrāh*, both of whom shall be equally visited upon. Instead of a resident alien, it seems more likely that this *gēr* represents a Gentile convert to Judaism, being judged equally as an Israelite, even if these Israelites are not among those receiving the mystery.

As a text that appears to precede the D and S traditions proper, this manuscript of 4Q423 provides an early example whereby a *gēr* has demonstrated conversion, in this case by the fact that he can receive a spiritual “inheritance,” suggesting a change in kinship and mutable ethnicity. The example of 4Q423 lends credibility to a conversion status for subsequent use of the term *gēr* in scriptural rewriting correlated with the sectarian movement. The text 4Q423 was found to be an early influencer but not fall precisely within the time frame of the “Teacher’s movement,” correlated with the rule traditions of D and S. For that reason, this example will not be drawn into the collated textual assessment of Chapter 4. However, this example of a *gēr* employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS serves as a clear indicator of the *gēr*’s nature in the examples to come: the *gēr* is a Judean convert (whether accepted by the movement or not).

3.2 Texts Correlated with the Damascus (D) Tradition

3.2.1 CD VI, 14–VII, 1

This passage of CD VI, 14–VII, 1 (text and translation in Section 2.3.2.1.1) draws on scriptural language, evident in the references to widows (אלמנות), orphans (יתומים), the poor (עני), the needy (אביון), and of course the *gēr*. While scriptural predecessors have been suggested to include Lev 19:10; 23:22; Deut 14:29; 16:11, 14; 24:14; and 17–21,⁹ one must ask whether the influence appears more strongly oriented in its nature to Deuteronomy or to HL. Combined references to widows and orphans are rooted in Deuteronomy, as they do not exist together

⁹ Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 205. Donaldson identifies all listed examples apart from Deut 24:14.

in Leviticus or other HL material. One might thus consider Deuteronomy to be the motivating text. However, CD VI, 20–VII, 1 reads “to love each man his brother (אחיהו) 21 as himself, to support the poor, destitute, and *gēr*, *vacat* and to seek each man the peace of VII, 1 his brother (אחיהו).” Norbert Lohfink observes that it is only in HL, and not Deuteronomy, where one finds the poor and the *gēr* side by side.¹⁰ In the HL material, Lev 19:10 and 23:22 both describe leaving gleanings behind for the poor and for the *gēr*. Granted, Deut 24:14 seems to provide an exception, where one finds that both a brother (i.e., an Israelite) and a *gēr* (a resident alien) can fall within the economic category of poor and needy temporary labourers (שְׂכִיר עָנִי וְאֲבִיּוֹן).¹¹ In addition, Ezek 22:29 contains references to the poor, needy, and *gēr* existing in close proximity.¹² The stronger parallels for this passage are nevertheless those that draw from HL. The HL passage most likely rewritten in this CD excerpt is Leviticus Chapter 19. CD VI, 20–21’s stipulation “to love each man his brother 21 as himself” (לאהוב איש את) (אחיהו כמהו) is reminiscent of Lev 19:34’s stipulation that “the *gēr*, the one sojourning with you, you shall love him like yourself” (הַגֵּר הַגֵּר אִתְּכֶם וְאֹהֲבֵתָ לּוֹ כְּמוֹדֶךָ). If the text conjures the images of poor, needy, orphan, widow, and *gēr*, the reader could easily envision that the *gēr* of Lev 19:34 has been substituted for the brother of CD VI, 20–21. The memory of the *gēr* of Lev 19:34 conflates with the brother of CD VI, 20–21.

An additional HL passage is likely rewritten in CD VI, 20–VII, 1. The regulation in that passage is also reminiscent of Lev 19:18: “you shall love your neighbour/friend like yourself” (וְאֹהֲבֵתָ לְרֵעֶךָ כְּמוֹדֶךָ). Katell Berthelot makes an argument that both brother (אח) and friend or neighbour (רע) represent the Israelite brother within CD.¹³ Berthelot bases this argument on a parallel made between the reference in CD VIII, 6 concerning those who will receive God’s rage for “hating his neighbo[u]r [or friend]” (ושנוא איש את רעהו), and the command in Lev 19:17 that “You shall not hate your brother in your heart” (לֹא־תִשְׂנֵא לְאֶחָיו בְּלִבְבְּךָ), in which “brother” and “friend” appear interchangeable. The proposed outcome that the *gēr* and the brother have merged together as one within CD VI–VII need not change, even if, in the mind of a reader of CD, the

10 Lohfink, “Poverty in the Laws,” 44, 45, 48. According to Lohfink, Deuteronomy never correlates the widow, orphan, and alien with “being poor,” because as soon as someone is poor (Deut 15:11), the laws to protect from poverty (Deut 15:4) come into effect to ensure that there is no poverty. It is in this way that to Lohfink, Deuteronomy incites a utopian viewpoint.

11 Hamidović calls to mind Deut 24:14 as an example that includes the poor, the needy, and also the *gēr*, each of whom is in a precarious position. Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 268.

12 Berthelot, “La notion de גר,” 185.

13 Berthelot, “La notion de גר,” 189–90.

“brother” that he should love like himself calls to mind Lev 19:18’s reference to “love your friend/neighbor as yourself” instead of Lev 19:34’s command to “love the *gēr* as yourself.” It is possible the shift to “brother” in CD VI, 20 from either “friend” or “*gēr*” is intended to demonstrate that the categories described in CD VI, 21 of poor, needy, and *gēr* are still “brothers.” Berthelot points out that the figures of poor, needy, and *gēr* could still represent “brothers” as they are “situated between the command to love his brother like himself and that of seeking the peace of his brother.”¹⁴ Thus both Lev 19:34 and also Lev 19:18 serve as reasonable base texts, and in fact could be intended simultaneously.

In sum, CD VI, 14–VII, 1 draws on HL material of Lev 19:18 and 34. The *gēr* appears as a brother when held up to either of these HL passages. In either case, the characters of the *gēr* and the brother become one and the same. Memories of loving the brother and the *gēr* are conflated. The *gēr* of Lev 19:34 becomes the brother of CD VI, 20–21, and the *gēr* of CD VI, 21 becomes a brother also. The *gēr* is equivalent to a D movement “brother,” who is Israelite.

3.2.2 CD XIV, 3–6

CD XIV, 3–6 (text and translation in Section 2.3.2.1.2) lists twice—once for the enlistment and once for the subsequent inscription of member names—the hierarchical order for those who are included within the rule of the assembly of all the camps: the priests first; the Levites second; the children of Israel third; and the *gēr* fourth. Katell Berthelot draws on the possible influence of Deut 29:9–11 [Eng. 10–12]:

You stand assembled today, all of you, before the LORD your God—the heads of your tribes, your elders, and your officials, all the men of Israel, 11 your children, your women, and your *gēr* who is within your camps; for cutting your trees or for drawing your water—12 so that you will pass over into the covenant of the LORD your God.¹⁵

It is the combined aspects of the list which include the *gēr*, in the singular as in CD XIV, 4 and 6, along with the reference to camps as in CD XIV, 3, that make the Deuteronomy passage significant. The added fact that the listed members in Deut 29:9–10 are entering into a covenant with God is also significant if

14 Berthelot, “La notion de גַּר,” 191.

15 Berthelot, “La notion de גַּר,” 185. As a related observation, Cecilia Wassen suggests that Deut 29:10–12 also seems a close parallel to the initiation rite described in CD XV. Wassen, *Women*, 138. The possible relation to Deut 29:10–12 in CD XV strengthens the likelihood of the passage’s use also in CD XIV, since both columns are part of the Laws section of CD IX–XVI.

compared to the camp members described in CD XIV, 3–6. These camp members have likewise entered into some sort of association together, whereby they shall each “inquire about any (matter)” (CD XIV, 6). Berthelot highlights the important point that in both these textual examples, the *a priori* implication is that “the *gēr* is a part of the camps.”¹⁶

Regarding the fact that CD XIV, 3 refers to the “rule of the assembly of all the camps,” Berthelot turns to other passages in CD in which “camps” are referenced, citing in particular CD XIII, 20: “And this is the assembly of the camps for all the s[eed of Israel]” (וזה מושב המחנות לכל זרע ישראל).¹⁷ If the assembly of the camps is the seed of Israel, then in some fashion the *gēr* in CD is also a part of this seed of Israel. Berthelot posits that זרע must be understood in terms of “people” (עם) in this case, since the term in its scriptural sense can connote not only “seed” and “race” or “kinship,” but also a moral or religious category that has nothing to do with biology.¹⁸ Thus she selects זרע as “people” without implications of shared kinship insofar as the *gēr* is included within the people of Israel in a religious perspective (i.e., a perspective of common culture). However, depending on the manner in which one interprets the “brother” in CD XIV, 5, the possibility exists that this *gēr*, who is indeed included within the assembly of the camps, might be more than simply related to Israelites by common culture alone.

If one interprets the phrase איש אחר אחיהו in solely a technical sense, in which the combination of איש and אחיו serves the grammatical function of representing “alter—alter” or “the one—the other,” then the phrase simply means “one after the other.”¹⁹ In this case, there is no added significance of kinship. On the other hand, the authors of the text still chose this grammatical option over others that provide a similar meaning, such as the construct זה ... זה, in Exod 14:20 or Isa 6:3 (both using אֶל־זֶה זֶה), or the construct ... האחד

16 Berthelot, “La notion de גר,” 185.

17 For this phrase, the text and translation which makes use of the ז from זרע is preferred, in this case from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 2 vols. See Berthelot, “La notion de גר,” 191. Berthelot observes that the reconstruction is possible due to the full word זרע being preserved in the manuscript parallels found within 4Q266, and also due to the similar phrasing of זרע ישראל as found in CD XII, 22.

18 Berthelot, “La notion de גר,” 191–92. Berthelot draws on an example from Proverbs in which the “race of the righteous ones” (זרע צדיקים) is contrasted against that of the evil (רע). (The verse in question is in fact Prov 11:21, and not 1:21 as noted on page 192.).

19 As described by Gesenius in no. 139e, with the terms (either in masculine or their feminine counterparts) representing such a relationship between not only persons, but also animals and inanimate objects, such as what is observed in Exod 26:3. Wilhelm Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Edited and Enlarged, trans. A.E. Cowley; ed. E. Kautzsch (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2006), no. 139e.

דָּחָה, as in 2 Sam 14:6 (דָּחָה־תָּחָד דָּחָה־).²⁰ Instead, the passage specifically uses the grammatical choice that can serve a double purpose, with the meanings of both “one after the other,” and also, more literally referring to kinship, “each one after his brother.” Such a double *entendre* is also evident in the phrase’s use in Gen 13:11 (אֶחָיו מְעַל מְעַל) with respect to Abram and Lot, who are uncle and nephew to one another. The phrase can represent their separation one from the other, but also one man from his kin relation “brother.” The same is thus possible for CD XIV, 5, with each of these four entities of priest, Levite, Israelite and *gēr* as a “brother”: the categories may be inscribed “one after the other” in addition to “each one after his brother.”

Therefore the question arises as to whether it is best to consider the *gēr* as a part of Israel’s seed of shared kinship, or simply as a person who is related to Israelites by common culture but not by kinship. Berthelot’s argument is reminiscent of the *gēr* of the HL, who is not esteemed Judean yet must partake in all cultic practices. But CD XIV, 3–6 is rewritten from Deuteronomy and not from the HL, wherein the regulations exist that make the resident alien *gēr* equal under the law with the *‘ezrāh*, causing such a HL perspective to be unlikely. Another possible interpretation, which would result in the *gēr* representing an individual related by common culture but not by kinship, could be that this term represented a Gentile sympathizer of Judaism.²¹ Such a view is implied by Daniel Schwartz when he writes the following concerning the *gēr*’s separate registration in CD XIV, 3–6: “however welcome it might be that non-Israelites undertake to worship the Jewish God, and therefore associate themselves with a Jewish community, that cannot make them into Israelites, any more than cats can become dogs, even if they learn to bark.”²² Schwartz is implying that by the very fact that a *gēr* is not called an Israelite, this *gēr* is not Israelite. However, even though the *gēr* is not named an Israelite does not mean that he has not taken on Israelite kinship; instead, the use of the term could simply signal a lower hierarchical status.²³ It seems highly unlikely that a Gentile sympathizer

20 See Gesenius, *Gesenius*, no. 139e, n. 3, for these alternative forms and scriptural examples.

21 For an overview on Gentile sympathizers, sometimes known as “Godfearers” or “God-worshippers” and representing Gentile individuals that engaged in Judean practices such as Temple worship and association with Judean communities (but not circumcision), see the following: Kuhn, “προσήλυτος,” 731; Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 10; Shaye J.D. Cohen, “Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective: From Biblical Israel to Postbiblical Judaism,” *Conservative Judaism* 36.4 (1983): 39. See also Josephus, *Ant.* 14.110.

22 Daniel R. Schwartz, “Doing Like Jews or Becoming a Jew? Josephus on Women Converts to Judaism,” in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, and Stephanie Gripentrog (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 94.

23 See Ch. 4 of the present study concerning the *gēr* ranking lower in community hierarchy but nevertheless remaining a Gentile convert to Judaism, in Section 4.1.6.

would be included within the sectarian movement, for reasons mentioned in the introductory chapter concerning the movement's high level of social closure and existing regulations that legislate to keep away from Gentiles (e.g. CD XI, 14–15). Overall, when one considers the above rebutted arguments, calling the *gēr* a “brother” seems suggestive of something more than merely a shared common culture. This *gēr* appears to share in Israelite kinship.

In summary, CD XIV, 3–6 draws on Deut 29:9–11's reference to the inclusion of the *gēr* within the camps. CD proceeds to suggest innertextually that the “camps” are the seed of Israel. Furthermore, the *gēr* is identified as a brother, since the *gēr* is included in a list of figures who will be inscribed “each one after his bother.” The *gēr*, identified as both brother and seed of Israel, appears to share in Israelite kinship.

3.2.3 *11QT^a Temple Scroll XL, 5–6*

Where the *gēr* of 11QT^a Temple Scroll is concerned (text and translation in Section 2.3.2.2), a number of interlocking textual comparisons may be made to not only scriptural material, but also to other scriptural rewriting within the DSS, and even innertextually within the Temple Scroll itself.

Among current comparisons drawn between the Temple Scroll and scriptural predecessors, not all prove to be accurate. Connections have been made between Temple Scroll and 4Q174 Flor, the latter of which was discerned in the previous chapter to denote an eschatological Temple.²⁴ Literary parallels drawn between Temple Scroll and 4Q174, for example, that both simply make mention of a *gēr*, have been used to suggest that the Temple described in the Temple Scroll is also eschatological, as is the Temple in 4Q174.²⁵ However, the

²⁴ See Ch. 2 of the present study, Section 2.3.3.2.

²⁵ Michael Wise suggests that “the redactor intended the TS as an eschatological law for the land.” He forms this conclusion regarding an eschatological nature of the scroll primarily on the basis of possible connections, made by George Brooke, between the Temple Scroll and 4Q174, the latter of which has been established to represent an end-times Temple (whether that be a “sanctuary of men” or a physical building). However, Wise proceeds to contradict these very “connections.” He establishes that of the eleven textual connections made by Brooke between the two texts, “some are not very remarkable.” Of the “more persuasive” connections, Wise identifies the very presence of the term “*gēr*” between the Temple Scroll and 4Q174 to be one. Wise suggests thus because at the time he published his monograph, only the *gēr* of 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 4; CD VI, 21 and XIV, 4–6; and 11QT^a XL, 6 were known. As the present study demonstrates, in fact thirteen confirmed occasions exist of the *gēr* in DSS that utilize scriptural rewriting, if one includes the CD occurrences as verified by the close overlap with the 4QD and 6QD manuscripts. Chapter 2 demonstrated that the term *gēr* occurs in a variety of contexts and also in texts correlated with the traditions of D as well as S, and the presence of the term does not in and of itself suggest a shared connection between texts. This observation means that the Temple Scroll

Temple Scroll appears to describe a future, eschatological Temple only in 11QT^a XXIX, 8–10, which is separate from the Temple primarily referenced in the Temple Scroll. The Temple primarily discussed in the Temple Scroll is rendered as an ideal Temple, not an eschatological one.²⁶ One finds support for this point of view in Schiffman's argument that many of the laws in the Temple Scroll (such as the Laws of the King) speak out against the "existing order" and call for radical change in the time period contemporary to the Temple Scroll.²⁷ Nothing suggests that the Temple Scroll must be referring to an eschatological era. Rather, the third courtyard for daughters and for *gērîm* in Israel is construed in an era, albeit idealized, that is contemporary to the sectarian movement. The two Temples of the Temple Scroll and 4Q174 are not the same and should not be compared for similarities as to the meaning of the *gēr*.

Because connections to 4Q174 are unfounded, other passages connected to 11QT^a XL, 5–6 must be sought instead. Deut 23:2–9 [Eng 1–8] has been noted as a likely predecessor, for not only this passage but also 11QT^a XXX, 5–11. Deut 23:2–9 discusses who is to be included or excluded from the assembly (קהל) of the LORD, implying the Temple. Specifically, Deut 23:8–9 [Eng 7–8] regulates that the children of the third generation of Egyptians may enter the assembly of YHWH, the motivation being that the Israelites had been resident aliens (*gērîm*) in Egypt. Yigael Yadin notes that those included in 11QT^a XL, 5–6 can be deduced based on those excluded from the middle courtyard, namely boys under twenty who have not been mustered, women, and third-generation aliens "born to them."²⁸ In this fashion Yadin also calls upon the textual parallel between both third generation children and *gērîm* who were "born" (with Deut. using imperfect), (בְּנֵי אֲשֶׁר-יִלְדוּ לָהֶם דֹּר שְׁלִישִׁי) and 11QT^a using perfect, (ולגרים אשר נולדו[ו]). Wise and subsequently Berthelot also observe that 11QT^a XXX, 5–11 and 11QT^a XL, 5–6 rely on Deut 23:2–9 as a base text, concerning Temple exclusions.²⁹

Despite Deut 23:2–9 serving as a scriptural predecessor for 11QT^a XL, 5–6, a comparison of these two texts highlights a different interpretation of *gērîm*.

need not represent something eschatological just because that is the case where 4Q174 is concerned. See Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*, SAOC 49 (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1990), 155, 168–69, esp. 169 n. 27; Wise refers to Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 206–9.

26 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 207–9.

27 Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll," 51. See the discussion on this topic in the present study, Ch. 2, Section 2.3.2.2.

28 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2, 170.

29 See Berthelot, "La notion de גֵר," 194–95; summarizing and referring to Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll*, 57.

Whereas the reference to the *gēr* in Deut 23:8–9 refers to the Israelites as aliens in Egypt, the *gērîm* in 11QT^a refer to converts, made apparent through three features. First, the *gērîm* described in 11QT^a are born in Israel. There is no mistaking them with a foreigner from another land, nor even with Israelites who lived in Egypt. Second, the *gēr* is present with daughters (women) in the same courtyard. Based on various purity regulations within the Temple Scroll which stipulate to keep clear of Gentiles and not do as Gentiles do,³⁰ it would not make sense to include a resident alien, who is a “Gentile,” in the same Temple courtyard as women who are presumably Judean and not Gentile.³¹ Finally, Donaldson observes that all those who enter the Temple, regardless of the courtyard, are referred to as “the children of Israel” (בני ישראל) in 11QT^a XLVI, 7–8.³² The *gērîm* of 11QT^a XL, 5–6 have now themselves become the children of Israel, implying that at least where these particular daughters and *gērîm* are concerned, they are included as Israelites.

While this chapter endeavours primarily to study the *gēr* as he appears within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, 11QT^a provides the situation whereby one must also consider occasions of the *gēr* in absentia. Michael Wise demonstrates that within rewritten Deuteronomic passages of the Temple Scroll, the *gēr* is omitted when he must clearly be understood as a resident alien due to context.³³ The parallel to Deut 14:21 in 11QT^a XLVIII, 6–7 serves as an example. This passage describes the treatment of the carcass of an animal that has died on its own. The relevant excerpt from Deut 14:21 reads: “You shall not eat anything that dies of itself, to the resident alien (*gēr*) who is in your gates you may give it so that he may eat it, or sell (it) to a foreigner (*nokrî*), for you are a holy

30 For example, 11QT^a XLVIII, 1–14, which commands not to bury the dead anywhere as do Gentiles; LVI, 15, which commands not to set a foreigner as king; LVII, 2–11, which commands that the king shall be protected from capture by foreign nations; and LXII, 13–16 which commands the ban on Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Hivites, Jebusites, Gergasites, and Perizzites, so that they cannot teach concerning their gods.

31 Gentiles are kept in a separate court from women in Tannaitic literature, suggesting that these women are themselves Judean. The fact that Gentiles are kept separate from women in this literature also renders it unlikely that women and Gentiles would be placed in the same courtyard in 11QT^a. For example, see Cana Werman's discussion concerning the overlap between Second Temple and Tannaitic literature on degrees of holiness and division. Cana Werman, “The Price of Mediation: The Role of Priests in the Priestly Halakhah,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011), esp. 386, 405.

32 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 208. Donaldson refers to XLIV, 7–8, but XLVI, 7–8, is the passage intended.

33 Michael O. Wise, “The Eschatological Vision of the Temple Scroll,” *JNES* 49 (1990): 171.

people to the LORD your God.” Even if one lifted the passage out of its preexilic or exilic setting, the *gēr* could only be construed as a resident alien in this passage. If the *gēr* was a convert, he too, would be prohibited from eating the carcass. 11QT^a XLVIII, 6–7 parallels the Deuteronomy passage, except for the reference to the *gēr*, which is now absent: “You shall not eat the carcass of any winged thing or animal, but may sell it to a foreigner (*nokrî*). And any abominable thing you shall not 7 eat, for you are a people holy to the Lord [LORD] your God.” The question to now consider will be the Temple Scroll’s reasons for omitting the *gēr* from these Deuteronomy rewrites.

When the two examples are considered together, namely the *gēr* that is identified in 11QT^a XL, 5–6 and the *gēr* that is now absent from 11QT^a XLVIII, 6–7, a pattern emerges. It appears that the *gēr* is omitted from the text when a closer rewriting is underway and the term can only be construed as a resident alien, and that the *gēr* is present in the text when representing a Judean convert who is now a member of the movement. Wise concludes that these converts are only welcome to enter the primary Temple of the Temple Scroll, a Temple which he deems to be eschatological. However, the present study considers the Temple Scroll to represent a contemporary Temple. The *gēr* is omitted from the text solely when he can only ever be construed as a resident alien, and the *gēr* of 11QT^a XL, 5–6 is included as a Gentile convert to Judaism in the idealized “contemporary” Temple, due to his nature as a child of Israel.

In sum, 11QT^a XL, 5–6 includes a *gēr* in a third courtyard with Judean women, and is a passage based loosely on the Temple exclusions within Deut 23:2–9. This *gēr* was specifically “born in Israel,” and is identified among the children of Israel. The *gēr* appears to be recognized as a Judean proselyte in the idealized albeit contemporary era of the Temple Scroll, as opposed to some sort of eschatological time in the future. The *gēr* is also “absent” from the Deuteronomy rewrite of 11QT^a XLVIII, 6–7, where the text does not want to confuse the readership by using a term which means a Judean proselyte, in a context borrowing from Deut 14:21 which implies a resident alien. In 11QT^a, the *gēr* as a convert shares in Israelite kinship.

3.2.4 4Q377 *Apocryphal Pentateuch B Frag. 1, 1*

A number of scriptural predecessors have already been identified within 4Q377 apocrPent.B (text and translation in Section 2.3.2.3). Nevertheless, investigating pertinent themes within the column fragment as a whole through the lens of bricolage will prove helpful. In so doing, a variety of charted and as yet uncharted predecessors drawn from scripture become apparent, whose usage demonstrate the express purpose of creating a document with a new and identifiable theme. This theme is that the people of this sectarian movement

will find themselves in a new land, which is a land of promise and honey. Ariel Feldman suggests that the whole of Fragment 1 contains a theme pertaining to a “Promise of the Land.”³⁴ The sum of the reworked parts transforms this promise, and the specifics of this land, into something different than the land of Canaan promised by Moses to the Israelites.

Line 2, as suggested by Vanderkam and Brady, may “point to the Sinai revelations,”³⁵ if *לְעֵצֵם הַשָּׁמַיִם* is an expression taken and reworked from Exod 24:10, in which the ground under the God of Israel’s feet is described as “something like a pavement of sapphire stone, like the *very heavens* (*וּבְרָעָצָם הַשָּׁמַיִם*) of clearness.” This line introduces the Exodus sentiment of the text.

A number of textual allusions call to mind a notion of land and land inheritance. Line 4 appears to be an allusion to Prov 8:21, Isa 49:8, or both, with the use of the infinitive construct form “to give as a possession,” or “to cause to inherit” (*לְהִנְחִיל*). In Prov 8:21, this form is found in the context of personified Wisdom promising “to give those who love me substance as a possession” (*לְהִנְחִיל אֶהְבֵּי יֵשׁ*). In Isa 49:8, this infinitive construct form is found within the context of YHWH’s identified salvation. Isa 49:8 reads as follows: “Thus says the LORD, ‘In a time of favour I have answered you (2ms), and on a day of salvation I have helped you; I have kept you and given you as a covenant people; to cause to stand land, to give desolate ones inheritances as a possession (*לְהִנְחִיל נְחִלֹת שְׂמִמֹת*).’” An allusion to an inheritance of a “lot of land,” such as the distribution of land by lot described in Joshua 18, may also correlate with the noun from this same root *נחל*. In addition, this allusion to the inheritance of a “lot” is reminiscent of the reference to lots within 4Q279 Four Lots, distributed to the four categories of Aaronide priests, Levites, children of Israel, and *gērîm*, denoting a hierarchical list of members who share in kinship (from the root *יחש*, spelled *יחס*).³⁶

VanderKam and Brady offer a number of possibilities that could serve as scriptural predecessors to line 6, where various figures, including the *gēr*, are juxtaposed for adjudication: “and I [will judge] be[tw]een a man and his friend, between a father and his son, and between a man and [his] *gēr* []” (*וְאֵין שֹׁפֵט תִּי*) (ב[י]ן אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ וּבֵין אָב לְבָנָו וּבֵין אִישׁ לְגֵרָו). Passages that resemble this phrase “between such-and-such” include Exod 18:16; Num 30:17; Deut 1:16; and Jer 7:5.³⁷ A variant of Num 30:17 has also been quoted in another text belonging to the

34 Feldman, “Sinai Revelation,” 155–56.

35 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 207. See also the comment for line 2 on p. 209.

36 See Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*, 309.

37 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 210.

sectarian movement, namely CD VII, 8–9.³⁸ Of the above passages, a combination of Exod 18:16 along with Deut 1:16 offer the closest parallels to line 6. In Exod 18:16, Moses explains how he resolves disputes: “I judge between a man and his friend” (וְשֹׁפֵטֵתִי בֵּין אִישׁ וּבֵין רֵעֵהוּ). But what about “between a father and his son, and between a man and his *gēr*”? In Deut 1:16 Moses reminisces to the people on his prior words that “you (2mp) shall judge rightly *between a man, his brother, and his gēr* (בֵּין-אִישׁ וּבֵין-אָחִיו וּבֵין גֵּרֹו).” This passage matches the phenomenon of a *gēr* with a 3ms pronominal suffix, as in the 4Q377 passage. However, the reference in Deut 1:16 to “a man and his brother” does not match the 4Q377 passage, and Deut 1:16 contains no reference to a father and his son as does 4Q377. 4Q423 Instruction^s Frag. 5, 4 contains the phrase that he will “visit upon fathers and sons, [using a *lamed* of specification], upon *gērīm* together with every native born” (יִפְקֹד לְאָבוֹת וּבָנִים לְ[גַרִי]ם עִם כָּל אֲזֻרְחִים). Making such a connection is not intended to suggest that 4Q377 is necessarily making a direct reuse of 4Q423, but merely that it is only in 4Q423 where one finds a similar-minded turn of phrase regarding the side-by-side paralleling of “a father to his son.” Thus line 6 conflates Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16, and is reminiscent of 4Q423 Frag. 5, 4.³⁹ The reference from Deut 1:16 to a brother has been omitted but the reference to the *gēr* remains. Identifying these scriptural predecessors will prove helpful in determining the nature of the *gēr*, in particular this omission of the “brother”: the omission of the brother erases any differentiation between a *gēr* and a brother, as was the case in Deut 1:16.

On this topic of the erasure in differentiation between a *gēr* and a brother, one may wonder regarding the reuse of a reference to a *gēr* from Deut 1:16. Since the 3ms pronominal suffix in that text implies a resident alien under the authority of an Israelite individual, could not “his *gēr*” of 4Q377 also be a resident alien and not a “brother” in any way? To leave the parallel usage of the pronominal suffix in the rewriting may seem unusual for a figure if autonomous status as a “brother” convert is nevertheless implied. This question can be answered by looking back to the previous chapter and its reference to the similar phraseology in Frag. 2, II, 6–7 “And he spoke wi[th]the assembly of Israel face to face as a man speaks 7 with his friend” (וַיִּדְבָּר עִם [קְהַל יִשְׂרָאֵל פְּנִים] 7 with his friend”).

38 The excerpt from CD VII, 7–9 reads as follows: “then they shall walk according to the Torah *vacat* and the precept 8 established according to the rule of the Torah, and he said, ‘Between a man and his wife and between a father 9 and his son’ אב ובין אב לבנו.” The Num 30:17 [Eng. 16] passage differs in that it stipulates “between a man to his wife; between a father *to his daughter* לְבַתֹּו,” instead of between a father *to his son*, as in CD VII, 8–9.

39 While textually similar, the referent in 4Q423 Frag. 5, 4 is likely YHWH and not Moses, which is the case with Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16.

(עם אל פנים כאשר ידבר־ 7 איש עם רעהו), which is reminiscent of Exod 33:11. Wido van Peursen observes that 4Q377 is reusing “biblical” phraseology to forge a re-interpretation that God is speaking to all the assembly, and not only to Moses as in Exod 33:11.⁴⁰ Language such as “face to face” and “as a man speaks to his friend” may suggest intimate relationship.⁴¹ If so, it would be important to continue use of the parallel structure wherever it occurs, such as in the rewriting from Deut 1:16 and Exod 18:16 in Frag. 1, I, to highlight an idiom indicating such an intimate relationship between God and the people. The idiom highlighting intimacy can exist simultaneously with the *gēr* representing an individual perceived to be an Israelite “brother.”

Returning to these two passages from scripture in Frag. 1, I, the fashion in which Moses is the speaker contrasts in one way against 4Q377. VanderKam and Brady suggest that the legible phrase in line 3, “my righteousness to the eyes of all” (צדקתי לְעֵיני כול), is reminiscent of Psalm 98:2 “The LORD has made known his salvation, for the eyes of the nations he has revealed *his righteousness*” (צִדְקָתוֹ).⁴² The substitution in suffix from that of the 3ms found in the Psalm, to the 1 c. s. observed in 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 3, suggests that God is the speaker in 4Q377.⁴³ Because Moses is only addressed in the third person within the rest of 4Q377, in particular Frag. 2, I and II,⁴⁴ God, and not Moses, is likely the first person speaker in Frag 1, I, 6. If so, God takes over the voice of Moses from Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16. Such a literary move erases time. No longer do readers in 4Q377 see themselves under Moses’s direction as the Israelites wandering in the desert after being released from Pharaoh’s grip, nor as the Israelites upon the threshold of entering the promised land. Instead, readers are on the threshold of entering a promised land that is new and different.

Line 8 strengthens the message of a promised land in 4Q377. This list of the nations who will be driven out from the land (the Hivite, the Canaanite, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Jebusite, the Girgashite, הַחִוִּי הַכְּנַעֲנִי הַחִתִּי הָאֲמֹרִי הַיְבוּסִי הַגִּרְגָּשִׁי) finds an appropriate predecessor in Exod 34:11, or also Exod 3:8 (Exod 3:8 also features in line 9). Other similar series of nations exist within scripture but since 4Q377 clearly refashions themes from the

40 van Peursen, “Portrait of Moses,” 103–4, 112.

41 van Peursen, “Portrait of Moses,” 112.

42 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 209.

43 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 209, Comments line 3; see also p. 207.

44 VanderKam and Brady comment on the differences between 4Q377 Apocryphal Pentateuch B and 4Q368 Apocryphal Pentateuch A, which stem primarily from the fact that 4Q368 displays Moses talking with God and 4Q377 does not. VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 207–8.

Exodus delivery from Egypt, this Sinai passage is the best fit. While the Girgashites are missing from MT Exod 34:11 and Exod 3:8, VanderKam and Brady note that they can be found within the parallel verses found in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint.⁴⁵ The Perizzites, a nation named among those lists in Exod 3:8 and 34:11, are missing from line 8, and VanderKam and Brady suggest that they could potentially be located within the traces of remnant letters at the end of the line.⁴⁶ Regardless of whether Perizzites are present in the text or not, line 8 strongly resembles Exod 34:11 and 3:8, which deal with a divine gift of land, intended for one group of individuals. Furthermore, the *gēr* is a part of this group of included individuals, and is not among those foreigners who represent excluded nations.

Finally, line 9 completes the theme of securing a land, a land which by now is known to be separated in time from that land Moses secured. The line's clear words "better and wider" (טובה ורחבה) are derived from Exod 3:8, in which YHWH says: "And I have come down to deliver them (literally, 'it' with a 3ms suffix, referring to 'my people' in Exod 3:7) from the hand of Egypt, and to bring them up from that land, to a land better and wider, (אֶל-אֶרֶץ טוֹבָה וְרַחְבָּהּ) to a land flowing with milk and honey, to the place of the Canaanite, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite." 4Q377 reworks existing texts which call to mind the promised land of Canaan, while simultaneously transferring the voice of Moses into the voice of YHWH. The result is the allusion of being brought to a new land of honey, a land that is separate in time and space for a new community.

In summary, 4Q377 Frag. 1, I, 6 contains a reference to a *gēr* which is borrowed from Deut 1:16, but is placed into a unique framework in which Deut

45 VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 210. In addition, Exod 33:2 offers another close parallel listing of excluded nations, also only missing the Girgashites. However, the Septuagint version adds the Girgashites but is missing the Canaanites.

46 VanderKam and Brady comment that the end of the line contains "traces of perhaps five letters." VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, 209, Comments line 8. Having had the opportunity to see one of the initial infrared photographs of this fragment, I conclude the word would have to be within the missing space just after the Girgashites, if it is present. While there are remnants of about five, or more likely six, letters at the end of the line, the first two are indecipherable, the third shows an upper horizontal stroke that could belong to either a *he* or a *lamed*, the fourth looks like a *yod* (which could represent either a *yod* or a *vav* in this document), the fifth looks very much like a medial *kaph*, and the final ink blur is indecipherable. Unfortunately, there is no distinguishable *pe* of הפריזי, and the word appears to not be borrowed from either contexts of Exod 3:8 or 34:11. Thus a reading of ◦ליכ◦[is suggested as a replacement to that reading of VanderKam and Brady's at the end of line 8: ◦◦◦◦◦[.

1:16's reference to the brother is omitted, and a reference to a father and son is added (as in 4Q423 Frag. 5, 4), alongside Exod 18:16's reference to a friend. The result is that the *gēr* is no longer differentiated from a brother as was the case in Deut 1:16, and could thus be a brother himself. The continued use of the pronominal suffix with the *gēr* is a vestige of the rewritten passage and others like it to keep the parallel structure alluding to the intimate nature of divine relationship. The *gēr* is also included within the group that will replace the Amomite, Canaanite, Hittite, Perizzite, Hivite, and Jebusite, who are the nations to be driven out of the land in Exod 3:8 and 34:11. The new land, in which the *gēr* is now a part, is not the land described in Exodus, but is rather a future-oriented new land of honey in a new time and space. Furthermore, it is God who speaks of the inheritance of this land of honey, narrated through the memory of the Exodus Sinaitic adjudicating voice of Moses, and observed in the change of voice in Psalm 98:2. The promised inheritance is evident through allusions to Prov 8:21 and Isa 49:8. The act of separating Moses from his voice takes the land to a new place, for a new time and a new people, within which the *gēr* is an included figure. That the *gēr* is both present in the text without the contrasting presence of the term "brother," and is also included in the promise of land, suggests his identity as a "brother" who is Israelite in the sectarian movement.

3.2.5 4Q159 Ordinances^a Frags. 2–4, 1–3

Chapter 1 confirmed that 4Q159 Ordinances^a Frags. 2–4, 1–3 (text and translation in Section 2.3.2.4) is generally a reworking of the manumission text (rights of slavery redemption) of Lev 25:47–55. A number of omissions have been made. 4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 1 opens with a variant of the second half of Lev 25:47: "And (if) he sells himself to a *gēr tōshāb* with you or to the descendant of a *gēr* family" (וְנִמְכַר לְגֵר תּוֹשֵׁב עִמָּךְ אוֹ לְעֶקֶר מִשְׁפַּחַת גֵּר). It is clear that 4Q159 deals with the part of the passage from Leviticus 25 that concerns Israelites in indentured slavery to non-Israelites. After reworking Lev 25:47, 4Q159 then skips over the manumission rules of Lev 25:48 through 52, and picks up in lines 2 and 3 with allusions to Lev 25:53 and possibly Lev 25:55.⁴⁷ Line 2 does not proceed with Lev 25:48, which regulates that the Israelite shall have the right of redemption after selling himself. Instead, line 2 opens with the phrase "in the presence of Is[rael]," lit. "before the eyes of Israel" (לְעֵינֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). Lev 25:53 contains a similarly-minded phrase "in your sight" (לְעֵינֶיךָ).⁴⁸ The beginning of line 3 has a reference to "Egypt" (מִצְרַיִם), calling to mind the phrase "from the land of

47 Hamidović, "À la frontière," 271.

48 Elisha Qimron also notes the correlation to Lev 25:53, evidenced in his reconstruction of the rest of line 1 (following the same reconstruction מִשְׁפַּחַת גֵּר) as an abbreviated

Egypt” (מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם), located in Lev 25:55.⁴⁹ The manumission reinterpretation ends in line 3 by circling back to the concluding command of Lev 25:42 not to sell Israelites as permanent slaves.⁵⁰

There are two indicators in this passage that, when taken together, suggest the *gēr* may be interpreted as a Gentile convert to Judaism instead of a resident alien, and regarded as an Israelite (Judean) “brother” himself.⁵¹ The first indicator has to do with a modification to the term *gēr* itself between this rewritten text and its scriptural predecessor. Schiffman observes that the compound noun “*gēr tōshāb*” in Lev 25:47 changes to the solo reference of the “*gēr*” in 4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 1, and identifies this shift as that used similarly in rabbinic texts to denote the shift in meaning of the *gēr* from that of “resident alien” to “Gentile convert to Judaism.”⁵²

The second indicator stems from the manner in which the omissions from the Leviticus passage, as identified above, affect the meaning of the *gēr* included within 4Q159. Included within the omissions from Lev 25:47–52 is the reference within v. 47 “and your brother becomes poor” (וְגַמְךָ אֶחָיִךְ), along with the reference within v. 48 to the right of redemption for the Israelite by “one from

version of Lev 25:53: כַּשְׂכִּיר יִהְיֶה עִמּוֹ וְלֹא יִרְדְּנוּ בַּפֶּרֶךְ. The beginning of line 2 would then complete the rewritten version of Lev 25:53. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:25.

49 Qimron also reconstructs the end of line 2 heading into line 3 as a variant of Lev 25:55: בּוֹרָא עִם כִּי עַבְדֵי אֱלֹהִים הֵם אֲשֶׁר הוֹצִיאָם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:25. Simultaneously, this reference to Egypt could be borrowed from Deut 5:15 or 26:8: the בּוֹרָא of line 2 leading up to the *vacat* and subsequent reference to Egypt has been recognized by Weinert and Schiffman as “with an [outstretched] ar[m] and a mighty hand he brought them out of the land of 3 Egypt” (בּוֹרָא וְעַתָּה נְטוּיָה וְבִיד חֲזָקָה הוֹצִיאָ אוֹתָם מֵאֶרֶץ 3 מִצְרַיִם). Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 184; Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules,” 155, n. 31.

50 Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules,” 155, n. 32.

51 4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 2 adds an additional stipulation that “[t]hey (meaning the Israelites who sell themselves into indentured slavery) [may no]t serve non-Jews (הַגּוֹיִים).” This addition, not observed in Lev 25:47–55, has been used to argue both that the *gēr* is a convert, and that the *gēr* is still a resident alien as in Leviticus. In support of the former argument, Schiffman concludes that the main point of the passage is a prohibition of Jews “being in servitude to non-Jews.” In other words, Schiffman concludes that the *gēr* is a convert and the *gōy* is a foreigner in the context of 4Q159. On the other hand, in support of the latter argument, Berthelot suggests that 4Q159 could simply be adding specificity to what is already understood in Leviticus. Under certain circumstances it is not prohibited for an Israelite to serve a resident alien *gēr*, but it is always prohibited to serve a *gōy*. It is therefore difficult to draw any firm conclusions from this addition. See Schiffman, “Ordinances and Rules,” 155, no. 30; Berthelot, “La notion de גֵר,” 182. See also Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 271.

52 See the discussion on the matter in the introduction chapter of the present study, Section 1.1.2.

among his brothers” (אָרְיָהוּ). The space in 4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 1 that contains whatever words are missing between the וְאִם (“and if”) and the לְגֵר (“to a *gēr*”) is not lengthy enough to contain anything more than at most, something along the lines of what has been proposed either by Francis Weinert, יְמוּד וְנִמְכַר (“he becomes impoverished and sells himself”), or by Elisha Qimron, יְמוּד אִישׁ וְנִמְכַר (“a man becomes impoverished and sells himself”).⁵³ Such a required abbreviation of Lev 25:47 confirms the omission of the reference to “your brother.” Concerning Lev 25:48, the entire verse, with its reference to an Israelite’s redemption by a brother, is omitted. The omitted references to a “brother” strip away any differentiation between the Israelite man of 4Q159 who presumably sells himself, and the *gēr*. A *gēr* was clearly differentiated from a “brother” in Lev 25:47–48, leaving it clear that the *gēr* was in no way a brother. The omission of the term “brother” could have taken place because the *gēr* in 4Q159 is understood to be a “brother,” and differentiation between a brother and a *gēr* is no longer desired.

Such an interpretation with regard to this rewriting matches another occurrence of scriptural rewriting within Fragments 2–4. Concerning one of the other three sets of legislative matters listed in Fragments 2–4, namely the case of a man challenging the bride’s virginity, Moshe Bernstein observes that it has been “summarized in its presentation, with details being both added and deleted” from the biblical predecessor of Deut 22:13–21.⁵⁴ Bernstein argues that these omissions, in particular any discussion of the parents of the bride, have been made to transform the nature of the transgression: whereas the narrative in Deuteronomy places responsibility on the woman’s family, the 4Q159 rewriting places responsibility solely with the new bride.⁵⁵ That another of the rewritten pieces of legislation in 4Q159 also shows evidence of omissions for the sake of transforming the law in some way, possibly ideologically so, strengthens the possibility that the omission of the brother from the rewriting of Lev 25:47–55 is also performed to transform this passage in a purposeful fashion as argued above. In this instance, an ideological shift for the omission of the “brother” is also more likely than one based on grammatical issues, such as the shift from second person in Lev 25:47 (“your brother”) to the third person used throughout 4Q159. As noted above, 4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 2 and its reference

53 Weinert, “4Q159: Legislation,” 197; Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3:25. Both reconstructions effectively conflate Lev 25:39 (the use of imperfect aspect, יְמוּד, matches that of v. 39) and Lev 25:47.

54 Moshe J. Bernstein, “The Re-Presentation of ‘Biblical’ Legal Material at Qumran: Three Cases from 4Q159 (Ordinances^a),” in *Law, Peshet and the History of Interpretation* (vol. 2 of *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, STDJ 107 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013), 512.

55 See the full discussion of this rewritten law: Bernstein, “Re-Presentation,” 507–11.

to “before the eyes of Israel” has had no difficulty in shifting from the second person used in Lev 25:53 “in your sight.”

In sum, Frags. 2–4, 1–3 use text manipulation strategies of both omissions and also additions on the manumission passage of Leviticus 25. First, the *gēr tōshāb* of Lev 25:47 is reduced to solely a *gēr*, understood to represent the distinction between resident alien and proselyte within rabbinic literature. Second, this passage from 4Q159 begins with a variant of Lev 25:47, and proceeds to Lev 25:53 as well as Lev 25:55. In this rewritten passage, brother references in Lev 25:47–48 are omitted, references which highlighted a difference between the Israelite brother and the resident alien *gēr* in the context of Leviticus 25. In the rewritten version of 4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 1–3, there is nothing with which to differentiate this *gēr* from an Israelite brother. There is no longer any differentiation in kinship between the *gēr* and the Israelite selling himself in 4Q159. The *gēr*’s newfound “Israelite” nature may be understood to match that of other members within the D tradition of the sectarian movement.

3.2.6 4Q279 Four Lots Frag. 5, 1–6

Textual predecessors to 4Q279 Four Lots (text and translation in Section 2.3.2.5) exist within both scriptural rewriting in the DSS as well as scripture itself. As for rewriting from within the DSS, it has been established that the list in 4Q279 Frag. 5 is likely similar to that list within CD XIV, 3–6, referring to priests, Levites, children of Israel, and the *gēr*.⁵⁶ 4Q279 designates a lot (גורל) for each of the listed entities. It was established that in the case of the wisdom text 4Q423, the “lots” and “inheritance” represented a spiritual inheritance that was either granted or not. It is possible a similar meaning is intended in 4Q279, more specifically to do with the apportioning of light in a person’s spirit, such as what is observed in CD XIII, 12. In the scrolls pertaining to the sectarian movement, Alexander, Vermes and others suggest that the term denotes a predestined figurative apportioning of “light” to an individual or a group.⁵⁷

56 If 4Q279 Frag. 5, 1–6 is borrowing from CD XIV, 3–6, as was suggested in Chapter 2, this secondary status could explain 4Q279’s plural *gērīm* (versus the singular *gēr* in CD XIV). It was established that CD XIV keeps the *gēr* in the singular because of the singular nature of the *gēr* in CD XIV’s scriptural predecessor, Deut 29:9–11. As a work that is borrowing from CD XIV, but no longer Deut 29:9–11, the authors of 4Q279 may have written all entries (Aaronide priests, Levites, children of Israel, and *gērīm*) in the plural for the sake of consistency. Nevertheless, a Deuteronomic sentiment lingers, especially in the joint reference to Levites and *gērīm* (see below).

57 Alexander and Vermes, “4QFour Lots,” 222. Hamidović suggests that “[t]he quality of the spirit, meaning the proportion of light in the spirit received at birth, determines all the hierarchy.” Hamidović, “4Q279, 4QFour Lots,” 172. Gerhard von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E.W. Trueman Dicken (London: SCM, 1984), 82.

On the other hand, Gerhard von Rad, in a study of the word “portion (lit. inheritance, נחלה)” within Hexateuchal sources, concludes that in this context “the term נחלה applied originally to the hereditary lands of both families and tribes.”⁵⁸ He observes that נחלה of Israel as a whole ... [was] a peculiarity of *Deuteronomy*.⁵⁹ Von Rad identifies numerous passages that highlight a land being sworn to the Israelites, described sometimes as land sworn “to your ancestors” (lit. “your fathers,” לְאֲבוֹתֵיךָ, e.g. Deut 6:8, or variably in the plural לְאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם, e.g. Deut 8:1).⁶⁰ He also lists numerous examples of גורל within the Pentateuch, as well as Joshua and Judges, with the sense of distribution of lots of land, such as Num 26:55.⁶¹ 4Q279 seems to use such Pentateuchal scriptural predecessors, with references to Aaronide priests, Levites, children of Israel, and *gērîm*. Indeed, 4Q279’s distribution of an inherited lot of land for the children of Israel is customary based on scriptural predecessors. Num 36:2 directly relates inheritance as a lot of land: “The LORD commanded my lord to give *the land for inheritance by lot* (אֶת־הָאָרֶץ בְּנַחֲלָה בְּגוֹרָל) to the Israelites.” However, the distribution of lots to Aaronide priests, Levites, and *gērîm* is very unusual.⁶² Numbers 18:20 assigns holy offerings to Aaronide priests instead of land allotment. Furthermore, in Deut 26:11, Levites and *gērîm* have to be specifically included during the festival of first fruits and tithes, precisely because neither of them was included in the gift of land inheritance.⁶³ This means that within

58 von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch*, 81.

59 von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch*, 81–82.

60 von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch*, 80. Von Rad lists numerous passages that highlight the Deuteronomistic concept of a land being sworn to the Israelites: Deut 6:8, 23; 8:1, 18; 9:5, 27; 10:11; 11:8 ff., 18–21; 26:3, 15; 28:11; 31:7, 20; 34:4.

61 von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch*, 82.

62 Recall that the self-designated terms “sons of Aaron,” “sons of Zadok,” and Levites are not esteemed historical references with regard to positions filled and services performed at the Jerusalem Temple. This terminology is instead added to show legitimacy and hierarchy within the sectarian movement. See the section that revisits scholarly debate concerning a sectarian movement “Zadokite priesthood,” as well as the section that investigates the provenance and dating of 4Q279, in Ch. 2 of the present study, Sections 2.1.1 and 2.3.2.5, respectively.

63 Num 18:20 excludes Aaronide priests from a portion of land (described as a חֶלֶק), because instead YHWH is their inheritance and their portion. Levites were not granted land as they were instead set aside to perform tabernacle/Temple duties (Num 3:5–51; 34:16–35:8). Passages that describe the exclusion of Levites from receiving land or inheritance (described as חֶלֶק וְנַחֲלָה) include the following: Deut 10:9; 12:12; 14:27; and 18:1. Joshua 21 describes the alternate allotment of towns and livestock pasture lands to be set aside for the Levites. See von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch*, 82. *Gērîm* were understood as resident aliens and thus could not own land as could Israelites. Deut 16:14 and 26:11–12 describe sharing produce and first fruits tithes with socially and economically-depressed individuals; the resident alien *gēr* is included among such individuals, presumably because of his lack

4Q279 Frag. 5, it is unusual that the “lot,” in its Pentateuchal relationship to “inheritance” usually designated for Israelites, is also attributed to Aaronide priests, Levites, and *gērîm*.

Therefore in 4Q279 the text simultaneously inverts and conflates scriptural predecessors, such as Num 36:2 that describes a promise of an inheritance of land by lot for Israelites, combined with Num 18:20 and Deut 26:11, which set apart Aaronide priests, Levites, and *gērîm* because they will not receive any land. Instead, Aaronide priests, Levites, and *gērîm* are each accepting a lot of their own. The reference to the lot takes 4Q279 even a step further than CD XIV in its inclusion of the *gēr*, due to the lot’s allusions to land and Israelite inheritance, and consequently, to the *gēr*’s consideration as an “Israelite.” The additional reference within 4Q279 that the hierarchical ordering of the lots is structured according to one’s “pedigree” suggests a connection of shared kinship between the Aaronide priests, the Levites, the Israelites, and the *gērîm*. Presumably this connection is the key to the Pentateuchal inversion, and suggests an appropriate interpretation concerning the change of the *gēr* in 4Q279 from one who was a guest at the festival celebration as a non-Israelite, into one who is now a part of the Israelite—presumably representing the sectarian movement—hierarchy, albeit fourth on the list. While the hierarchical listing has been used to argue the status of a *gēr* as non-Israelite and nonproselyte,⁶⁴ it is now clear that a hierarchical separation in which a *gēr* is listed separately from other Israelite categories need not negate his existence as Israelite/Judean. Despite Jutta Jokiranta’s resistance to calling the *gēr* a “convert,” just as she has observed, the *gēr*’s low hierarchical ranking does not preclude his full membership in the sectarian movement.⁶⁵ This *gēr* shares in land and kinship with other members of the movement.

of an allotment of land. With regard to the *gēr*, it should be noted at this juncture that Ezekiel 47:22–23 provides the unusual occasion whereby an inheritance of land will also be granted to *gērîm*, who are also to be treated “like” the *ezrâhî* (עֲזְרָאִי). However, Ezekiel 47 follows the model of land distribution to the individual tribes of Israel (Ezek 47:13, 21), and not to a nation as a whole, as in the largely Deuteronomic model, leaving the passage as an unlikely scriptural predecessor. In the case of 4Q279, the combined Pentateuchal allusions to Aaronides, Levites, and *gērîm*, make the likes of the passages described above more likely predecessors.

64 Hamidović suggests the *gērîm* of 4Q279 are not excluded, but neither are they assimilated as Israelites. It appears, however, that he argues against an Israelite kinship for the *gēr* merely for the reason that the “*gērîm*” are listed separately from “Israelites.” Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 287.

65 See the introduction chapter, Section 1.2.1.

3.3 Texts Correlated with the Serekh (S) Tradition

3.3.1 4Q169 *Pesher Nahum Frags. 3–4, 11, 7–10*

In the case of 4Q169 pNah (text and translation in Section 2.3.3.1), even though Frags. 3–4, 11, 7–10 start with the reference to Nah 3:4 and describe a sex worker (“harlot”) who misleads nations and families, the interpretation which follows only loosely hearkens to a similar list of those misdirected. The meaning of the *gēr* as a member of this list relates directly to whatever meaning is established regarding the other characters in the passage, with whom the *gēr* is likened. Further time spent in innertextual comparison within 4Q169 itself is required before moving on to discovering other scriptural allusions or rewritings.

Chapter 2 equated “Ephraim” with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, who were identified with the Pharisees.⁶⁶ A necessary subsequent step is to establish the identity of those misdirected figures, listed in 4Q169 Frags. 3–4, 11, 9, among whom the *gēr* is included. According to Shani Berrin, the syntax should be understood as follows: the “kings, princes, priests and people together with the *gēr*” are “best understood as referring to adherents of the Pharisees”; “cities and families” are unclear but also most likely refer to those adherents of the Pharisees “who were misled”; and “nobles and rulers” would “represent the opponents of the Pharisees.”⁶⁷ In this interpretation of the syntax, the *gēr* represents someone who is an adherent of the Pharisees. Hamidović concurs with this interpretation: “the \aleph seems also to have been susceptible to Pharisaic teachings. It is the indication also of participation on the part of the \aleph in the debates that spanned Judaism; this figure does not rest neutrally, [instead] he participates in the life of the society.”⁶⁸ Yonder Moynihan Gillihan has likewise observed that this *gēr* does not represent a member of the sectarian movement, but rather “a victim of liars,”⁶⁹ meaning that the *gēr* has fallen prey to the teachings of a group whose views the authors of 4Q169 oppose. Therefore it appears evident that the *gēr* is connected in some way to the Pharisaic group of kings, princes, priests, and people.

Now that the *gēr* is identified as one who participates as a follower of the Pharisees, scriptural predecessors can be sought out to further identify this

66 See Ch. 2 of the present study, Section 2.3.3.1.

67 Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 252–3. One may also take into account the slight alteration in reading according to Qimron’s addition of the *vav*, resulting in the reading “kings and princes, priests and people ...” discussed in the previous chapter. See Ch. 2, Section 2.3.3.1. This parallelism does not alter Berrin’s conclusion regarding symbolic representations.

68 Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 275.

69 Gillihan, “The \aleph Who Wasn’t There,” 273.

figure. Most revealing is the use of the verb לִוֶּה in the *niphal* in Frags. 3–4, II, 9 to describe “people together with the *gēr*,” וְעַם עַם גַּר נִלְוֶה. This use of לִוֶּה along with the *gēr* calls to mind Isa 14:1.⁷⁰ Isa 14:1 reads as follows: “But the LORD will have compassion (on) Jacob and he will choose again Israel and he will set them upon their land; and the *gēr* will be joined upon them (וְנִלְוֶה הַגֵּר עִלְיֵיהֶם) and they will be united with the house of Jacob.” This verse is considered to be a Persian era insertion into First Isaiah (Isa 1–39), itself generally assigned to the eighth century BCE. Scholarship’s choice in dating Isa 14:1 has been established in particular by the very use of the Second Temple period verb לִוֶּה, “to attach oneself” or “to join oneself,” usually used in the *niphal*.⁷¹

Much debate surrounds the meaning of the verb לִוֶּה in Second Temple period literature. In addition to the simple notion of attaching or joining oneself to something, numerous scholars have postulated this verb to implicate an act of conversion within later Second Temple literature in such passages as Est 9:27; Isa 14:1; 56:3, 6; Jer 50:5; Zech 2:15; Dan 11:34; Jdt 14:10; and Tob 1:8.⁷² On the other hand, John Lübbe argues against an intended implication of “conversion”:

lawah has no inherent religious meaning in these references, nor even in the occurrences of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zechariah, which specify Yahweh as the one with whom Gentiles will associate (Isa. 14:1; 56:3, 6; Jer. 50:5; Zech. 2:15). For if we place a restraint on multiplying meanings unnecessarily, then it is possible to find a single meaning for all occurrences of *lawah* in Niphal, viz. that *lawah* simply describes an act of association, in which a person chose to unite himself to another.⁷³

70 Berthelot, “La notion de גַּר,” 186.

71 Kidd, *Alterity and Identity*, 72. Joseph Baumgarten’s Isaiah 1–39 Anchor Bible commentary discusses the postexilic nature of Isa 14:1. See Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, AB 19 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 89, 281, 311.

72 For example, see any of the following: Kidd, *Alterity and Identity*, 72; Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 42, 207; Steven S. Tuell, “The Priesthood of the ‘Foreigner’: Evidence of Competing Politics in Ezekiel 44:1–14 and Isaiah 56:1–8,” in *Constituting the Community: Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride Jr.*, ed. John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 193–4. In texts in which we find a Greek rendering of the Hebrew verb לִוֶּה, to indicate some kind of transferal to the Israelite nation (namely Judith, which is composed in Greek, and Tobit, for which there is no extant Hebrew manuscript available for our verse of interest 1:8), the Greek verb πρόσκειμαι is used.

73 Lübbe, “Exclusion of the *Ger*,” 178. Jer 50:5, contrary to Lübbe’s argument, suggests that people of Israel and Judah, and not Gentiles, are “joining” with YHWH.

Lübbe's concept of "association" seems to run along the lines of the *gēr* within the Persian era HL, where the *gēr* is not Israelite and yet follows Torah to stay in the land. Certainly one may argue that an act of ethnic conversion, which would include a conversion of the features of "religion" as a part of common culture, only took effect in the Hellenistic period. Thus, with regard to the above-mentioned scriptural passages of the Second Temple period, the verb will allude to either a conversion or to a general "uniting" as described by Lübbe, depending on the dating of each text. Isa 14:1 has been dated to Judea's Persian, pre-Hellenistic era.

In the case of 4Q169 in particular, what would it mean for someone to "join" with others in the way of life of the Pharisees? Katell Berthelot considers the choice of verb לִוּה in 4Q169 to indicate that the *gēr* "must also be accountable to God," meaning that the *gēr* must "be associated with Israel for religious matters."⁷⁴ In making this statement, Berthelot implies that the *gēr* is not actually a Gentile convert to Judaism, but is rather to be viewed along the lines of the "biblical" conception of the *gēr*. However, since it has been discerned that the *gēr* can participate in the realm of Judaic debate, surely the *gēr* has a more intimate relationship with Judaism than merely being associated with Israel for religious (cultic) matters like the *gēr* of the HL. Berthelot also hypothesizes that the *gēr* could even be resultant from Hasmonean conversions, due to the dating of the text.⁷⁵ It seems unlikely that the *gēr* in 4Q169, with its affiliation to the Pharisees, would indicate those Idumeans converted by Hyrcanus.⁷⁶ Because 4Q169 dates well within the realm of Hellenistic influence and the era of permitted conversions within Judaism, a meaning of a Pharisaic convert for the *gēr* in this text seems more likely, whether as a group or an individual.

In conclusion, the *gēr* in 4Q169 finds himself in a list, loosely expanded upon from Nah 3:4, of those who have been misdirected by a Pharisaic group that stands in opposition to the *peshet's* sectarian authors. Furthermore, the *gēr* is attached, in the manner of the *gēr* of Isa 14:1, to this group of misdirected individuals, suggesting that the *gēr* is able to closely follow the practices of that group. Finally, because of the Hellenistic era date of the passage and the influence of ethnic conversions that era brought with it, the verb לִוּה takes on a

74 Berthelot, "La notion de גֵּר," 186.

75 This discussion relates to that in the introduction chapter, concerning the conversions of the Idumeans by Hyrcanus. See Section 1.2.2, as well as below in the discussion on 4Q174. See also Berthelot, "La notion de גֵּר," 186. Recall the date assigned to 4Q169 is the mid-first century BCE. See the section on 4Q169 in Ch. 2 of the present study, Section 2.3.3.1.

76 See Section 2.3.3.1 for the discussion concerning the correlation made between the Pharisees and Hyrcanus, due to his mother Salome Alexandra's befriending of the Pharisees.

meaning of “convert,” which applies to the *gēr*. Based on these observations it seems that the *gēr* serves as a Gentile convert to Pharisaic Judaism in this text.

3.3.2 4Q174 *Florilegium Frag. 1, 1, 1–4*

4Q174 Flor (text and translation in Section 2.3.3.2) reinterprets several scriptural texts. The two predecessors with regard to the *gēr* in Frag. 1, 1, 1–4 are Ezek 44:9 and Deut 23:3–4. Those figures who will be excluded from the eschatological house (Temple),⁷⁷ which will be established in the last days, are a conflation of those who are excluded from the assembly of the LORD: first, the Ammonite, the Moabite, and the bastard (*mamzer*) are excluded within Deut 23:3–4 [Eng. 2–3].⁷⁸ Second, the exclusion from the sanctuary of the “son of a foreigner” (בְּזוּי־נֶכֶר) is found within Ezek 44:9.⁷⁹ To this list in 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 4, the *gēr* has been added as a new figure and does not draw from the two identified sources.⁸⁰

The purpose for which the *gēr* has been added to the list of the Ammonite, the Moabite, the bastard, and the foreigner may be discerned by finding the point of similarity between the listed entities. Terence Donaldson suggests that the main concern of the list is not to do with “membership in Israel,”⁸¹

77 Wise notes 4Q174’s change in terminology from the “assembly” (קהל) of Deut 23:2, to the “eschatological sanctuary,” lit. “house,” (בית). The present study describes this house/sanctuary as a Temple, due to line 3’s reconstructed reference to a מקדש אדני (sanctuary/Temple of the Lord), which is rewritten from Exod 15:17–18. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll*, 169.

78 On the use of Deut 23:3–4 in 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 1–4, see for example the following: Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies*, 76; Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll*, 169; Berthelot, “La notion de גַּר,” 205–6. Gerald Blidstein suggests that the excluded ממזר is in fact borrowed from Zech 9:6, based on various rabbinic sources which consider that passage to represent a “ban upon the future entry into Jerusalem by bastards.” This ban would include entry into the Temple, as well. Blidstein is the lone voice, however, suggesting Zech 9:6 as the motivator for an exclusion of the ממזר from the eschatological Temple of 4Q174; this passage does not seem to be the underlying motivating force. The general consensus seems appropriate, namely that Deut 23:3–4 serves as the scriptural predecessor for those 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 4 entries of Ammonite, Moabite, and bastard. Gerald Blidstein, “4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources on Bastard and Proselyte,” *RevQ* 8 (1974): 431–3.

79 On the use of Ezek 44:9 in 4Q174 Frag. 1, 1, 1–4, Allegro draws attention to line 3’s reference to לוא יבוא שמה, which is a slight variant from לוא יבוא אל־מקדשי (“he shall not come to my Temple”) in Ezek 44:9. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I*, 55, line 3.

80 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 212. Despite Blidstein’s lone observations concerning the matter of the illegitimate child (see n. 78 above of the present chapter), his views agree with Donaldson and others that generally, the term *gēr* is added to the list of those excluded from the Temple in 4Q174 in a unique fashion with neither textual predecessor nor successor. Blidstein, “4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources,” 433–35.

81 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 213–14.

meaning that the *gēr* is not necessarily being treated as a non-Israelite. Instead, he argues that the list's concern is to do with purity,⁸² especially if the eschatological Temple will be derived from a physical "sanctuary of men," meaning that a notion of Temple purity expands to the spatial realm of members of the sectarian movement in their contemporary era.⁸³ For example, Donaldson observes that the individual born of an "illicit sexual union" (the bastard, or *mamzer*) is included in the list of excluded individuals, even though this individual would be presumably "Israelite."⁸⁴

What kind of impurity would preclude the *gēr* from entering an eschatological Temple, in this rewritten context? Christine Hayes argues that according to the sectarian movement, the *gēr* is arguably not ritually impure, as one might expect if the *gēr* were a Gentile who did not follow purity regulations. Instead, where 4Q174 is concerned, the seed of the *gēr* remains profane and can never be transformed into that of a Judean, and more specifically, a member of the movement.⁸⁵ Therefore, the impurity in question is not ritual impurity, but is rather an attempt to avoid "moral impurity following from an illegal union," or, in other words, "genealogical impurity." The rationale for the impurity stems from Ezra 9:1–2's exegesis of Exod 19:6 to mean that all Israelites are holy priests, with a holy seed.⁸⁶ In other words, the authors of 4Q174 (who have been affiliated with the S tradition) do not believe that Judean kinship is mutable for Gentiles, because they lack a holy seed. To return to Donaldson, while he is correct to say that the list has to do with purity, this purity concerning the *gēr* specifically, at least, does in fact relate to the question of shared kinship in Israel.

82 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 214.

83 See Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 212–14; the present study's section on 4Q174 in Ch. 2 (especially the citations from Brooke), and the introductory chapter's section on the sectarian nature of the movement (especially the citations from Harrington and Schmidt), Sections 2.3.3.2 and 1.1.1, respectively.

84 Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles*, 213.

85 Christine Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), Ch. 3, esp. pp. 61–62. The present study does not apply Hayes's notion of genealogical impurity to all occasions where the *gēr* is employed in scriptural rewriting in the DSS. It will be seen that only the *gēr* of 4Q169 and 4Q174 is affected by this notion, which pertains to the S tradition of the sectarian movement.

86 Berthelot, "La notion de גֵר," 206–7. Berthelot refers to Christine Hayes, "Intermarriage and Impurity in Ancient Jewish Sources," *HTR* 92 (January 1999): 9. In this earlier article, Hayes discusses this concept of genealogical impurity in Jubilees and 4QMMT. See also Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 21–26.

In sum, the *gēr* in 4Q174 is excluded from the movement's contemporary physical space in addition to the eschatological Temple into which its members will be transformed, for reasons of genealogical impurity. As iterated above, the rationale for genealogical impurity is that an Israelite seed is holy and therefore immutable. The implication behind the notion of genealogical impurity is that the *gēr* is not recognized to have made any change in kinship away from that of being a Gentile. In terms of semantics, the *gēr* may now represent one of two different entities. On the one hand, the *gēr* may be a non-Israelite "resident alien." On the other hand, the *gēr* may represent a "proselyte" to general Judaism, but is excluded from the eschatological Temple because the members of the sectarian movement behind 4Q174 consider the proselyte to be perpetually genealogically impure despite this conversion. While Berthelot suggests that the view concerning inauthentic conversions may be with regard to the conversions of the Idumeans, specifically, the view toward perpetual genealogical impurity may be held regarding any Gentile individual who "converted."⁸⁷ Either way, the *gēr* is clearly excluded from the eschatological Temple. Based on the evidence the present study has accumulated thus far, the *gēr* has typically come to represent a proselyte, when seen within scriptural rewriting in the DSS. This evidence suggests that indeed, the *gēr* of 4Q174 may also be understood as a "proselyte," meaning a Gentile convert to general Judaism. However, according to the present study, the *gēr*'s exclusion from the eschatological Temple implies that a notion of mutable kinship for Gentiles is invalid for the authors of 4Q174.

87 As outlined in the present study's introduction chapter, Berthelot argues that within 4Q174, the *gēr* is a contemporary stranger claiming to be a "Jew" (i.e. a proselyte), but 4Q174 doubts the authenticity of such an action and therefore excludes him from the future Temple. Berthelot considers this theory a possibility in light of the era's forced circumcisions. The present study suggests the sociohistorical milieu of 4Q174 is simply that the authors behind it find themselves in an era whereby Hellenistic influence has instigated the mutability of ethnic identity features within Judaism, as within the wider ancient Mediterranean, and conversions are becoming evidenced. 4Q174 denies the legitimacy of a Gentile conversion because mutable kinship is deemed impossible for the reason stated above of genealogical impurity. Berthelot, "La notion de גֵר," 211–13. See the present study's introductory chapter, Section 1.2.1.

3.4 Texts Correlated with the Sectarian Movement: Alignment with Damascus (D) or Serekh (S) Tradition Indeterminate

3.4.1 4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple Frag. 1

As established in Chapter 2 (text and translation in Section 2.3.4.1), because 4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple is a very fragmentary text, connections between 4Q307 and scriptural predecessors will only be sought from within Fragment 1.⁸⁸ Select textual or thematic findings may help to uncover the text's meaning of the *gēr*. Timothy Lim does not suggest any scriptural predecessors in his DJD entry on this passage, due to the fragmentary and damaged nature of the text. The result of the study is a bricolage highlighting the *gēr* as one who returns to the land, within the context of a reworking of Ezra 1:4. Unfortunately, however, because the reconstruction cannot be confirmed, the finding will not be used when making overall conclusions concerning the nature of the *gēr* in the DSS and the sectarian movement.

Fragment 1 contains the excerpt where the term *gēr* has been employed. Line 6, now established to read “and it shall be that any *gēr* who remains” (יהיה כול הגר הנשאר), is quite unique as a whole, although one verbal connection exists to other scripture. Numerous occurrences exist for “the one who remains” (הנשאר). A few instances deal with either Judeans who remained in the land during the exile (2 Kings 25:22) or Judeans who were exiled and are now returned or returning, namely Ezra 1:4 and Haggai 2:3. In the context of 4Q307 as a scroll connected to the sectarian movement, “exile” could represent either the historical and scripturally narrated Babylonian exile, or the movement's own experience of “exile” from the rest of Judea and the Temple. The use of the root גור (“to sojourn”) in Ezra 1:4, which combines “the one who remains” (הנשאר) with “from all of the places where he may be sojourning” (using גר as a *qal* active participle, m. s.), seems to elicit the use in 4Q307 of הנשאר with the same גור root. In 4Q307, meanwhile, the root is used as the m. s. noun *gēr*. It is unlikely the 4Q307 text is reading הגר, with the definite article, as a *qal* active participle. That verbal form with the addition of the definite article is usually found alongside an additional nominal *gēr*, (see, for example, Exod 12:49; Lev 16:29; 17:10; 17:13; 19:34), which is not the case in 4Q307. The term *gēr* may represent either a resident alien or a Gentile convert to Judaism, when found in

88 To reiterate, despite the fragments being written in the same script and on the same skin, Timothy Lim expresses uncertainty whether the fragments were from one manuscript. The damaged nature of the fragments is the reason for this hesitancy. Lim, “4QText Mentioning Temple,” 255.

its nominal form. Accordingly, Fragment 1's combined use of הַנְּשָׂר and also גַּר appear to connect to Ezra 1:4, although Frag. 1, 6 transforms the outcome. In this case, the "gēr who remains" of 4Q307 appears to substitute for the Israelite in Ezra 1:4 who "remained" (i.e., who remained to return) from his place of "sojourning" during exile. The verbal and nominal intentions of the roots שָׂר and גַּר are purposefully exchanged to enable this shift in meaning.

Of note, Frag. 1, 7 also contains a fragmentary reference to "Israel among the nati[ons]." To what does "Israel" refer in this line? "Israel" in 11QT^a XL, 6 is clearly a reference to Israel as a land and geographic region. In 4Q307 Frag. 1, 7, the reference to Israel could represent the land of Israel (similar to 11QT^a XL, 6) among other Gentile regions. Or, the reference to Israel could represent some sort of "discredited" Israel as distinct from the sectarian movement.⁸⁹ The setting of Ezra 1:4 describes Israelites, living in exile among Gentiles, being called back to Jerusalem. The reference to "Israel among nati[ons]" within 4Q307 appears to draw from the memory of Ezra 1:4, even though it is difficult to discern the nature of this "Israel." Frag. 1, 7 further supports the argument that Frag. 1, 6 reworks Ezra 1:4.

In sum, what can one make of 4Q307 and its employment of the gēr? The results of textual bricolage are an allusion to an exilic community of remaining gērîm, with a likeness to Ezra 1:4. Intriguingly, that the gēr substitutes for the returning Israelite suggests that the gēr should be an "Israelite" also, and not a "resident alien."

3.4.2 4Q498 Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments Frag. 7

Maurice Baillet added a question mark to his title for these fifteen papyri fragments, "Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments,"⁹⁰ highlighting his uncertainty surrounding these fragments (text and translation in Section 2.3.4.2). This uncertainty extends to whether the fragments stem from one single manuscript or not.⁹¹ On the one hand, one might argue that the fragments could be from one

89 Philip R. Davies, "Old' and 'New' Israel in the Bible and the Qumran Scrolls: Identity and Difference," in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Others in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Congress Proceedings of 10QS, July 25–28 2004, Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 33. Davies assigns three somewhat different meanings to Israel: 1) "the sect"; 2) "the discredited entity of the past, a nation punished by exile"; and 3) "a continuing, equally discredited entity, the contemporary Jewish society outside the sect." In this fashion, Davies does not focus on Israel as a geographic entity. Davies, "Old' and 'New' Israel," 33.

90 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 73.

91 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 73.

manuscript. The handwriting itself looks fairly uniform in style, apart from the handwriting of Fragment 9 which is smaller than that of the other fragments.⁹² Furthermore, a link to Deuteronomy can be observed among a number of the fragments. For example, Frag. 2, 2 draws on Deut 8:7 with the phrase וַנְחַלֵּי מַיִם [“and streams of wa[ters]”). The Deuteronomic verse falls within Moses’s entreatment of the Israelites to follow the commandments of the “LORD your God” when they cross over the Jordan, precisely because “the LORD your God is bringing you into a good land, a land with *streams of waters* (אֶרֶץ נַחְלֵי מַיִם).” The occasion where the term *gēr* has been employed within Fragment 7, more specifically the reference to a לְגֵר with the *plene* spelling, could fall within the framework of Deuteronomy 26, as shall be seen below. On the other hand, it is still uncertain whether the fragments fit together as one text, or are from multiple manuscripts that happen to reuse passages from Deuteronomy. For that reason, one may only consider Fragment 7 on its own.

Frag. 7, 1 contains the reference to a לְגֵר, which Baillet suggests to be a *plene* spelling for לְגֵר.⁹³ This fragment could fit within the context of Deut 26:12 and its reference “to the Levite, to the *gēr*, to the orphan, and to the widow” (לְלוֹי לְגֵר (לְיָתוֹם וְלְאַלְמָנָה)), who are the recipients of the third year produce tithe. Or, the fragment could draw from the reference to these same tithe recipients listed in Deut 26:13, although this version of the tithe recipients inserts a *vav* conjunction before the *lamed* prefix attached to the *gēr*. Chapter 2 discussed the two options of the letters *he* or *khet* visible at the end of the missing word that precedes the לְגֵר,⁹⁴ instead of the expected *yod* from לוֹי, as in Deut 26:12, or *vav*, as in Deut 26:13. Because no identical match can be made to scripture, no definitive conclusions can be drawn regarding the exact surrounding environment of the לְגֵר, despite the strong allusions to the *gēr* as a tithe produce recipient.⁹⁵

Where 4Q498 is concerned, the *gēr* passage appears to locate itself within the confines of Deuteronomy 26. Due to the fragmentary nature of this text, it is impossible to know whether the *gēr* in 4Q498 has been used in a preexilic fashion with respect to the Deuteronomic representation of a “resident alien” who receives the third year tithe, or, with a new meaning of a proselyte. For this reason, the findings regarding 4Q498 cannot be used for further assessment regarding the nature of the *gēr* within the sectarian movement.

92 Thank you to Professor Sarianna Metso for making this observation while studying the plate.

93 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 74. Baillet cites the *plene* spelling of וַגִּיר from Deut 5:14 in 8Q3, along with וַגִּיר from a Samaritan manuscript of Deut 10:19 as predecessors.

94 See Ch. 2 of the present study, Section 2.3.4.2.

95 The present study has considered that *he* might be a Qumran *plene* spelling for לוֹיָהּ, but there is no extant form in the DSS corpus that uses such a spelling for לוֹי.

3.4.3 4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back Frag. 45

Due to the uncertainty regarding whether the fragments of 4Q520 papUnclassified frags. (verso) are from the same manuscript, along with their overall fragmentary nature, the present study will analyze only the relevant fragment for any scriptural predecessor that may reveal themes concerning the *gēr* (text and translation in Section 2.3.4.3). The fragment responds to the method of bricolage, revealing a possible theme of a postexilic promise in which abandoned *gērîm* may be called back to YHWH in the same fashion as Israel. These reconstructed results remain hypothetical, however, and their results cannot extend beyond this chapter's assessment.

The fragment to consider is Fragment 45, in which one finds the occasion where the term *gēr* has been employed, הגרים. In line 2, one notes the unique structure] אודי[of which only the word itself ("a brand") and not the preceding word ending in final form *nun* is found in Zech 3:2: "Is not *this (man) a brand* (יָה אֹד) plucked from the fire?" Line 3 contains the fragmentary phrase]הגרים עזו[. There is no occasion of scripture whereby הגרים is followed by an *ayin*, *zayin*, and *vav*. Presumably the letters form a m. pl. passive participle עזובים ("the ones who were abandoned"). The plural *gērîm* and the plural passive participle "the ones who were abandoned" do not appear to be functioning like an attributive adjective ("the abandoned *gērîm*"), because normally the definiteness would be attached to both parts of the phrase in such a construct.⁹⁶ Instead, the phrase appears to function as a predicate adjective, thus, "the *gērîm* have been abandoned." While no m. pl. or f. pl. forms of עזובים or עזובות exist in scripture, a number of occurrences of עזובה (the f. s.) occur in prophetic texts that deal with the prophecy of exile, exilic, or postexilic themes: Isa 54:6; 60:15; 62:4; Jer 4:29; and Zeph 2:4. In each of these examples, Israel is the subject of the abandonment, whether alluded to symbolically as the wife of YHWH, identified simply as a "city," or named metonymously as a city within Israel, such as Jerusalem. In the postexilic examples in particular, though, the message is clearly one of hope that YHWH will bring Israel out of her desolate

96 Choon-Leong Seow, *A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew*, rev. ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), 72. Seow writes the following: "The attributive adjective modifies a noun. In this usage, the adjective agrees with the noun in gender, number, and definiteness. It also comes *after* the noun." Furthermore, a participle "may also be used like an attributive adjective." Seow, *A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew*, 83. Hebrew of the DSS does not seem to function any differently in this regard. Elisha Qimron discusses the feature, prevalent in DSS Hebrew, of doubly-marking both nouns with the plural in an attributive construct phrase, but says nothing with regard to the features of definiteness in noun or adjective phrases. Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, HSS 29 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 74–75.

nature once more. In Frag. 45, 3, Israel is substituted by the *gērîm* who have been abandoned.

What conclusions can be drawn concerning the nature of 4Q520 Frag. 45? This fragment may make use of exilic prophetic imagery, from Zech 3:2, and may also allude to other exilic and postexilic imagery from Isa 54:6; 60:15; 62:4; Jer 4:29; and Zeph 2:4. Perhaps the abandoned *gērîm* of 4Q520 will be called back and reconstituted in a similar fashion to those identified symbols or metonyms for Israel which were also the subject of abandonment. These *gērîm*, in substituting for Israel, appear to contain some type of Judean kinship. The prospect of demonstrating kinship by means of textual substitution is intriguing. There is, however, no way to confirm the reconstruction beyond acknowledgement that this passage does rewrite a reference to *gērîm* in some way.

3.5 Chapter Conclusions

This chapter considered the meaning of the *gēr* employed in the DSS that make use of scriptural rewriting. Similarities were observed by means of parallels in thematic, verbal, or nominal structures between the selected DSS and possible scriptural predecessors. The process of bricolage, that is, pulling together pieces (whether within multiple fragments or solely various possible scriptural predecessors within one fragment) into a new whole, was utilized in the fragmentary cases of 4Q307; 4Q377; and 4Q520 to seek overarching themes that could reveal the nature of the text, and the nature of the *gēr* within the text. Overall, the reuse of a breadth of material was evident, which helped to uncover the meaning of the *gēr*.

Findings from Chapter 3 reveal that the *gēr*, where discernible (on 4Q498 see below), is more than a Gentile “resident alien,” and in fact is a Judean convert. In some cases, the *gēr* is equated with an Israelite “brother.” In other cases, the *gēr* clearly represents an individual of Judean ethnic identity because of other indicators in the text, such as the *gēr* receiving an inheritance of land, substituting in the text for “Israel,” or entering a Temple courtyard in the physical proximity of Judean women. A real, and not fictive, change in kinship, as one feature of a full ethnic identity, would have had to take place in order to avoid purity concerns alongside of other sectarian group members. Because these features of shared kinship and connection to land are important to the Judean identity of a *gēr* when the term is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, consequently the features of shared kinship and connection to land appear strong within the ethnic identity of members of the sectarian movement, in general. These features have been observed to be important,

regardless of the present or future (eschatological) implications of any of the texts. Hellenistic influence of mutable ethnicity, already apparent within other literature of late Second Temple Judaism, is clearly evident.

In addition, 4Q423 Instruction^g, which has been identified as a document that serves as an early influencer for the D and S traditions, expresses the *gēr* as a Judean convert who is nevertheless excluded from those who will receive the mystery of existence. In this example, the *gēr* takes on the meaning of a Gentile convert to Judaism, but he is somehow not quite “converted” enough to receive this mystery. This example lends credibility to all the examples that follow, whereby the *gēr* is always identified as a Judean, but is variably included or not.

To that end, when the findings from Chapter 2 regarding the textual correlations with either the D or S traditions are considered in tandem with the results from Chapter 3, the results yield the following interesting preliminary divisions:

The *gēr* within CD VI–VII; CD XIV; 11QT^a XL; 4Q377 apocrPent.B; 4Q159 Ordinances^a; and 4Q279 Four Lots, always appears to be a full Judean (Israelite) member within the movement. As it happens, each of these texts is correlated with the D tradition. Therefore it appears that the D tradition accepts Gentile converts to Judaism as members, and considers Judean ethnicity to be mutable and open to Gentiles. Within 4Q169 pNah and 4Q174 Flor, the *gēr* appears to represent a Judean convert who is nevertheless excluded from the ingroup movement, because his conversion status is esteemed “fraudulent.” The idea has been raised that these fraudulent conversions may relate to accounts of historical conversions, such as those of the likely forced conversions of the Idumeans. However, it appears for the sectarian movement the concept of genealogical impurity would pertain to any conversion by a Gentile, and would be deemed fraudulent, regardless of the individual or the circumstances. These two texts correlate with the S tradition. In the S tradition, therefore, it appears that Judean ethnicity is immutable and closed to Gentiles. Overall, the D tradition appears more permeable than the S tradition, in that Judean ethnicity is mutable to Gentiles in the D tradition, but immutable to Gentiles in the S tradition. Why would the tradition of S uphold genealogical impurity which considers Judean kinship immutable to Gentiles, and consequently Gentile conversions to be “fraudulent”? Could other textual findings within the DSS add clarity to understanding these differences between the traditions of D and S?

Finally, a few observations may be made concerning the *gēr* in 4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple; 4Q498 papSap/Hymn; and 4Q520 papUnclassified frags. (verso). As seen in Chapter 2, these three texts correlate with the sectarian movement overall, although a connection with either the traditions of D or S

is indeterminate. Now, in Chapter 3, it is evident that the fragmentary nature of these texts makes establishing concrete scriptural predecessors and discerning the nature of the *gēr* also indeterminate, although a few hypotheses can be made when considering the fragments under consideration. First, where 4Q307 is concerned, only if the reconstruction הגר הנשאר is accurate, the *gēr* could be functioning as a convert. The reason for this convert status is due to the fact that the “*gēr* who remains” appears to take the place of the Israelite called back to Judea in Ezra 1:4, when the verbal and nominal intentions for the roots גור and שאר swap between the two passages. Second, despite a possible connection to Deuteronomy 26, the fragmentary nature of 4Q498 renders it impossible to make any informed decision concerning the nature of the *gēr* in this text. Whether this *gēr* is a resident alien or a convert is unknown, although the passage seems rewritten in some way. And third, the *gērîm* in 4Q520 Frag. 45 may substitute textually for Israelites, but only if the tentative reconstruction proves to be correct, of which there is no way to confirm. The tentative nature of these findings means that they cannot be utilized to make firm arguments regarding the nature of the *gēr* in the DSS. For that reason, these findings will not be brought into Chapter 4. Nevertheless, despite the tentative nature of these texts, the passages add value to the discussion thus far, through the observation that the *gēr* continues to be rewritten in texts with seeming connections to the sectarian movement overall. In other words, the *gēr* is a figure of ongoing concern and rewriting within the movement.

The above observations and questions will be further assessed in Chapter 4. There, the findings from Chapters 2 and 3 will be considered in closer detail. Upon examination of the identity-marking features of a shared notion of kinship, a connection to a land, and a shared common culture in the practice of circumcision, the specific nature of the D and S traditions will stand out in clearer detail.

Locating the *Gēr* and Assessing Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement

Chapter 2 provided the important preliminary step of correlating the DSS that utilize scriptural rewriting whereby the *gēr* is employed with either the D or S traditions. Chapter 2 was instructional in that it brought to the fore the fact that the *gēr* is always included within the texts correlating with the tradition of D (CD; 11QT^a Temple Scroll; 4Q377 apocrPent.B.; 4Q159 Ordinances^a; and 4Q279 Four Lots), and is always excluded within the texts correlating firmly with the tradition of S (4Q169 pNahum; and 4Q174 Florilegium). Chapter 3 proceeded to assess how the *gēr* changed between its employment in scrolls utilizing scriptural rewriting, and identifiable scriptural predecessors, in order to uncover changes in meaning that may have taken place due to differing sociohistorical environments. Chapter 3 discovered that the *gēr* is more than a Gentile “resident alien,” and is in fact a Gentile convert to Judaism.

Furthermore, the individual assessment of texts in Chapter 3 highlighted the fact that the features of shared kinship and connection to a land—both identified to be significant markers of late Second Temple Judean ethnic identity—are also significant for the sectarian movement. In addition to kinship and land, the introduction chapter found that the ethnic feature of common culture (sometimes described under the purview of “religious practice”), in particular the practice of circumcision as a sign of the Abrahamic covenant with YHWH, was also a significant feature that marked ethnic conversions within late Second Temple Judaism. Having now recognized the importance of shared kinship and connection to a land for ethnic identity in the sectarian movement, along with the mutability, or immutability, of these features which permits or denies Gentile conversions, it would make sense for the feature of common culture in the practice of circumcision to play a role in these conversions, as is the case in late Second Temple Judaism more generally.

Therefore, the chapter proceeds with an analysis of the three features: first, the shared notion of kinship, and in particular the *gēr*’s identification as a “brother”; second, the *gēr*’s inclusion in the promise of land; and third, the manner in which passages correlating with the traditions of D or S discuss the matter of circumcision, regarded to be a known sign of conversion to membership in a Judean group. The chapter locates the term *gēr* with respect to how the term interacts with notions of kinship and land. The chapter furthermore

collates the findings of Chapters 2 and 3 regarding both the convert status of the *gēr* within scriptural rewriting in the DSS and also the correlations with either the D or S traditions of those passages. The manner in which the features appear, when analyzed through the lens of their correlations with the D or S traditions, will further reveal how and why levels of ethnic mutability differ between the D and S traditions. This chapter discovers that within the S tradition, members of S are in fact “supra-Judeans” who undergo an extra “circumcision of the heart.” This “supra-Judean” nature of members helps to explain why the S tradition does not accept regular Gentile converts to Judaism as does the D tradition. Finally, while it was noted in the introduction chapter that Shaye Cohen argues that the component of shared kinship is immutable within early Judean conversions, Steve Mason and Philip Esler consider the notion of shared kinship to represent only one feature of the broader picture of a mutable notion of ethnicity. For these two scholars, the identity *in toto* is mutable, which includes all three features observed to hold particular significance within the present study. Such a suggestion implies that all three features have the potential to demonstrate mutability, and this possibility is exactly the finding of the present chapter.

4.1 Shared Kinship as a Marker of Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement: How *Gēr* Represents Kin

This section will collate the particular patterns whereby the comparison between the *gēr* of scriptural rewriting and scriptural predecessors highlighted the significance of the feature of shared kinship for ethnic identity in the sectarian movement, and how its mutability or immutability affected the meaning of the *gēr* as a convert. In some cases, certain passages evidence multiple patterns in which the *gēr* has come to represent general Judean kin. The cases where the *gēr* is nevertheless excluded, despite demonstrating Judean kinship, will be considered together as one group. Finally, because the *gēr* is often found to equate to a “brother,” the section also explores further the identity of a “brother” within the sectarian movement.

4.1.1 *Gēr Is (an Israelite) Brother*

A dominant theme, found in a number of passages, identifies the *gēr* as kin by means of the manipulation of “brotherhood” language. The passages that employ the *gēr* from CD VI, 14–VII, 1; CD XIV, 3–6; 4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 1–3; and 4Q377 Frag. 1, 1, 1–9, all fit within this largest pattern. In CD VI, 14–VII, 1, the memory of an Israelite loving his friend like himself (Lev 19:18) conflates with the memory

of an Israelite who shall love the *gēr* like himself (Lev 19:34). The reinterpretation of this HL material results in the conclusion that CD VI, 20–21's reference to both loving a brother and also helping a *gēr* suggests that this *gēr* substitutes for a friend, and is indeed a further explication of a brother, albeit a brother in need.

CD XIV, 3–6 states that each category listed, including the *gēr*, is a “brother” one to the other. If the “brother” represents Israelite kin, then the *gēr* is also Israelite kin in CD XIV. In addition, while this *gēr* of CD XIV is clearly a member of the camps, calling to mind Deut 29:9–11, CD goes a step further and identifies in CD XIII, 20 that the assembly of the camps is for the “seed of Israel.” Thus, the *gēr* is identified as Israelite “seed,” which, when placed alongside the reference to those listed members as “brothers,” identifies the *gēr* as Israelite kin in an indirect fashion as well. The cumulative effect of “seed” and “brother” is one of a shared notion of kinship.

4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 1–3 consists of further reinterpretation of HL material, namely the manumission regulations of Leviticus 25:47–55. In particular, 4Q159 omits brother references that are present in Lev 25:47–48. This rewriting leaves no way to differentiate between a *gēr* and the textual memory of a “brother” as in Leviticus 25, suggesting that the *gēr* is an Israelite brother. This finding is confirmed with the deletion of “*tôshāb*” resulting in the use of “*gēr*” without accompaniment, the term known in rabbinic texts to represent a Judean proselyte.

Finally, the joint allusion of 4Q377 Frag. 1, 1, 1 to Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16 conflates the figures of a man, a friend, and a *gēr*, while omitting a reference to a “brother,” which in the context of Deut 1:16 is used to differentiate between an Israelite brother and a resident alien *gēr*. The added feature that the *gēr* is included in a list of those that will replace other nations, borrowed from Exod 3:8, further effaces the differentiation between an Israelite and a *gēr*. In 4Q377, as was seen in 4Q159 above, when the term “brother” in a scriptural predecessor differentiates between a resident alien *gēr* and an Israelite brother, the scriptural predecessors's use of the term “brother” is omitted in the scriptural rewriting.

4.1.2 *Gēr Is Identified as Israelite Kin through Other Kinship Terminology*

4Q279 Frag. 5, 1–6 and 11QT^a XL, 5–6 both categorize accordingly, whereby the *gēr*'s identity as Israelite kin is established through kinship terminology, apart from that of direct identification as a “brother.” The statement in 4Q279 Frag. 5, 3 that lots (sg. גורל) shall be ordered according to one's “pedigree” implies a kinship connection between the Aaronide priests, Levites, Israelites, and the *gērîm*, even though the *gērîm* are ranked fourth in the list. The very fact that

these *gērîm* receive a lot at all implies that they are now Israelite, in particular when one contrasts this passage to a scriptural predecessor such as Num 36:2, in which land inheritance is appointed by lot to Israelites, specifically. This outcome whereby a lot is now granted inverts the memory of Num 18:20 and Deut 26:11, in which the Aaronide priest, the *gēr*, and the Levite receive other offerings or tithes precisely because they do not own land.

With respect to 11QT^a, all those who enter the Temple are referred to as “the children of Israel” (XLVI, 7–8), and thus indirectly the *gēr* of XL, 6, who is within the third courtyard of the Temple, is also one of these Israelite children.

4.1.3 *Physical Proximity with Respect to Other Judeans Indicates Gēr as Sharing in Kinship*

This third categorization of utilizing the strategy of scriptural rewriting so that the *gēr* comes to represent a Judean applies to 11QT^a XL, 5–6. The *gērîm* in 11QT^a XL, 6 are esteemed to share Judean kinship due to their physical proximity to other Judeans. The third courtyard described in XL, which appears to reinterpret the Temple exclusions until the “third generation” in Deut 23:8–9, includes *gērîm* and women together. The women in this courtyard are seemingly Judean by birth, and for purity reasons, such as the regulation to avoid closeness to Gentiles on the Sabbath (CD XI, 14), it therefore seems impossible that women would be placed next to Gentile resident aliens in this third Temple courtyard. The *gērîm* in this passage, based on their physical proximity to women in the third courtyard, represent Judean kin and thus proselytes.

4.1.4 *Effacement of Gēr as a Resident Alien*

This categorization whereby scriptural rewriting effaces either the term *gēr* that was employed, or, the original context of the *gēr* in the scriptural predecessor, applies to two passages, namely 11QT^a XLVIII, 6–7 and 4Q377. With regard to 11QT^a XLVIII, 6–7, the *gēr* was clearly omitted from its textual predecessor Deut 14:21. The reason established for the omission was that the author understood that a contemporary meaning of “proselyte,” as in a Gentile convert to Judaism, would be equated with the term *gēr*, but an actual meaning of “resident alien” was necessary within the context of the Deuteronomistic passage. Therefore, to avoid confusion, the term was simply omitted. The absence implies that the author(s) understood a contemporary meaning for the *gēr* other than that of “resident alien.”

Where 4Q377 is concerned, the replacement of the Mosaic voice of Exod 18:16 and Deut 1:16 with the voice of God effaces the scriptural context and “resident alien” meaning of the *gēr*. Instead, the *gēr* of 4Q377 is now included in the promise of a land which is better and wider. While this new land alludes

to that promise offered to the Israelites in Exod 3:8, it is in fact a land in a new rewritten context, which may now include the *gēr* as Israelite.

4.1.5 *Judean Convert Status of a Gēr Is Denied*

This final categorization represents the *gēr* in quite a different fashion. In the two relevant texts, namely 4Q169, Frags. 3–4, II, 7–10 and 4Q174, Frag. 1, I, 1–4, irrespective of whether the *gēr* can be identified as sharing in Judean kinship, he is nevertheless excluded from membership in the intended ingroup of each text. Where 4Q174 Frag. 1, I, 1–4 is concerned, within the list of Ammonite, Moabite, bastard, foreigner, and *gēr*, the *gēr* is excluded from the future eschatological Temple due to genealogical impurity. This *gēr* was perceived to represent a Gentile convert to Judaism both by the *gēr* himself and also by general Judaism, but it appears that the S tradition responsible for this text denies the legitimacy of such an act of conversion because a Gentile's kinship can never change to that of a Judean. One recalls that through the lens of genealogical impurity, a Gentile's seed can never mix with that of a Judean, because the seed of a Judean is holy and immutable to non-Judeans. This sort of impurity means that the kinship of a Gentile can never convert into that of a Judean. For that reason, the *gēr* is among those excluded from the eschatological Temple because according to the tradition of S, the *gēr*-convert is a Gentile just the same.

The *gēr* of 4Q169, another text correlated with the S tradition, is treated similarly to the *gēr* of 4Q174. In 4Q169, Frags. 3–4, II, 8–9, a *gēr* has “attached himself” to a list of kings and princes, priests and people, reminiscent of that *gēr* belonging to Isa 14:1. Since all the figures listed represent “mised” Pharisees, this means that the *gēr*, being equally swayed by Pharisaic teachings, likely represents a Gentile convert to Pharisaic Judaism. That the whole passage replaces a critique against foreigners with a critique of the Pharisees furthermore implies that this *gēr* is tantamount to being a Gentile convert. Nevertheless, a mutable ethnicity is impacted by closely interconnected notions of kinship and common culture, leading the conversion of the *gēr* of 4Q169, regardless of an affiliation with any opposing sectarian group, to be esteemed fraudulent as well.

In these two examples, Gentile converts to Judaism may consider themselves, and be considered by general Judaism, to have fully taken on a Judean ethnic identity, including the feature of kinship; nevertheless, the legitimacy of their conversions is denied by the authors of these texts.

4.1.6 *Who Is a “Brother”?*

As noted in section 4.1.1 above, certain of the patterns of scriptural rewriting involve the *gēr* assuming a notion of shared kinship by means of equation with

a sectarian movement “brother.” Thus far the present study concludes that the “brother” is clearly Israelite (Judean) in the DSS. Can a brother in the occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed in the DSS truly indicate a notion of shared Judean kinship? At this point a brief survey of other scholars who have also considered the question of the nature of the “brother” in the sectarian movement is in order.

According to Aharon Shemesh, “your fellow [brother]’ (אחיד), ‘your kinsman [friend]’ (רעד) and ‘your countryman [child of your people]’ (בן עמד) refer exclusively to members of the sect; not only are those outside the sect not ‘fellows’ or ‘kin,’ they are not even counted as members of the same people.”¹ Shemesh looks to 1QS IX, 15–18, 21–23, which prohibits movement members to have any dealings whatsoever with the “men of the pit” so that the counsel of the Torah might remain hidden from those persons.² Thus, anyone not included in the movement becomes a man of the pit. For anyone who is not a brother, friend, or child of the people, “a concerted effort should be made to expose them to the opposite treatment.”³ This “treatment” in question, to which the opposite should be applied for those who are not brothers, friends, and children of the people, is that of loving one’s brother as oneself, from Lev 19:16–18.⁴ All other outsider Judeans are considered enemies.⁵ In this case, a “brother” would be more specifically only a member of the sectarian movement, and Judean kinship itself becomes irrelevant.

According to Katell Berthelot, the reference to “one after the other [lit. each one after his brother]” (איש אחר אחיהו) in CD XIV, 5 refers to the brother as a movement member: the brother reference is not cosanguinal. She concludes thus because the terms “brother” (אח) and also “friend” (רע) often occur together and seemingly as synonyms, such as their placement within CD XX, 17–18: “each will speak 18 to his friend, each (helping) his brother to be righteous” (וַיְדַבְּרוּ אִישׁ אֶל רֵעֵהוּ לְהַצְדִּיק אִישׁ אֶת אָחִיו).⁶ Berthelot argues that the אח - רע combination represents an Israelite brother (a fellow Israelite),⁷ with

1 Aharon Shemesh, “The Origins of the Laws of Separatism: Qumran Literature and Rabbinic Halacha,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 225.

2 Shemesh, “Origins of the Laws of Separatism,” 225.

3 Shemesh, “Origins of the Laws of Separatism,” 230.

4 Shemesh, “Origins of the Laws of Separatism,” 225.

5 Shemesh, “Origins of the Laws of Separatism,” 231.

6 Berthelot, “La notion de גר,” 189–90, and n. 64. Hamidović offers a perspective similar to Berthelot on the sectarian movement’s meaning of the “brother,” calling the “brother” (אח) synonymous with the “friend” (רע), and also citing CD XX, 18 as example. Hamidović, “À la frontière,” 286. The translation “neighbour” as found in Charlesworth has been changed to match the translation of Berthelot (רע as “friend”).

7 Berthelot, “La notion de גר,” 190.

respect to the command to love the “brother” like himself of CD VI, 20–21, which she links to the parallel structure of Lev 19:18, a passage that instead inserts the “friend.”

In this regard Berthelot’s description of a “brother” differs from that of Shemesh, for Berthelot emphasizes the general Israelite kinship of a sectarian movement member, while Shemesh negates the general Israelite kinship in the act of highlighting the movement’s view that any outsider, whether Judean or non, is specifically not kin. Both consider a “brother” and “friend” as synonyms. Neither conclude that the sectarian movement considers the “brother” as a literal brother in terms of cosanguinal relationship. They do, however, each allude to the fact that a notion of shared kinship (whether Israelite or “sectarian movement member”) exists in identifying one another as brothers. Jutta Jokiranta emphasizes this familial sentiment found in the brother language of the sectarian writings. Jokiranta describes the fact that the brotherly relationships are not cosanguinal by defining the brother terminology as metaphorical in nature.⁸ The present study’s findings indicate, however, that although not indicating cosanguinal reference, calling one another “brothers” and even calling the *gēr* a “brother” suggests shared Judean kinship among all those individuals that is more than metaphorical.

In addition to brother language expressing a notion of shared kinship, another purpose for the use of brother language within the DSS can be identified. Jutta Jokiranta and Cecilia Wassen suggest that the purpose of brother language within the DSS, in particular D and S, is to identify hierarchical relationships between movement members. The “brother,” when not meaning a cosanguinal kin, such as CD V, 19 “Johne and his brother,” represents “the other” and is found to be synonymous with the “friend.”⁹ Jokiranta and Wassen take into consideration both the passages from CD VI–VII and XIV. The repeated use of “brother” in CD XIV, 5–6 describes the hierarchical ordering for both seating and inquiry, and implies “one after the other.” The use of “brother” three times in CD VI, 11–VII, 4, esteemed to be an early D tradition, emphasizes the “unity of the members and their behaviour towards each other.”¹⁰ Furthermore, Jokiranta and Wassen point out that while this brother language may express unity,

8 Jutta Jokiranta, “גֵּר,” *ThWQ* 1:129–136.

9 Jutta Jokiranta and Cecilia Wassen, “A Brotherhood at Qumran? Metaphorical Familial Language in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings on the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, et al., STDJ 80 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009), 196–97, including n. 66. The hierarchical sentiment within brother terminology in the sectarian movement is also discussed in Jokiranta, *ThWQ* 1:134–136.

10 Jokiranta and Wassen, “A Brotherhood at Qumran?” 197–98.

it does not express democracy.¹¹ They argue that instead of a “brotherly guild,” the sectarian movement appears as a “patriarchal household,” where members may be brothers, but these brothers have different “responsibilities and ranks.”¹² Brother language is used to express this hierarchical relationship. The recognition that hierarchical status is normative amid sectarian movement members, in addition to the finding that *gēr* and brother are coterminous (in the tradition of D), confirm the ingroup status and shared kinship of the *gēr* within texts that describe hierarchy (namely CD XIV, 4Q279, and 11QT^a XL, the former two placing the *gēr* fourth in the list, and the latter placing the *gēr* in a third courtyard).¹³

4.1.7 *Ethnic Identity in the Feature of Shared Kinship: Conclusions*

Within the sectarian movement a brother appears to represent either a fellow member who is Israelite, or a fellow member who is “beyond” being Israelite. The brother is not cosanguinal, but shares the same kinship with other brothers within the same tradition. Furthermore, the term conveys a meaning of hierarchical rank within the movement. Because a brother and a *gēr* are synonymous, this finding implies that a *gēr* who is included is also considered either a fellow member who is Israelite, or a fellow member who is “beyond” being Israelite.

The divergent findings of Shemesh and Berthelot can be explained when one compares their findings with those of the present study, namely that within the sectarian movement a difference exists between the D and S traditions. According to Berthelot, a “brother” has an Israelite identity. The *gēr* as a brother, who is Israelite even if ranked hierarchically lower, matches the observations of the present study’s texts found to correlate with the D tradition in which the *gēr* is a brother: CD VI–VII; CD XIV; 4Q159; and 4Q377. In each of the other texts correlated with the D tradition, even though the *gēr* was not directly equated with a “brother” (Temple Scroll and 4Q279), the *gēr* was associated with having an Israelite kinship, and would thus also by default represent a “brother.”

According to Shemesh, it appears that a “brother” is somehow “other than” an Israelite. This perspective seems best attributed to the present study’s

11 Jokiranta and Wassen, “A Brotherhood at Qumran?” 201.

12 Jokiranta and Wassen, “A Brotherhood at Qumran?” 203.

13 Shaye Cohen also recognizes that the hierarchy expressed by placing the *gēr* farther down the list of members (in the Temple Scroll and in CD XIV) does not negate the *gēr*’s status as a convert. Cohen, “Crossing,” 30.

examples of 4Q169 and 4Q174.¹⁴ The *gēr* in both 4Q169 and 4Q174 is a type of Judean convert (whether Pharisaic or follower of general Judaism, respectively), but the new Judean kinship of the convert is irrelevant. Due to the notion of genealogical impurity, according to these texts the legitimacy of the conversion is denied, therefore the *gēr* has never really attained this Judean status. A better way to describe the phenomenon, where the S tradition scrolls 4Q169 and 4Q174 are concerned, would be to describe that a “brother” is actually “more than” an Israelite or Judean. To be “more than” Israelite still requires an underlying foundational Israelite kinship. In other words, the sectarian movement member within the tradition of S is supra-Judean. While it seems that Judeans could convert into this supra-Judean state, someone perceived as lacking Judean kinship could not. Brothers included within the tradition of S must be supra-Judean, and the *gēr* of 4Q169 and 4Q174 is not, because of his perceived genealogical impurity.

This section confirms that kinship is clearly a component of ethnic identity within the sectarian movement. Furthermore, attaining Judean kinship may be either possible and mutable (in the tradition of D) or impossible and immutable (in the tradition of S). A fellow “brother” in the D tradition of the sectarian movement is Judean, while a fellow “brother” in the S tradition of the sectarian movement is “supra-Judean.” The perspectives of Berthelot and Shemesh both hold legitimacy. Can the present study find further evidence to confirm the theory that members of the S tradition are “supra-Judean”? In other words, what would elevate the status of a member of S to that of “supra-Judean”? The answer lies in the discussion of circumcision to follow in Section 4.3.

4.2 Connection to Land as a Feature of Ethnic Identity: *Gēr*'s Incorporation in the Promise of Land

The second dominant feature of Judean ethnic identity, that of a connection to a land, is also present within those DSS containing occasions where the

14 The perspective also applies to 4Q423, but it was determined that because the document was found to be “presectarian,” i.e. preceding the sectarian movement’s specific “Teacher’s” traditions of D and S, the text would not be considered in the collated results pertaining to the sectarian movement in Chapter 4. However, recall that 4Q423 was instructional in providing a textual example whereby a *gēr* is employed to mean a Judean convert to Judaism, even though this newfound Judean status is still not enough for the text’s intended ingroup. Because 4Q423 is an earlier text, this example demonstrates that an understanding of the *gēr* as a convert readily exists for all the other texts under consideration.

term *gēr* has been employed. This section will collate the particular patterns whereby the comparison between the *gēr* of scriptural rewriting and scriptural predecessors highlighted the significance of the feature of a connection to land for ethnic identity within the sectarian movement. Often the feature of connection to land is demonstrated by means of inclusion in a promise of land, whether that be a promise of land inheritance or a promise of a new land.

4.2.1 *The Promise of a Land of Honey*

It was discerned that 4Q377 relates specifically to a promise of a land of honey. In 4Q377 Frag. 1, 1, 1–9, God's voice is inserted into Moses's Sinaitic presence to forge a promise of a new land for a new time and place, fashioned out of allusions to a promise of a land flowing with milk and honey from Exod 3:8. The new land offers a new meaning for the *gēr*; his insider status is confirmed by the fact that he is not included in Exodus's list of foreigners who will be replaced. It appears that this land of honey will be granted when the commandments are kept. The *gēr* seems best described as a non-Gentile; the new context frees the *gēr* to be a Judean convert who is included in the Israelite promise of a land of honey.

With regard to this scroll, the question arises as to what exactly the reference to honey implies, other than a general reference to plenty. Multiple texts may be found concerning a theme in which honey is equated with law or wisdom, starting in the earlier, and strengthening throughout the later, Second Temple period.¹⁵ In the parascriptural text *Joseph and Aseneth*, Aseneth is commanded to eat honeycomb by a heavenly man as a part of her conversion process to Judaism (Chapter 16). In the narrative, the honeycomb is associated with immortality and life, reminiscent of the promise made to the Israelites in Deuteronomy 30 whereby they will receive life so long as they love YHWH and follow the commandments. Consequently, the honeycomb seems to represent Torah. The honeycomb in *Joseph and Aseneth* may represent Torah also through the lens of Sir 24:19–22, which describes the memory and possession of Wisdom as sweeter than honeycomb.¹⁶ Multiple passages from late Second Temple scripture refer to honey, as well. Psalm 19, a Torah psalm, describes

15 It is feasible that the connection between law and honey exists as early as the period prior to the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 586 BCE, based on Ezekiel's consumption of a scroll that tastes like honey, in Ezek 3:1–3. The scroll eaten is not clearly defined as Torah, however. Further discussion also rests on the date of composition, which is debatable. See, for example, Paul M. Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary*, LHBOTS 482 (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), Introduction, 1–62.

16 Concerning the honeycomb in *Joseph and Aseneth*, Edith Humphrey writes the following: "God's law, no doubt understood here through Sir. 24.20 in terms of wisdom, is

the ordinances of YHWH to be sweeter than honey (vv. 10–11), while Psalm 119, another Torah psalm, mirrors closely Joseph and Aseneth's allusion to consuming the law: "How sweet are your words to my taste, sweeter than honey to my mouth (v. 103)." By the late Second Temple period, wisdom and law appear to be synonymous, by means of their mutual description as honey.¹⁷ Consequently, for the author or authors of 4Q377, a tradition of wisdom and law is important, because of the scroll's reference to honey. Land is also connected, perhaps by means of legal stipulations that, if followed, will bring about the promised land of honey.

4.2.2 *Land Inheritance and Lots*

As a second fashion in which a theme of land is observed, 4Q377 and 4Q279 each have in common a theme of *land inheritance and lots*. 4Q377 Frag. 1, 1,

sweeter than honey from the comb." Edith M. Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, GAP (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 97.

17 Apart from Proverbs, the other above texts may be ascribed to the late Second Temple period or shortly thereafter. Joseph and Aseneth, even though subsequently utilized by Christians, in its composition is arguably a Hellenistic Judean work with a provenance possibly from Egypt, and may date somewhere between the first century BCE and the first century CE. See Randall Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), Ch. 8; Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 115. The original Hebrew work of Ben Sira was composed by Yeshua son of Eleazar, son of Sira, between roughly 190–180 BCE in Jerusalem, with a translation into Greek by his grandson written sometime between 120–117 BCE. See, for example, Alexander A. Di Lella and Patrick W. Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*, AB 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 1–16. Psalm 19 is seen as a composition of two layers, namely an appropriated Canaanite hymn to the sun (vv. 2–7 [Eng. 1–6]) followed by a postexilic Torah psalm (vv. 8–15 [Eng. 7–14]). See Ross J. Wagner, "From the Heavens to the Heart: The Dynamics of Psalm 19 as Prayer," *CBQ* 61 (1999): 246. Finally, Psalm 119 may be dated to the late Second Temple period. Jon Levenson argues that although the psalmist's primary theological influence is Deuteronomy, making a date for the psalm in the period of Ezra and Nehemiah a possibility, in fact certain Deuteronomistic key concepts such as "covenant" are missing. This finding, along with the fact that the psalmist receives his laws from teachers and elders, spiritual experience, and wisdom, leads Levenson to suggest that the psalmist's Torah is not limited to the Pentateuch. See Jon D. Levenson, "The Sources of Torah: Psalm 119 and the Modes of Revelation in Second Temple Judaism," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*, ed. Patrick D. Miller Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 559–74. Levenson's comment concerning the nature of the "Torah" calls to attention a wider debate, not engaged by the present study, regarding the exact nature of "wisdom" and "law" described in the texts of the late Second Temple period. For an overview concerning the varied subtraditions involved in wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible and late Second Temple period, see John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997).

4 refers to an inheritance, this time in the verbal form “to cause to inherit” (להנחיל). Two scriptural passages which use this verbal form are the wisdom-oriented Prov 8:21 and exilic-themed Isa 49:8, the latter of which offers a promise of inheritance, presumably one of land. Portrayed in 4Q377 as a recipient of land inheritance himself, the *gēr* makes most sense as an Israelite, rather than as a Gentile.

4Q279, Frag. 5, 4–6 also alludes to land inheritance with a reference to lots (sg. גורל). These lots may be lots of an apportioning of light. They may simultaneously refer to land inheritance promises made to Israelites, such as Num 36:2’s promise of land inheritance to be apportioned. Either way, the *gēr* is included in the promise of the inheritance. That a *gēr* should be included in an inheritance (of land) offers a marked divergence from scriptural predecessors wherein resident aliens do not own land, and once again suggests a Judean identity.

4.2.3 *Significance of Birth and/or Livelihood in the Land of Israel*

Finally, a third fashion in which the theme of land emerges in 11QT^a and 4Q159, whereby there is significance to a *gēr*’s living in the land of Israel. The present study follows the reconstruction in 11QT^a XL, 6 regarding *gērīm* who were born specifically “in Israel.” 4Q159, Frags. 2–4, 1–2 describes an Israelite selling himself to a *gēr* or to the offspring of the family of a *gēr* “in the presence of Israel.” This specific location is an addition to the scriptural predecessor Lev 25:47–55. The reference to selling oneself to the offspring of the family of a *gēr* in the presence of Israel implies that the *gēr* originated in Israel. In both cases it is important for the proselyte to have a connection to the land of Israel. One notes both of these passages are correlated with the D tradition, which makes sense in light of the fact that it is D which permits the inclusion of converts to Judaism. However, the inclusion of the Gentile convert to Judaism, where 11QT^a and 4Q159 are concerned, is not fully mutable; rather, this convert must still at least have been a Gentile born in Israel (i.e., stemming from a lineage of previously immigrated foreigners). This presence in Israel more strongly roots the *gēr* in the land, in parallel fashion to those third generation children who may subsequently enter the assembly of YHWH, identified in Deut 23:8–9 [Eng. 7–8], which happens to be the scriptural predecessor for 11QT^a XL, 5–6. The overall impression is that of an assumed Israelite kinship and ethnicity through a period of integration.

4.2.4 *Connection to Land as a Feature of Ethnic Identity: Conclusions*

What can be discerned from the multiple texts that draw heavily on themes of land, a land in which the *gēr* is included? The present study has revealed

that a notion of shared kinship and also a geographic connection to a land, both common ethnic identity markers, are relevant for not only late Second Temple Judaism more generally, but also the sectarian movement specifically. Indeed, Esler argues that “territory is frequently a dimension of ethnicity.”¹⁸ The *ġĕr*’s inclusion in a promise of land is a strong indicator that the *ġĕr* is included within the ethnicity of the group to whom the promise and the land belong. The *ġĕr* of these passages pointedly contrasts against scripture where the *ġĕr* is not included in land inheritance. For example, the *ġĕr* of 4Q279 who is included in the receipt of a lot, inverts passages such as Deut 26:11 where a *ġĕr* does not receive a lot. The *ġĕr* of these passages also pointedly contrasts against foreigner figures of the *nokrî* and the *zār* who instead pose as a threat to land and its inheritance for Israelites. For example, consider 4Q501 Apocryphal Lamentations B, 1: “Do not give to strangers our inheritance, nor the fruit of our labour to foreigners” (אל תתן לזרים נחלתנו ויגיענו לבני נכר).¹⁹ The stark contrast of the *ġĕr*’s inclusion within the inheritance, against the warning toward these foreigner figures, all the more strongly alludes to the *ġĕr* as an Israelite and member of the sectarian movement and not merely a resident alien.

Instead, the *ġĕr* is included within multiple texts that draw on themes of land, whether that be a promise of land inheritance and lots (4Q377; 4Q279), pointed references to a *ġĕr* originating in Israel (11QT^a XL; 4Q159), or a community who is promised a land of honey (4Q377). This section has demonstrated that for the sectarian movement, just as for late Second Temple Judaism more generally, the ethnic feature of connection to a land is mutable, just as is that of shared kinship. For some texts (11QT^a XL; 4Q159), the feature of connection to land can also be immutable, when the *ġĕr*’s place of birth is not Israel. Texts correlated with the sectarian movement generally, and the tradition of D specifically, are found to permit mutability of this feature. These features of connection to a land and shared kinship are also interconnected, since it is a *ġĕr*’s new Judean kinship which permits a connection to the land to unfold.

18 Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 71. Stephen Hultgren observes a connection specifically between the “Damascus covenant” and a theme of exilic return to the land. See Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 66 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 162–63. Jutta Jokiranta refers to this theme observed by Hultgren within D as one of sojourner (i.e. that members of the D tradition see themselves as sojourners). Jokiranta, “Conceptualizing *Ger*,” 675. The present study sees the theme of a promised return to land as one among many within a connection to land as a feature of ethnicity.

19 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 79. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.

4.3 Common Culture in the Covenantal Practice of Circumcision as a Feature of Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement

Thus far, the present chapter has now confirmed the importance of the ethnic identity features of kinship and connection to a land, which are significant for the sectarian movement just as for late Second Temple Judaism. Both features have the ability to be mutable (or not) and consequently play a significant role in identifying the *gēr* as a convert, as well as understanding the *gēr*'s subsequent inclusion or exclusion. The *gēr* in texts correlated with the D tradition (CD ×2; 11QT^a; 4Q377; 4Q159; and 4Q279) is always a Gentile convert to Judaism, as is the *gēr* of rabbinics, and is always included in the sectarian movement—albeit with the restriction that he must have been born in the land, according to 11QT^a and 4Q159. In contrast, regarding the texts 4Q169 and 4Q174 which correlate with the S tradition, the study has found that the *gēr*, even as a Gentile convert to Judaism, is excluded from the movement for reasons of genealogical impurity. A “brother” for the S tradition is someone “more than Judean,” or “supra-Judean,” and it appears that this special kinship is immutable for a newfound Judean who was a prior Gentile, despite being converted.

Because the features of kinship and connection to a land are mutable within the sectarian movement and arguably permit conversions, at this time the study looks at another feature of ethnicity, found to be an important marker of conversions within general late Second Temple Judaism, which is the ethnic feature of common culture as witnessed in the covenantal practice of circumcision. If the present study argues that the *gēr* within the sectarian movement is a convert, then a study of the practice of circumcision within the DSS will be in order to help prove this claim. As it happens, a study of circumcision will also further explain the differences in identity between the traditions of D and S, in particular the “supra-Judean” status of members in S that prohibits the acceptance of Gentile converts into their movement.

4.3.1 *Overview According to Pre and Post-Hellenistic Influence*

The act of circumcision did not serve as a marker of Gentile conversions in the Persian pre-Hellenistic Second Temple period. With regard to Exod 12:43–49, which describes the inclusion of circumcised non-Israelites in the Passover festival, Rainer Albertz suggests that Holiness legislators composed this passage to permit a “controlled religious integration of the alien inhabitants of the province.”²⁰ Albertz notes that it is the act of circumcision which acts as the medium for this controlled integration. The reason for this regulation, argues

²⁰ Albertz, “From Aliens to Proselytes,” 61.

Albertz, is that the Passover festival is the only domestic ritual over which the Jerusalem Temple did not exert control, and some mechanism was needed at the local level to oversee that “not all types of people participated in the domestic Passover.”²¹ In this case, the act of circumcision in this Persian period does not serve to treat aliens “in a way that would fit the proselytes of later periods.”²²

In a similar vein, ancient Israelite covenants in general did not represent a change in ethnicity, even though they were a way to extend the protective reach of individual kinship groups. According to Scott Hahn, in the scriptural context of ancient Israel, covenants “functioned as a legal means to integrate foreign individuals or groups within the familiar structure of society.”²³ A covenant entailed more than simply a legal contract, and incorporated other dimensions such as the familial.²⁴ Hahn believes that the purpose of a covenant that forges what he calls a “kinship covenant,” is to forge family ties amongst those who might otherwise be foes, or also to strengthen existing ties.²⁵ Oath swearing sealed the act of covenant.²⁶ Hahn lists scriptural examples of Abraham and Abimelech (Gen 21:22–34); Isaac and Abimelech (Gen 26:26–33); and Jacob and Laban (Gen 31:43–54).²⁷ These covenants span across different sorts of relationships, including between two Israelite ancestors (Abraham and Isaac) and a Philistine. Hahn also looks to the work of Frank Moore Cross, who uses the term “legal fictions” to describe the same mechanism of kinship covenant:

21 Albertz, “From Aliens to Proselytes,” 62.

22 Albertz, “From Aliens to Proselytes,” 66. On the matter of circumcision, Jakob Wöhrle takes a similar view to Albertz with regard to Exod 12:43–49, in addition to Gen 17:9–14. Wöhrle argues that circumcision in these pre-Hellenistic passages “cannot be understood in the sense of proselytism.” Wöhrle concludes that the texts are “directed only toward the integration of alien persons, who live in the land, and not toward the integration of alien persons in general.” Jakob Wöhrle, “The Integrative Function of the Law of Circumcision,” in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle, BZABR 16 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011), 71–87; direct citations from 84 (×2). It is in this fashion that Wöhrle’s argument is similar to that of Albertz, namely that circumcision is for controlled integration of a growing diverse population within Persian Yehud, an integration that will permit the land to remain holy.

23 Scott Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God’s Saving Promises* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2009), 3.

24 Hahn, *Kinship*, 8.

25 Hahn, *Kinship*, 37.

26 Hahn, *Kinship*, 41.

27 Hahn, *Kinship*, 43.

In tribal societies there were legal mechanisms or devices—we might even say legal fictions—by which outsiders, non-kin, might be incorporated into the kinship group. Those incorporated, an individual or a group, gained fictive kinship and shared the mutual obligations and privileges of real kinsmen.²⁸

The method of oath and covenant included as a way to share in the obligations and privileges of “real kinsmen” is not the same as the change in ethnicity entailed for a non-Judean to convert to a Judean identity. Abraham, Isaac, and Abimelech may have forged covenants for the sake of peaceful relations, but Abimelech remained as a foreigner to Abraham and Isaac, and vice versa.

However, due to Hellenism’s influence within the late Second Temple period, the act of circumcision as a practice of common culture could signal a sign of conversion by those non-Judeans who performed it. Shaye Cohen argues that for Josephus, the narrative of the Roman Metilius saving himself by “judaizing (*ioudaizein*) as far as circumcision” (*J. W.* 2.454) makes clear that circumcision is the point where “adherence” ends and “conversion” begins.²⁹ In other words, the practice of circumcision as a sign of the covenant with YHWH is equally a mutable feature of the ethnic identity that changes in a conversion to Judaism of the late Second Temple period. Furthermore, this practice of circumcision is regarded to be a normative and important feature not only for converts but also for Judean identity in general, made evident by a number of Judean and Gentile writers in the general time period under discussion.³⁰

Even though circumcision was a normative signifier of Judean identity, in the DSS, physical circumcision is never included as a ritual for the admission of new members. CD III, 12–15 describes a covenant with God that yielded revelations including holy Sabbaths, appointed times, righteous testimonies, true ways, and the desires of God’s will; no circumcision is mentioned. This absence of a circumcision ritual for new members has been interpreted in a variety of ways. One way is to argue that physical circumcision is not important

28 Frank Moore Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore; London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 7.

29 Shaye J.D. Cohen, “Respect for Judaism by Gentiles According to Josephus,” *HTR* 80 (1987): 427, see also 416, 418. To be clear, one must remember that Cohen, who has been seen to argue in favour of a mutable religious practice (common culture) and citizenship (connection to land), does not argue in favour of a mutable notion of kinship as a part of an ethnic identity. See the introduction chapter, Section 1.2.2.

30 For example, see Philo *Spec. Laws* 1.1–11; Josephus *Life* 113; Tacitus *Hist.* 5.5. See also Jdt 14:10. For further textual examples and discussion on circumcision as an important aspect of early Judaism, see Cohen, “Crossing,” esp. 26–27; also Collins, “A Symbol of Otherness.”

for the sectarian movement overall. Just such a notion has been argued by Sandra Jacobs, who asserts that the sectarian movement did not follow the rite of circumcision, as for them it was not regarded “as a requirement for the future redemption of Israel in the Dead Sea Scrolls.”³¹ Jacobs calls to mind that in addition to the nonexclusive Israelite nature of circumcision, its negative perception within the Greco-Roman era as “a disfiguring social stigma” would make it unappealing to the sectarian movement.³² Such perceptions toward circumcision within the movement as a whole would explain the absence of a ritual of circumcision for new members. This argument is unconvincing. Indeed, on the one hand, the sectarian movement can be seen to absorb Greco-Roman influences, such as devising association-like groups in the first place. Nevertheless, on the other hand, overall the scrolls exhibit a deep dislike for the Romans, codifying them as “Kittim” against whom they will wage war, evidenced in the War Scroll, for example. It seems unlikely that the movement would abandon circumcision due to Hellenistic preferences.

Another way to explain the absence of circumcision ritual for new members is to argue that there simply are no adult Gentile converts joining the group directly. This outcome could potentially mean that the *gēr* may have nothing to do with a Gentile convert to Judaism for the sectarian movement. However, the DSS do seem to imply that other Gentiles who joined the movement did, in fact, have to be circumcised. Such is the case of the male slave in CD XII, 10–11, who may not be sold to a Gentile because he entered the “covenant of Abraham” with the owner. While not an explicit reference to circumcision, the passage implies that the male slave would have been circumcised, especially in light of the passage regarding Abraham and his circumcision in CD XVI, 4–6 that will be described below.³³ It seems that circumcision of this adult male

31 Sandra Jacobs, “Expendable Signs: The Covenant of the Rainbow and Circumcision at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*, ed. Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold; in association with Bennie H. Reynolds III, VTSup 140/2 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011), 575.

32 Jacobs, “Expendable Signs,” 575.

33 The association between Abraham and male circumcision from the passage in CD XVI makes the likelihood of the male slave’s entrance into the covenant of Abraham in CD XII representative of circumcision a more likely argument than one which suggests that the joint referral to both a male and female’s entrance into the covenant implies something other than circumcision. An argument along those lines has been made by Daniel R. Schwartz, “Ends Meet: Qumran and Paul on Circumcision,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature*; ed. Jean-Sébastien Rey, STDJ 102 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014), 301. Entrance into the covenant of Abraham could represent different things for the male and female.

slave would have taken place, even though there is no rule articulating the details or timing of the ritual. From this case of likely adult circumcision left unarticulated, it is also possible that other adult circumcisions may be happening within the sectarian movement as well, even though left unwritten (or at least, without any remaining textual evidence). This more likely conclusion leaves open the possibility that the *gēr* can be a convert, after all.

Furthermore, even though explicit mention of circumcision rituals for new (adult) members are not evidenced in the rules of the DSS, both physical circumcision and nonliteral circumcisions are described in texts correlating with D and S, and therefore the feature of common culture in circumcision seems to be an integral part of membership in the sectarian movement in some way. Because these passages alluding to circumcision are not located within the occasions of scriptural rewriting where the term *gēr* has been employed, they have not yet been assessed. At this time, however, the present study will assess these references and discern whether there are any trends relating to circumcision between the D and S traditions, and what these trends might reveal about differences between the D and S traditions and attitudes toward conversion of the *gēr*.

4.3.2 *Allusions to Physical Circumcision as a Reminder of Complete Covenantal Obedience in the D Tradition*

Two passages concerning the physical act of circumcision are found within D. First, CD XVI, 4–6 rewrites Abraham’s initial circumcision from Gen 17:9–14 in the following manner: “And on the day when a man takes upon himself (an oath) to return to the Torah of Moses (לשוב אל תורת משה), the angel Mastema shall turn aside from after him, if he fulfills his words. Therefore, Abraham was circumcised on the day of his knowing (ביום דעתו) {ב} אברהם ביום דעתו.” A second passage, located within in 4Q266, Frag. 6, II, 6, draws on the regulations concerning women and childbirth of Leviticus 12, and the circumcision of male children: “And on the eighth day the flesh of his] foreskin [shall be circumcised” (וביום השמיני ימול בשר] עָרְלָתָּ [ו]).³⁴

These passages in D allude to the physical act of circumcision. The first passage identified (CD XVI, 4–6) describes the timely and absolute obedience of a person turning to the Torah of Moses, which is then paralleled with Abraham’s own circumcision. The reference is too vague to denote a specific practice of circumcision at the time of joining the movement. Instead, the reference to circumcision appears to denote the immediacy and the need to follow through with one’s faithful intentions, whether that be with regard to an

34 Text and translation are from Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4: XIII*, 55–56.

initial circumcision into the Abrahamic covenant, or obedience in the Torah of Moses as it pertains to the covenant of the sectarian movement. The second passage, 4Q266, Frag. 6, II, 6, draws upon the custom of circumcising an infant at eight days after birth. Even though a ritual of circumcision for Gentile converts is not extant within the writings of D, the presence of these two passages alerts readers to the fact that physical circumcision was a known cultural feature within the tradition of D. Knowing the importance of circumcision to Judean identity within late Second Temple Judaism by its frequent presence as a literary topic, and knowing the importance for the D tradition of maintaining a covenant with God, it is hard to imagine that the tradition of D would not require circumcision for all members, including those born to parents within the D tradition, and converts. Feasibly, the absence of a ritual of circumcision for the Gentile *gēr*-convert in D might suggest that the D tradition accepted individuals who had already converted to general Judaism and had already been circumcised. Or, as noted above, circumcisions may have occurred, but the articulation of the ritual for adults (slave or free) was not described or is no longer extant in writing.

More important than noting the absence of a ritual of circumcision for converts in D, however, is to note the absence of an explicit restriction to eighth day circumcision. Neither of the two identified references to circumcision in D (one describing Abraham's adult circumcision and one describing the circumcision of a baby on the eighth day after his birth) explicitly restrict circumcision to eighth day circumcision *only*. The passages are not at all exclusive to the extent explicitly recounted in Jub. 15:14 and 15:25–26, as a contrasting example, whereby anyone not circumcised on the eighth day is destined for destruction.³⁵ The absence in the rule of D of a ritual of circumcision for converts does not negate the *gēr*'s status as a Gentile convert to Judaism. Calling to mind the various arguments described in Section 4.3.1 above regarding the absence of the ritual of circumcision for new adult members in the DSS, it was

35 Jub. 15:14 reads as follows: "The male who has not been circumcised on the eighth day—the flesh of whose foreskin has not been circumcised on the eighth day—that person will be uprooted from his people because he has violated my covenant." Jub. 15:25–26 reads as follows: "This law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days, nor omitting any day of the eight days because it is an eternal ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. 26 Anyone who is born, the flesh of whose private parts has not been circumcised by the eighth day does not belong to the people of the pact which the Lord made with Abraham but to the people (meant for) destruction. Moreover, there is no sign on him that he belongs to the Lord, but (he is meant) for destruction, for being destroyed from the earth, and for being uprooted from the earth because he has violated the covenant of the Lord our God." Translation from VanderKam, *Jubilees, an Edition*, 89, 91–92.

discerned that the ritual's absence is unlikely due to circumcision being regarded as unimportant for movement members, or even that there are no adult Gentile converts in the movement. Instead, the fact that adult male slaves do seem included, and there is no mention of their circumcision, suggests that adult circumcisions may happen, but are left unrecorded. Such a conclusion suggests that at the time of joining the movement, independent (non-slave) adult Gentiles joining the group would have been already circumcised as converts before joining, or, become circumcised at the time of joining.

Overall, these two textual examples of circumcision from D imply an awareness of actual physical circumcision. This circumcision serves as a reminder for immediate obedience to a covenant, once revealed. Furthermore, circumcision is described as occurring at eight days after birth, but this description does not contain any wording that would definitively restrict circumcision to that time frame.

4.3.3 *Circumcision of the Heart as Spiritual Obedience in the S Tradition*

A total of five passages within DSS material refer to a spiritual and metaphorical circumcision of the heart.³⁶ 1Q Peshar Habbakuk XI, 12–13 refers to “the priest whose shame prevailed over his glory, 13 for he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart” (הכֹּהֵן אֲשֶׁר גָּרַר קִלְוֹנוֹ מִכְבוֹדוֹ 13 כִּי אֵלֹא מָל אֶת עוֹרֹלַת לְבָבוֹ).³⁷ Based on a proposed reading by John Strugnell, 4Q177 Catena A Frag. 9, 8, which he has reassembled as Frags. 7, 9, 10, 11, 20, 26, line 16, may have a reference to “take away the foreskins of their fleshy heart in the last generation” (הַסְּרִי [הַסְּרִי] הַסְּרִי עֵרְלוֹת לִבָּם [בְּ] שְׂרָם בְּדוֹר הָאֵחָרִי).³⁸ 4Q434 sBarkhi Nafshi Frag. 1, 1, 4 contains the phrase “And he has circumcised the foreskins of their heart” (וַיִּמּוֹל עוֹרֹלוֹת לְבָבָם).³⁹

36 A complete list of these passages may be found by combining the partial lists within the following: Martin G. Abegg, “The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians,” in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo, JSJSup 71 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 82; David Rolph Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart’ in 4Q434 Barkhi Nafshi,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 532.

37 Maurya P. Horgan, “Habakkuk Peshar (1QpHab),” in *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, James H. Charlesworth, PTDSSP (Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 180–81.

38 Strugnell, “Notes en Marge,” 243–45. Strugnell’s reading differs from that of Allegro’s in DJD v, which is the following: “[...] of foreskins to lead them aright in the L[ast] Generation” (וְסִרִי עֵרְלוֹת לִישְׂרָם בְּדוֹר הָאֵחָרִי). Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4: I*, 70. See also Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart,’” 532, and n. 16.

39 Hebrew text and translation from Moshe Weinfeld and Rolph Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetic and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, eds Esther Chazon et al., DJD 29 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 270–71; same as that found in Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart,’” 532.

4Q504 Words of the Luminaries Frag. 4, 11 contains a fragmentary entreaty to “circumcise the foreskin of [our heart]” (מולה עורלתָ לִבְנוֹ).⁴⁰ Finally, 4Q509 Festival Prayers Frag. 287 contains the lone reconstructed phrase to “circumcise [the] fore[skin of our heart]” (מולה עֵ וְרִלַת לִבְנוֹ).⁴¹

Not all of the passages identified above clearly correlate with the sectarian movement generally or with either the D or S traditions more specifically. Some have been suggested to either predate the sectarian movement or to not contain any vocabulary particular to the sectarian movement. First, even though David Rolph Seely and Moshe Weinfeld suggest a sectarian origin, George Brooke makes the argument that the composition of the Barkhi Nafshi hymns (4Q434–438) “could have been in non-sectarian circles.”⁴² Brooke argues thus because he does not consider there to be any vocabulary particular to the sectarian movement in the Barkhi Nafshi documents.⁴³ Eileen Schuller is another scholar who suggests that Barkhi Nafshi may predate the sectarian movement.⁴⁴ Second, concerning 4Q504 (one of the manuscripts containing The Words of the Luminaries), the document’s proposed dating to roughly 150 BCE based on the Hasmonean handwriting style has elicited alternative provenance suggestions.⁴⁵ Based on this early date, James Davila suggests that the work may be presectarian and adopted by the sectarian movement for long term use. He concludes that evidence does not point strongly one way or the other with regard to a sectarian movement provenance for the work.⁴⁶ Here, too, Schuller suggests that the manuscript date of 150 BCE indicates a realistic “somewhat earlier” date of composition, in the pre-Maccabean era (pre-160/150 BCE).⁴⁷ In

40 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 154–6. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.

41 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 214.

42 George J. Brooke, “Body Parts in *Barkhi Nafshi* and the Qualifications for Membership of the Worshipping Community,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, ed. Daniel Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen Schuller, STDJ 35 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 79. For the argument that *Barkhi Nafshi* is indeed sectarian, see Weinfeld and Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi.” Specifically, they suggest that the language and themes of the *Barkhi Nafshi* hymns are similar to those found in other texts esteemed to be sectarian. Second, they argue that the language suggests a real historical event at which point the community was hidden and protected among Gentiles, before being delivered, and suggest this theme relates to that of exile within CD. See Weinfeld and Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi,” 258–59.

43 Brooke, “Body Parts in *Barkhi Nafshi*,” 79.

44 Eileen M. Schuller, “Prayers and Psalms from the Pre-Maccabean Period,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 314 and n. 28.

45 Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4: III*, 137. See also James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works*, ECDSS (Grand Rapids; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2000), 239–40.

46 Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 242.

47 Eileen M. Schuller, “Prayers and Psalms,” 310–11.

that case, the work would predate the sectarian movement. Finally, due to lack of “technical terminology” related to the sectarian movement, Davila suggests that 4Q509 Festival Prayers may have been composed elsewhere and adopted for use by the movement.⁴⁸

On the other hand, two of these passages relating to circumcision of the heart clearly correlate with the sectarian movement, and the S tradition specifically. 1QP Hab clearly correlates with the S tradition, stemming from the *peshet* tradition and its reference to the Council of the Community (עצת היחד) in XII, 4. Likewise, 4Q177 Catena A correlates with the S tradition because there are numerous references within the document, whether extant or safely reconstructed, to the Community (היחד), which is the term associated to the S tradition: 4Q177 I, 1, 16; II, 10, 13; III, 5. Even if the other texts predate the D and S traditions, it is clear that a correlation is forged between the S tradition and its adoption of the theme of circumcision of the heart. The tradition of D, on the other hand, never uses that specific theme of circumcision of the heart.⁴⁹

This correlation observed between a reference to circumcision of the heart, and sectarian movement members affiliated with the S tradition, is indeed confirmed by a similar passage found in 1QS Rule of the Community. 1QS v, 4–5 also describes spiritual and metaphorical circumcision: “No man shall wander in the stubbornness of his heart, to err following his heart, his eyes, and the plan of his inclination. He shall rather circumcise in the Community the fore-skin of the inclination (יִאָאָם לְמוֹל בִּיחַד עוֹרֵלֶת יִצֵר) (and) a stiff neck.” The passage is found within the rule for the men of the community (1QS v, 1, וְזֶה הַסֵּרֶכַב, לְאֲנָשֵׁי הַיַּחַד). The “inclination” (יצר) in fact may be seen as synonymous with the “heart” (לב).⁵⁰ Furthermore, 1QS v, 26 regulates that a community member should not hate his fellow in the following manner: “And he must not hate him [in the fores]k[in] of his heart” (וְאֵל יִשְׁנֹאֵהוּ [בְּעוֹר־לֵ] [ת] לְבָבוֹ). 1QS and the S tradition clearly contain, even if adopted from earlier nonsectarian or presectarian circles, a theme of circumcision of the heart.

Noticeably these circumcisions of the heart are metaphorical and spiritual. First, a metaphorical meaning is assumed, because members of the sectarian movement certainly would not be performing heart surgery. Beyond this obvious metaphorical observation, these circumcisions are spiritual because the scriptural predecessors from which they are borrowed and reinterpreted

48 Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 17.

49 CD XVI, 9–10 stipulates that a member should “re[turn t]o the Torah of Moses with all (his) heart [and with all] 10 (his) soul,” but this general reference to Deut 6:5 is not a reference specifically to circumcision of the heart.

50 Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart,’” 532–33.

indicate a concept of spiritual obedience. Predominantly, the reference to circumcision of the heart correlates with the passages Deut 10:16 (“Circumcise, then, the foreskin of your heart, and do not be stubborn any longer”); Deut 30:6 (“Moreover, the LORD your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants, so that you will love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul, in order that you may live”); and Jer 4:4 (“Circumcise yourselves to the LORD, remove the foreskin of your hearts”).⁵¹ Werner Lemke argues that Jer 4:4, taken together with Jer 6:10 (describing an uncircumcised ear) and Jer 9:24–25 (describing an uncircumcised heart), signify either spiritual obedience or disobedience.⁵² More generally, Roger Le Déaut suggests that within scripture, circumcision of the heart “made precise the conditions of an authentic entry into this covenant by a total free-will offering of self to God in obedience to his will.”⁵³ Likewise, Michael Knibb points out the connection to Deut 10:16 and the command to circumcise the heart and not to be stubborn, in 1QS v, 4–5. Knibb describes the stubbornness to be avoided as the “attitude of the person entering which must be one of complete sincerity.”⁵⁴ In other words, circumcision of the heart represents not only full obedience to YHWH and the covenant of Abraham, but in the case of 1QS, the obedience is more specifically to the special “covenant of God” undergone by movement members. Entering this covenant means walking perfectly in all the ways of God, according to 1QS III, 9–10. Le Déaut explains that the theme of circumcision of the heart “is utilized to illustrate the *moral* conditions of a life of perfection in the new covenant.”⁵⁵ Circumcision of the heart, seen as spiritual obedience in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, is rewritten in the same fashion into 1QS and the S tradition, albeit specifying obedience to a covenant solely for the S tradition. Even the new covenant described in CD VI, 19; VIII, 21; XIX, 34; and XX, 12, in its

51 For the references to these and other scriptural allusions to circumcision, see all of the following: Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 107; Roger Le Déaut, “Le thème de la circoncision du cœur (Dt. xxx 6; Jér. iv 4) dans les versions anciennes (LXX et Targum) et à Qumrân,” in *Congress Volume: Vienna 1980*, ed. J.A. Emerton, VTSup 32 (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 178–83; Werner E. Lemke, “Circumcision of the Heart: The Journey of a Biblical Metaphor,” in *A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller*, ed. Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 300–305, 308–10; Seely, “The ‘Circumcised Heart,’” 530.

52 Lemke, “Circumcision of the Heart,” 303–7.

53 Le Déaut, “La circoncision du cœur,” 183. All direct citation translations from the French are my own.

54 Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 91.

55 Le Déaut, “La circoncision du cœur,” 193.

allusion to Jer 31:31–33, involves the writing of a covenant upon the heart, and not a circumcision.⁵⁶

Ironically, Lemke suggests that the theme of conformed spiritual obedience within the earlier traditions of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah eclipse to a reemphasis of a physical or ritualized circumcision in Priestly perspectives, elucidated in such texts as Ezek 36:27 and 44:7–9.⁵⁷ This comment is not to say that the traditions behind Deuteronomy and Jeremiah did not advocate physical circumcision, alongside the language of circumcision of the heart, intended to encourage spiritual obedience. Nevertheless, one could ask whether this spiritual circumcision into the sectarian movement's eternal covenant means that a physical circumcision is no longer required where 1QS and the S movement is concerned, as was argued by Jacobs above. However, in light of the fact that two passages regarding physical circumcision were observed within the D tradition, it seems very unlikely that the S tradition is omitting a physical circumcision. Furthermore, even where late Second Temple period Judean authors appear to acknowledge that circumcision was not necessarily universal among all individuals and communities, the writers nevertheless advocate for physical circumcision as normative.⁵⁸ Therefore, more likely is the conclusion that the sectarian movement affiliated with the S tradition is rather adding a secondary, metaphorical and spiritual circumcision, in addition to an initial physical circumcision.

4.3.4 *Common Culture in Circumcision as a Feature of Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement: Conclusions*

Despite the fact that no ritual of physical circumcision is described for new members within any of the sectarian movement rules located in D or S, this section noted that circumcision is nevertheless a theme present within the D and S traditions, suggesting that circumcision has a role to play within the sectarian movement. Instead of concluding that the absence of a ritual describing physical circumcision means that there are no converts, that all converts are

56 This observation is in contradiction to what is implied by Le Déaut, who connects these passages from CD with the discussion of circumcision of the heart as observed in texts from Qumran. Le Déaut, "La circoncision du coeur," 190, and n. 48.

57 Lemke, "Circumcision of the Heart," 310–18.

58 For example, John Collins and John Nolland both accept that Philo describes uncircumcised proselytes in *QE* 2.2. Collins suggests that for Philo, the matter is not that it is permissible to abandon circumcision, but rather that circumcision may only be required upon entry into a Judean community (and not prior to it). Nolland argues that Philo still has an expectation that converts should be circumcised. Collins, "A Symbol of Otherness," 173–74; John Nolland, "Uncircumcised Proselytes?" *JSJ* 12 (1981): 173–79, esp. 179.

prohibited, or even that circumcision itself is of no concern to the sectarian movement, the section discovered that circumcision is in fact an important indicator of identity for both the traditions of D and S. Where the D tradition is concerned, circumcision is a reminder of complete and immediate obedience to revealed covenantal regulations, whether they be Abrahamic or related to the Torah of Moses. Because Gentile converts are accepted into the D tradition, and D's references to physical circumcision are not explicitly restrictive to eighth day circumcision only, circumcision appears to be mutable and permitted for Gentile converts. Where the S tradition is concerned, there is no mention whatsoever of physical circumcision. Instead, a "circumcision of the heart" is identified on numerous occasions. The two passages regarding physical circumcision in D suggest that for the tradition of D, physical circumcision is a normative feature of identity. It is unlikely that the related sectarian movement tradition of S would obliterate the need for circumcision; therefore, the "circumcision of the heart" appears to be a second circumcision which is metaphorical and spiritual in nature, and describes the authentic state required to follow the Torah of the new covenant specific to the S tradition. Both the circumcisions of D and S and their respective traditions represent a type of covenantal obedience, but the circumcision in D emphasizes full and immediate compliance, and the circumcision in S emphasizes the spiritual intention behind compliance. The second circumcision performed by an S tradition member would represent becoming "more than Judean," or "supra-Judean."

The S tradition reworks scripture concerning a "circumcision of the heart" to describe the special nature of that covenant, which can only be attained because members have transformed to a Judean nature which is even more spiritual than that of general Judaism. Because the imagery chosen is that of circumcision, and circumcision is a significant part of Judean conversions, it appears that members of the S tradition see themselves as a type of convert, too. Therefore the reason that Judean ethnicity is closed to Gentile converts to Judaism in the S tradition is because, in fact, members of S believe that they are converts to supra-Judaism. This convert status could explain the specific choice in vocabulary *הגלויים עליהם* (1QS v, 6), used to describe those who joined the movement. As explained in Chapter 3, the term *nivvîm* in the late Second Temple period assumes a meaning of "converts."⁵⁹ It appears that the *nivvîm*

59 See Ch. 3 of the present study, discussion in Section 3.3.1. It should be noted that D also makes use of the verb *לזה* in CD IV, 4–6. However, in this case, it has been suggested that the verb is being used as a pun on "Levites," borrowing from Ezek 44:15. See Grossman, "Priesthood as Authority," 126–27. Members of the D tradition do not see themselves as supra-Judean converts in the manner of the S tradition.

may represent those with supra-Judean status. The issue is not so much that Judean ethnicity is closed to Gentile converts, but rather that supra-Judean ethnicity is closed to Gentile converts, because these converts were never esteemed to have become Judean in the first place. Only a Judean can become a supra-Judean. The fraudulent nature of any Gentile individual's initial conversion appears to be the reason for the *gēr*'s exclusion within the S tradition, and not that the *gēr* relates specifically to Idumeans or any other particular group. In other words, it is not a question strictly relating to the authenticity of one particular group's circumcision and conversion. Instead, for the S tradition, the matter of supra-Judean ethnicity attained through a circumcision of the heart is a more general matter pertaining to any and all *gērîm* converts.

4.4 Ethnic Identity in the Sectarian Movement Chapter Conclusions

Overall, this chapter discovered that the convert status of the *gēr* in the DSS relies heavily upon the ethnic features of shared kinship, connection to a land, and common culture in the covenantal practice of circumcision. Each of these features can be either mutable, or immutable. Furthermore, the secondary circumcision of the heart, made evident in the tradition of S, revealed to a fuller extent the differences between the traditions of D and S, and explained why members of the S tradition consider themselves to be "supra-Judeans."

Sections 4.1 and 4.2 collated the findings from Chapter 2, which assessed the likelihood of a D or S tradition provenance in the occasions where the *gēr* is employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS, and Chapter 3, which compared the occasions of the *gēr* employed in scriptural rewriting with scriptural predecessors and uncovered the important features of shared kinship and connection to a land. Section 4.1 assessed the ethnic feature of shared kinship in the sectarian movement. In cases whereby the *gēr* is included in the movement, the implication is that the *gēr*'s kinship has changed to that of the group. The *gēr* is a brother, who is Judean (Israelite), and therefore the *gēr* is also Judean, regardless of whether the *gēr* is still lower in the movement's hierarchy. In cases where the *gēr* is excluded from the movement, it is because kinship is considered immutable and the legitimacy of the *gēr*'s conversion is denied. It is the D tradition which permits mutability of kinship for the *gēr* to represent a Judean brother; it is the S tradition which denies mutability of kinship for the *gēr* (in 4Q169 and 4Q174). For the S tradition, the brother is "beyond" Judean kinship.

Section 4.2 assessed the ethnic feature of connection to a land. While the feature of land is not as dominant thematically as the feature of kinship, the

ġēr is included in a connection to the promise of land in texts clearly correlating with the D tradition (11QT^a; 4Q159; 4Q279; and 4Q377). In texts correlated with the D tradition specifically, this feature of the *ġēr*'s participation in the promise of land can serve as a hinge that links the mutability of the features of kinship and land. The component of land, in particular the fact that the *ġēr* now receives an inheritance or lot, inverts the *ġēr*'s previous resident alien meaning to one of Israelite (Judean), linking the components of land and kinship. The connection to a promise of land may also be immutable, in some cases, if the *ġēr* is not born in Israel. For some of these passages dealing with land (4Q279 and 4Q377), even though members of the sectarian movement are already within the land of Israel themselves, clearly varied sentiments exist: either they are waiting on the promise of a new land, or the promise of return to a land.

Section 4.3 investigated an additional important ethnic feature related to the *ġēr*. Because the feature of common culture in the practice of circumcision was found to be significant for conversions in late Second Temple Judaism more generally, this section assessed whether the feature holds significance for conversions attested in the sectarian movement, too. The section found that circumcision is significant for the sectarian movement, even if no ritual of circumcision is described within entrance procedures, and in fact shed insight into the differences observed in mutable and immutable ethnicity between the D and S traditions. Two different themes of circumcision were found to be present within the DSS. A theme of physical circumcision was present in the D tradition, and a theme of a circumcision of the heart was present in the S tradition. The circumcision of the heart identified in the S tradition suggests a "second" conversion is required for members, above and beyond a physical one. To this end, where the S tradition is concerned, even to be "Judean" is not enough, and Judeans themselves must "convert" by means of circumcision of the heart to become more than Judean, or supra-Judean, in order to join what is a new covenant. It appears that this supra-Judean status prohibits the membership of Gentile converts to Judaism, who are believed to have never relinquished their Gentile ethnicity in the first place. Without a baseline of Judean kinship, one cannot join the S tradition; supra-Judean ethnicity is closed to those yet perceived to be Gentiles. Meanwhile, the D tradition, which does not conform to a circumcision of the heart, believes that Gentile converts have fully become Judean brothers and are permitted entry and membership within the group.

The collated findings of this chapter confirm that strong features of ethnicity within the sectarian movement, namely those features of shared kinship, a connection to land, and common culture (in the practice of circumcision)

parallel those discerned in the introduction chapter to be strong features of ethnic, or full, identity within late Second Temple and early Judaism more generally. Furthermore, just as was observed in the introduction chapter, each of these features could be mutable. Of course, as has been noted, the features can also be immutable, primarily with regard to kinship for the texts relating to the S tradition, but also relating to some issues of connection to land pertaining to the D tradition. This evidence matches that observation by Robert Kugler that one can expect “literary evidence” to be “highly differentiated.”⁶⁰

Furthermore, in both cases, it appears that the overall perspective of ethnic identity within these groups is “defined from within, from the perspective of their members.”⁶¹ For example, because texts were linked to either a D or S tradition, it became possible to also distinguish that it is a spiritual circumcision of the heart that sets the S tradition apart, for reasons of perceived genealogical impurity, in other words, reasons of immutable kinship. But it is important to note that this spiritualizing does not in any way mean that descent and kinship do not matter, as has been argued by Daniel Schwartz.⁶² Quite the opposite holds true, that kinship matters a lot, enough to elevate the members of the S tradition to a status of supra-Judean. And, even though this kinship is mutable for the D tradition, the same can be said with regard to the importance of shared kinship for that tradition, too. The importance of ethnicity and shared kinship also suggests that the likelihood of the identity of the *gēr* having nothing to do with being a convert is poor. For example, just because the *gēr* is named separately does not mean he has not become Judean,⁶³ rather, he is now a “brother,” merely one of lower hierarchical status. These two traditions appear to delineate only by means of their internal definitional boundaries.

The next chapter will offer a sociohistorical comparison to brother language used in Greco-Roman associations to determine whether the brother, with whom the *gēr* is equated in the DSS, may truly represent a notion of shared kinship, and more broadly shared ethnicity, among members across various groups. Of interest will be to observe whether ethnic identity is also “defined

60 Robert Kugler, “The War Rule Texts and a New Theory of the People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Brief Thought Experiment,” in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, lead ed Kipp Davis, ed. Dorothy M. Peters, et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016), 165.

61 Thomas Hylland Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism*, Second ed., Anthropology, Culture and Society (London: Pluto Press, 2002), 37.

62 As he argues in Schwartz, “Ends Meet,” see especially the comment that “descent does not matter much” on 305, and the conclusion paragraph for the point that the sectarian movement tended to “spiritualize,” 307.

63 As is also argued by Schwartz, “Ends Meet,” esp. 298–99.

from within” in Greco-Roman associations, allowing the “brother” to represent kin, however kinship is defined. The comparison will more fully serve to confirm or deny the contemporary reality of ethnic mutability in the sectarian movement observed through the process and choices made in employing the *gēr* in scriptural rewriting in the DSS.

Sociohistorical Comparison between the Sectarian Movement and Greco-Roman Associations

Chapters 2–4, the first part of the present study, were rooted in the textual strategy of scriptural rewriting. The study assessed changes observed to the *gēr* as the term was employed between scriptural rewriting in the DSS and scriptural predecessors. It assessed these changes within the parameters of each text's provenance to the sectarian movement's traditions of D or S, and forged conclusions concerning the meaning of the *gēr* as a "convert" within the two traditions of D and S, as well as the mutable (and sometimes immutable) ethnic identity of the sectarian movement more broadly. Within scriptural rewriting in the DSS where the term *gēr* was employed, dominant features of mutable or immutable ethnicity mirrored those evident in late Second Temple Judaism generally: a shared notion of kinship; a connection to land; and common culture in the practice of circumcision. No one feature was representative of an ethnic identity alone; ethnic identity was dependent upon all features combined. Chapter 5 proceeds to the second part of the study's method, namely a sociohistorical comparison to the findings made from the literary and textual evidence of Chapters 2–4. The purpose of the comparison is to reassess the findings made on textual and literary grounds against a more concrete sociohistorical backdrop.¹

Comparisons are made to another type of group which is similar to the sectarian movement's organizational make-up, namely Greco-Roman associations. As discussed in the introduction chapter, the possibility of ethnic conversions within the sectarian movement is in response to the Hellenistic milieu in which the movement finds itself; therefore, it is appropriate to use Greco-Roman associations as the type of group(s) against which to compare, in this second part of the study.² Greco-Roman associations, and the sectarian movement related to D and S traditions affiliated with the DSS, offer a good point of comparison: both overlap in time frame and also contain many parallels in the

-
- 1 See the introductory chapter's discussion within Section 1.3 regarding the rationale for conducting a sociohistorical comparison in addition to textual and literary findings.
 - 2 See the introduction chapter, Section 1.2.2, concerning the adoption of Hellenistic ideals of choosing a "civilized" legislative law code as an instigator more generally to choosing ethnicity and converting across groups.

arena of group rules. The rules of D and S contain many points of similarity to those of various Greco-Roman associations, including rules overseeing acceptance of new members, laws and penalties, candidate probationary periods, and code renewal.³

Aside from the parallels between Greco-Roman associations and the sectarian movement in terms of group rules, Greco-Roman associations are also chosen for comparison for two reasons. First and foremost, they are chosen because they contain references to member as “brothers,” reminiscent of the brother references observed within the DSS. In the scrolls, these “brothers” were found to represent Judeans, and sometimes even “more than Judeans,” and always represented a shared notion of kinship, though not cosanguinal kinship.⁴ The *gēr* employed in scriptural rewriting in the DSS, as the primary term under scrutiny in the present study, was frequently equated with a “brother.” The “*gēr*,” however, is a term unique to Hebrew scriptures and scriptural tradition. Thus it is this brother language which can be used as comparison between contexts.

Scholarship acknowledges that the brother references of the Greco-Roman associations also need not represent solely “real” or “blood” (cosanguinal) brothers, and in fact can imbue meaning into the contexts in which the term is found. Philip Harland has argued that “a pattern of usage is becoming clear” whereby the term brother can represent “fellow-functionaries” and not merely cosanguinal brothers within the Greco-Roman context.⁵ Accordingly, Harland convincingly argues that “there is no reason to minimize the significance of

3 Weinfeld, *Organizational Pattern*, esp. Chs. 4–7. See the introduction chapter of the present study, Section 1.3, for further references to studies which offer comparisons between Greco-Roman associations and the groups affiliated with the sectarian movement. See also the following for a clear example of bylaws pertaining to an association: John S. Kloppenborg, “Associations in the Ancient World,” in *The Historical Jesus in Context*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Jr. Allison, and John Dominic Crossan, Princeton Readings in Religions (Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2006), 332–35.

4 The meaning of “cosanguinal” is to be related by blood. Individuals with cosanguinal ties may also be called “cognates” or “consanguines.” The terms all represent relationship between individuals by filiation (links between parent and children, and consequently between siblings), and also descent (going back a number of generations of filiation). See, for example, Parkin, *Kinship*, 8–9, 15, 35.

5 Harland looks to examples whereby various cultic association functionaries are identified as either “brother priests” (*IGLAM* 503 a and b); “good, brother under-priests” (*IMylasa* 544); or “brother *hieros*” (*hieros* being the god, *MAMA* x, 437). Harland convincingly argues that “[i]t would be difficult to explain these cases away as references to real brothers who happened to be fellow-priests.” Philip A. Harland, *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities* (New York; London: T & T Clark, 2009), 69–70. English translations provided by Harland.

familial expressions of belonging within non-Christian, Greco-Roman contexts.”⁶ A study of the associations’ use of noncosanguinal brother language will serve as a helpful comparison to the brother language identified in the occasions where the term *gēr* has been employed in scriptural rewriting in the DSS.

Elsewhere, scholarship has also scrutinized noncosanguinal brother references within the letters of Paul. Within the authentic letters (Romans; 1 and 2 Corinthians; Galatians; Philippians; 1 Thessalonians; and Philemon) the term is used in a noncosanguinal fashion on one hundred and thirteen occasions.⁷ However, while early Christ groups also convey similarities to Greco-Roman associations and also to early Judean groups,⁸ Pauline letters do not contain a “rule” or bylaws as witnessed in Greco-Roman associations and the Damascus Document and the Rule of the Community.⁹ Furthermore, Greco-Roman inscriptions have not undergone the level of editing or change as that which is considered to have taken place within the Pauline corpus. For example, there is no need to discuss the “authenticity” of Greco-Roman inscriptions.¹⁰ For these reasons, the present study will make some comparisons to the “brothers” and the arguably mutable kinship of the first century CE Paul, but only within the context of the primary comparison to “brothers” of Greco-Roman associations.¹¹

6 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 66.

7 This information draws from Appendix 1, excluding sister and cosanguinal sibling references, as found in Reidar Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!': Christian Siblingship in Paul*, *Early Christianity in Context: JSNTSup 265* (London; New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 313. With regard to scholarly consensus on the corpus of genuine Pauline letters, see David Trobisch, *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins* (Bolivar, Miss.: Quiet Waters Publications, 2001), 44–47.

8 Philip Harland observes that “common ground” in the “expression of belonging and group identity” may be observed between associations, synagogues, and congregations (i.e. early Christ groups). Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 80.

9 The Didache would constitute an early Christian rule and may date in oral form to the first century CE, but is not linked to the authentic writings of Paul. See, for example, Thomas O'Loughlin, *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians* (Grand Rapids, MI; London: Baker Academic; SPCK, 2010); Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* (New York: Newman, 2003).

10 Jonathan Hall discusses the need for literary comparanda “where the contextual material is ‘thick;” and suggests that difficulties arise where, by way of example, “evidence is spread more thinly and where such evidence as does exist often derives from authors living several centuries after the events they describe.” Hall, *Hellenicity*, 24. Editorial layers or uncertain authorship of books (i.e. pseudepigraphical authorship) could be construed within this concern.

11 Denise Kimber Buell and Caroline Johnson Hodge both consider Paul to conceive of “Christianity” as an ethnicity that is mutable. See Section 5.3.2 of the present chapter.

Specifically, Harland argues that within associations or guilds, noncon-sanguinal brother references represent “relations of solidarity, affection, or friendship.”¹² While Harland argues in favour of “brother” language to represent solidarity and friendship within the milieu of Greco-Roman associations, the present study takes the question further: can “brother” language signal a mutable notion of shared kinship?

This question brings us to the second reason for which Greco-Roman associations have been chosen for comparison. They are chosen for comparison because similar features of ethnic identity among Greek, Roman, and the sectarian movement traditions demonstrate a certain amount of mutability and permeability. The introduction chapter introduced the topic of groups within the ancient Mediterranean adopting particular features of other groups. Such a process of integration permits permeability across borders, and aligns with an “instrumentalist” perspective. The introduction chapter highlighted that one could become Greek by following Greek law, for example. Or, Gentile individuals could become Judean by making a change in their kinship relations, their connection to land, and their religious practices, such as what is described by Philo in *Virtues* 102.

An instrumentalist perspective can be understood even more readily when it is contrasted against an opposing perspective, which is a “primordialist” outlook. Within the notion of primordialism, features of ethnicity are argued to be understood by participants as “exterior, coercive, and ‘given.’”¹³ In such a model, ethnicity would remain fixed and immutable. If ethnicity in the primordialist perspective is “exterior” and “given,” then ethnicity in the socially constructed instrumentalist view could be seen as “internal” and “chosen.” Henri Tajfel’s social identity model highlights the role played by an individual’s own awareness of membership in a group, as understood within the instrumentalist pole: “an individual’s self-concept ... derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership.”¹⁴

The evidence of Chapters 3 and 4 shows that such a perspective is present within the sectarian movement affiliated with the DSS: features of identity that were discerned to be important, as well as mutable, for Judaism generally, namely a shared notion of kinship, connection to land, and common culture in the practice of circumcision, matched with that which was discerned to be

12 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 81.

13 Hutchinson and Smith, “Introduction,” 8.

14 Henri Tajfel, *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 255.

important and often mutable for the sectarian movement, as well. Depending on the tradition, the self-definition varied: where the D tradition was concerned, ethnicity was permeable to the extent that Gentiles could become Judean, while where the S tradition was concerned, members felt that they themselves had become “supra-Judean,” an ethnicity unattainable to Gentiles. While such a view demonstrates a certain amount of immutability, the fact that the S tradition considers themselves to have undergone a secondary circumcision of the heart also shows a certain amount of permeability.

As observed by Robert Kugler, these features relevant to general Judaism and the sectarian movement correspond furthermore to the manner in which Jonathan Hall defines an ethnic group, especially with respect to ancient Greece.¹⁵ Whereas the “people of the scrolls” identify with the “land of Israel” as well as “descendants of Abraham,” and hold “foundational Israelite discursive traditions,” as noted by Kugler,¹⁶ Hall emphasizes certain of the features of ethnicity described in the introduction chapter. In particular, he highlights a “myth of common descent,” “an association with a specific territory,” and “a sense of shared history.”¹⁷ Hall argues that these are core elements of determining membership in an ethnic group, and that other visible markers, such as “[b]iological features, language, religion or cultural traits” serve as “secondary *indicia*.”¹⁸ In terms of the sectarian movement, the connection to Abraham, and consequently circumcision, may fit within both categories of “shared history” as well as a “visible marker.” The ethnic features of shared kinship and connection to land, also important to the sectarian movement, are likewise common with those features recognized by Hall to be important for Hellenism (although, in Hall’s case, the feature of shared kinship is identified as a “myth of common descent”). Importantly, these features between these groups are “self-ascribing,”¹⁹ in other words, socially constructed. They are also mutable and open to permeability.

15 Kugler identifies the features as “a specific territory” and “particular foundational discourses (typically drawn from the Greek mythic tradition).” Kugler, “A New Theory,” 164–65.

16 Kugler, “A New Theory,” 166.

17 Hall, *Hellenicity*, 9. See also his earlier work Jonathan M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 25. Philip Kaplan, in his interpretation of Hall, refers to the features of the “myth of common descent” and “association with a specific territory.” Philip Kaplan, “Ethnicity and Geography,” in *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. Jeremy McInerney, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World (Mladen, MA; Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014), 298.

18 Hall, *Hellenicity*, 9.

19 That, along with “self-nominating,” are overarching descriptors for an ethnic group, according to Hall, *Hellenicity*, 9.

Finally, Roman tradition also demonstrated permeability. For example, with regard to citizenship, which is connected to geography, freed slaves could become Roman citizens under certain conditions.²⁰ Similarly, discovering the need to offer citizenship to four thousand men whose parents were Roman soldiers and Spanish women, is another example.²¹ The sons of these stateless Roman soldiers were settled in Carteia in southern Spain, which was given the status of a Latin colony of “ex-slaves.” Furthermore, Kostas Vlassopoulos writes of a “widespread Roman willingness to adopt and imitate.”²² This willingness led to the appropriation of other ethnic features, such as Roman authors composing in Greek language, and the adoption of Greek religious iconography and divinities.²³ These mutable and permeable features relate to shared kinship and territory, as well as those “secondary *indicia*” such as language and religious practices as described by Hall concerning the definition of an ethnic group.

It is this correspondence between socially constructed, mutable, and permeable features of ethnicity, alongside brother language, that will drive the investigation in the present chapter. This chapter will argue that while the representation of friendship for brother language appears to be the case in professional associations whose primary identity is not based on the features of ethnicity, a sense of newfound and constructed shared kinship between previously noncosanguinal “brothers” is evident in cultic associations where multiple features of ethnic identity are dominant. Affiliation with a particular deity and the added presence of kinship language represent a combination of both a primary feature of ethnicity (what the present work is calling a shared notion of kinship) as well as a secondary indicator (cultural or religious practice). The inscriptions illustrate that references to “brothers” do not need to represent cosanguinal relationship. However, upon joining cultic associations, members appear to assume a notion of shared kinship in a socially-constructed manner, akin to what is argued by ethnicity theorists. The notion of shared kinship between brothers is evidenced in the use of both nuclear family²⁴ and adoption

20 For example, the freed slave had to be over thirty years of age. However, slaves under thirty years of age could become Latin first, and subsequently become Roman citizens if they married a woman who was Roman, Latin, or of the same status as themselves, and had a son together. See Gaius, *Inst.* 1.8–47.

21 See Livy *History of Rome*, 43.3. The situation is described in Mary Beard, *SPQR: A History of Ancient Rome* (New York; London: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2015), 200.

22 Kostas Vlassopoulos, *Greeks and Barbarians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 27.

23 Vlassopoulos, *Greeks and Barbarians*, esp. 25–27.

24 According to Robert Parkin, “[s]trictly, a **nuclear** or **elementary** or **conjugal family** consists merely of parents and children, although it often includes one or two other relatives

language. This finding means that while these “brothers” are not cosanguinal from birth, effectively they become so after having joined the association. The comparison to the possibility of brother language signifying mutable kinship in Greco-Roman associations will uphold this study’s claims that brother language supports mutable kinship within the DSS. Therefore the chapter will not only confirm the study’s unique findings concerning the *gēr*’s status of shared kinship with other members of the sectarian movement; it will also discover new findings regarding the shared kinship that “brothers” assume upon joining Greco-Roman cultic associations, as well.

In assessing Greco-Roman associations in the general terms of “professional” and “cultic,” and not, for example, in Harland’s category of “ethnic,” (meaning more so “kinship” and geography within the context of the present study),²⁵ the descent make-up of members joining Greco-Roman associations may be more blended than within the DSS under consideration. In that sectarian movement, individual Gentile converts join a group whereby predominant membership is already Judean. The present study acknowledges that such a comparison is not exactly parallel. Evidence is scarce for an adequate study of descent-based Greco-Roman associations into which members from other groups are welcomed as members.²⁶ Therefore, the use of brother language for the comparison is upheld.

Additionally, while others such as Harland describe these brother references as “fictive kinship,” and even Hall describes myth of common descent within ethnicity as “fictive,”²⁷ this chapter will instead continue to refer to these brother references as “noncosanguinal”—even when a subsequent status of

as well.” Parkin, *Kinship*, 28. A Roman *familia* consisted of “an adult male Roman, the *paterfamilias*, lawfully married, with children born to him and his wife (or successive wives), together with the children, if any, of sons (and their sons, and so on in the male line only, through as many generations as might be simultaneously alive).” Jane F. Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life* (Oxford; New York: Clarendon, 1998), 1. The inscriptions within the present study refer to “fathers,” “sisters,” and “brothers,” permitting the more basic meaning of a nuclear family to stand. It should be noted that the present study does not equate a nuclear family with a Roman “household,” which in addition to cosanguinal kin, could also include friends, freedmen, slaves, and others. Jane F. Gardner and Thomas Wiedemann, *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook* (London; New York: Routledge, 1991), 7–9.

25 See Section 5.1 below, and n. 30.

26 Harland identifies one example of an “ethnic association” from Attica in the third century BCE that mentions the presence of a “Samaritan” member (although Harland iterates that “it is unclear whether this is an Israelite (who honors the Israelite God) or a non-Israelite from Samaria”). Philip A. Harland, trans., “Honours by a Society for Leaders Mentioning a Samaritan Member 1G II² 2943,” in *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, <http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=12116>.

27 Hall, *Hellenicity*, 10.

shared kinship between association members is established. The chapter uses the term “noncosanguinal brothers” to contrast against both references to cosanguinal (sometimes identified by scholarship as “real”) brothers from birth (e.g. Gal 1:19), and also against the notion that any kind of brotherhood that is not cosanguinal from birth must be merely “fictive.”²⁸ While modern Western society now has a narrow view concerning the constitution of kinship circles, the same is not true globally,²⁹ and is certainly not true for the ancient Mediterranean. Indeed, the first part of the study has already established that in the sectarian movement, brother language signifies more than something which is merely “fictive.” Instead, brother language signifies a notion of shared kinship to the extent that purity concerns (within the tradition of D) are no longer an issue for the *gēr*—a Gentile convert to Judaism—who is himself now a “brother.”

5.1 Greco-Roman Associations: An Introduction

Private Greco-Roman associations, or “collegia,” also known as voluntary associations, traditionally have been distinguished in the categories of professional and cultic.³⁰ Specific funerary associations are also argued to exist, whose primary purpose was to arrange for the burial of members. However, it has been suggested that these associations were only established during the reforms of Hadrian, reigning from 117–138 in the second century CE.³¹ Most

28 Concerning “real” brothers, see Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 313, Appendix 1. Concerning the term “fictive kinship,” the present study avoids the term to instead emphasize the perception of authenticity of new kinship bonds formed within associations.

29 See n. 9 in the introduction chapter of the present study.

30 “Cultic” associations are also frequently called “religious.” For example, see James S. Jeffers, *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of Early Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press, 1999), 74–77. Jeffers also identifies household and burial associations. Other taxonomies have also been recently used to organize association types. Philip Harland identifies five types of associations: household connections; ethnic or geographic connections; neighbourhood or locational connections; occupational connections; and cult or Temple connections. The present study will utilize the basic organizational categories of professional and cultic associations for simplicity. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 30–52. See also Kloppenborg, “Associations,” 323–24. Kloppenborg describes associations organized around the following groupings: extended family; common cult; ethnic identity; and common profession, with levels of overlap existing between the categories.

31 John S. Kloppenborg, “Collegia and *Thiasoi*: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership,” in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson (London; New York: Routledge, 1996), 18, 21–22.

associations in either professional or cultic categories also appeared to take care of funerary matters of members, as will be observed in a number of the inscriptions that follow. Membership drew from a variety of nonelite people, including men, women, freedmen, and slaves, although not all would be found necessarily within each association.³² Professional associations were generally formed of members in a common profession or a common location and existed as social clubs.³³ Cultic associations formed around particular deities.³⁴ Based on the findings of the present study, the sectarian movement may not seem closely connected to the “social club” descriptor of a professional association, and consequently one might argue that to compare the DSS brother references with brother references in only cultic associations would be adequate. However, according to John Kloppenborg, “one cannot in principle exclude the possibility that professional collegia occasionally leaned in the direction of cultic associations too.”³⁵ Thus the present chapter will compare noncosanguinal brother references within both broadly-reaching categories of professional and cultic associations.

In what follows, written references to noncosanguinal brothers have been collected from within epigraphic and papyrological evidence found in either Greek (*adelphos*) or Latin (“frater”).³⁶ This chapter introduction has already indicated that certain “brothers” will be found to assume kinship status (not esteemed “fictive”) subsequent to joining associations; the point presently noted is the fact that the following references to “brothers” do not indicate original cosanguinal relationship (i.e., brothers from the time of birth). While a wide range of references are identified, the study does not claim to be fully comprehensive.³⁷ The references that are used fall primarily between the first to third centuries CE, a time frame that exceeds the scope of the DSS texts under consideration. They are also broadly reaching within the Roman Empire, while the DSS under consideration are presumably limited to the region of Judea. Nevertheless the organizational similarities between Greco-

32 Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 52–53. Also, Kloppenborg, “Collegia and *Thiasoi*,” 23.

33 Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 38–44; Kloppenborg, “Collegia and *Thiasoi*,” 19–20, 24.

34 Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 44; Kloppenborg, “Collegia and *Thiasoi*,” 25.

35 Kloppenborg, “Collegia and *Thiasoi*,” 22.

36 Unless otherwise noted, translations for inscriptions are my own or also with assistance from Alexandra Pohlod.

37 Other additional association references made specifically to members as “brothers,” in addition to what will be covered in the present chapter, may also be found in Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 63–81.

Roman associations and the sectarian movement suggest the comparisons may still be significant despite the time and geographic differences.

5.2 Greco-Roman Noncosanguinal Brothers: Professional Associations

A few inscriptions from professional associations, in both Latin and Greek, have been found to refer to members as brothers in a noncosanguinal fashion.

Industria v 7487 (*CIL* v 7487) was the first inscription acknowledged by scholars to contain a brother reference which is noncosanguinal. The inscription is contained on a small paper fragment dating to the second century CE found in Monteu da Po in the Italian province of Liguria, with only the words “fabri fratres” (“smith brothers”).³⁸ It is clear these “brothers” were members of a professional association, and the letters themselves have the tendency of an actuary.³⁹ Even though the only two words existing on the fragment are the reference to “smith brothers,” it seems unlikely that these professionals would all belong together as cosanguinal brothers. While *CIL* v 7487 was not only the first, but at one time was considered in fact to be the only example of a professional association describing members as brothers,⁴⁰ other examples have now been compiled as well.

Stemming from the heart of the Empire in Rome, *CIL* VI 9148 (*ILS* 7333) describes an association of treasurers (“arcario”), of whom one is described to be “fratri piissimo” (“the most pious brother”).⁴¹ This association of treasurers

38 Manfred Clauss, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby, “CIL 05, 07487,” in *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*, db.edcs.eu; Unione Accademica Nazionale, *Supplementa Italica: Nuova Serie*, Supplementa Italica 12 (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1994), 45.

39 Concerning scholarship’s acknowledgment that *Industria* v 7487 stems from a professional association, see Jean Pierre Waltzing, and subsequent references by Wayne Meeks and Reidar Aasgaard. Jean Pierre Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu’à la chute de l’Empire d’Occident. Mémoire couronné par l’Académie royale de Belgique*, vol. 1 (Louvain: Louvain C. Peeters, 1895–1900), 329, n. 3; Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2003), 225, n. 73; Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 112, and n. 42. Regarding the comment that the letters have the feel of an actuary, see Unione Accademica Nazionale, *Supplementa Italica: Nuova Serie*, 45.

40 In the late nineteenth century Jean Pierre Waltzing wrote that *Industria* v 7487 was the only example of a professional association referring to members as brothers. Waltzing, *Étude historique*, 329, n. 3.

41 The inscription reads as follows: “D(is) M(anibus) / Hermeroti / arcario v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXIV / collegium / quod est in domu / Sergiae Paullinae / fecerunt / Agathemer(us) / et / Chreste Arescon / fratri piissimo b(ene) m(erenti).” Manfred Clauss, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby, “CIL 06, 09148,” in *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*, db.edcs.eu.

has been recognized to be a professional association and does not seem comprised of cosanguinal brothers.⁴² A certain slave is also mentioned, “Chreste Arescon.” In other circumstances this figure could indicate that the association is actually that of a household collective within which owned slaves would also be included. In such a case, the brother reference would be cosanguinal. However, it seems quite unlikely that an entire household would also be comprised of treasurers. The brother reference is neither cosanguinal nor within the context of a nuclear family, and refers to a fellow association member.

Another example from Rome of a professional association in which members refer to one another as “brother” in a noncosanguinal fashion is *CIL VI 467* (*ILS 3360*). This association, self-described as “collegium velabrensium” (a college from Velabrum, a lower part of Rome), has been categorized as a professional association in the wine trade.⁴³ In this inscription, a caretaker of the association is described as “instaurator fratrib(us) suis” (“restorer of his brothers”).⁴⁴ The inscription opens with a reference to “Deo Sancto numini / deo Magno Libero” (“God the holy deity / God the great and free”), which confirms that professional associations could also incorporate cultic elements.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, the overall sentiment of the inscription is one of roles and responsibilities among a profession’s associates.

Associations’ use of noncosanguinal brother references extend beyond Italy and throughout the Roman Empire. For example, two closely-related examples from Roman Egypt of noncosanguinal brother references used within associations are *P. Ryl. IV 604*, a private letter likely composed in Antinoupolis in the third century CE,⁴⁶ along with *PSI III 236*, a letter composed in the third or fourth century CE and stemming from Oxyrhynchos.⁴⁷ Robert Daniel observes

42 Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 112, and n. 42.

43 For a general reference to *CIL VI 467* as representing a professional association, see Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 112, n. 42. With regard to the identification of this association’s affiliation to the wine trade, see Robert Palmer, “Severan Ruler-Cult and the Moon in the City of Rome,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung II*, vol. 2.16.2, ed. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase, Principat (Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 1978), 1119, and n. 211.

44 The inscription reads as follows: “Deo Sancto numini / deo Magno Libero / Patri et Adstatori / et Conserbatori h(uius) l(oci) coll(egium) / velabrensium / Domitius Secundus curat(or) / instaurator fratrib(us) suis.” Manfred Clauss, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby, “*CIL 06, 00467*,” in *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*, db.edcs.eu.

45 It is likely this reference to a deity that caused Waltzing to label *CIL VI 467* as belonging to a religious cult. Waltzing, *Étude historique*, 329–30, n. 3.

46 Robert W. Daniel, “Notes on the Guilds and Army in Roman Egypt,” *BASP.1–2* (1979): 37. Daniel includes a text and translation of lines 11–36 on pp. 38–39.

47 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 40; see also Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 78.

that both papyri use the term *adelphos* to refer to “members of the same or related guilds.”⁴⁸ Because *PSI III 236* deals with a professional guild of athletes and entertainers, he concludes that *P. Ryl. IV 604* also refers to a professional association of athletes.⁴⁹ *P. Ryl. IV 604* refers to four different individuals as “brother” (using *adelphos*): “that my lord the hegemon is in good health. And now therefore I have written about him to brother Eutolmius (line 12); “and I have written about brother Heraiscus (line 15) to the same Eutolmius, introducing him”; “Brother Apynchis (line 28) salutes you. I pray for your health, brother (line 31);” and “Forward the enclosed letter, which is sealed with (my) ring (?), to Alexandria to brother Theodosius (line 33) by a dependable friend.”⁵⁰ *PSI III 236* refers to three different individuals as “brother” (*adelphos*) as well. Scholarship confirms that these “brothers” are not “blood brothers” (per Daniel) or “real siblings” (per Harland).⁵¹ Instead, the familial language used is intended to describe relationships between association members.

Another papyrus, also stemming from Egypt, serves to illustrate one reason why fellow-members from associations may refer to one another as brothers. Even though many private associations took care of members’ funerary matters, other associations functioned specifically as professional guilds whose members provided undertaking services. One such case is *PPetaus 28* (*AGRW 290*), a private letter on papyrus with a provenance in Kerkesoucha Orous (Arsinoites, a division of Herakleides, Fayûm, Egypt) that dates to the second century CE.⁵² According to Daniel, both the writer and recipient of the letter are likely members of a professional guild of undertakers, whose responsibilities include “not only embalming and burial, but also, as in this letter, the transportation of the dead.”⁵³ The letter is to do with the transport of the corpse of a Roman legionary, which a member named Papsaus had sent to another

48 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 40.

49 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 40.

50 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 38–39; see also Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 78. Harland collates the occasions where named individuals are referred to as “brother.”

51 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 40; Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 78.

52 For full information on provenance and dating, as well as an English translation to the letter, see Richard S. Ascough, Philip A. Harland, and John S. Kloppenborg, *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press; De Gruyter, 2012), *AGRW 290*, pp. 173–174. For a reading of the full inscription in Greek, see John S. Kloppenborg, trans., “*AGRW 290* Letter Concerning Transportation of a Corpse (II CE): Kerkesoucha Orous—Fayum Region,” in *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, <http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=2891>.

53 Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 41. Ascough et al. suggest that the sender and addressee of *PPetaus 28* are members of a “transportation guild.” Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg, *Sourcebook*, *AGRW 290*, p. 174.

member, Asklas. The corpse was then to be forwarded to a final destination, but because it did not arrive, Papsaus faced disciplinary action and wrote to Asklas to follow through with the task. The letter opens παψαύς Ἀσκλάτι τῶι ἀδελφῶ πολλὰ χαιρεῖν (“Papsaus to Asklas his brother (*adelphos*), many greetings”). Harland concurs with Daniel’s conclusion that the term *adelphos* was not a “conventional, meaningless [term] of address.”⁵⁴ Instead, the term reflects an everyday means for association members to address one another, and in this case, to call upon a fellow association brother, who “was sought for help.”⁵⁵

The appeal to brotherhood was not always offered necessarily as a positive entreaty, but instead as a negative reproach. IG X.2.1 824 is a third century CE epitaph from Thessalonica that reveals a tendency within one association of members having in the past reopened tomb niches either to add another body, or even to remove the remains of the deceased person within: “For Tyche. I have made this niche in commemoration of my own partner out of joint efforts. If one of my brothers (τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου) dares to open this niche, he shall pay.”⁵⁶ Onno van Nijf suggests that the intent of the epitaph may be to discourage “any fellow association members having designs on a specific tomb or niche.”⁵⁷ This example contrasts brother language used for the purpose of negative reproach against other examples which demonstrate positive entreaty.

A seventh and final example can be identified of a noncosanguinal brother reference utilized within what seems likely to be a professional association, in *IKilikiaBM* II 201 (= PH 285220 = *AGRW* 215).⁵⁸ This example dates to the first century CE in the period before Vespasian (i.e. pre-69 CE), and has a provenance in the vicinity of Lamos in central Rough Cilicia.⁵⁹ The inscription is on one of a series of tombs carved in mountain rock and belonging to an association’s collective burial site. Since the leader of the association, along with four of the members, are immigrants from Selge in Pamphylia, and Selgian immigrants were “particularly prominent in the profession of masonry,” it is

54 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 80; citing Daniel, “Guilds and Army,” 41.

55 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 80.

56 Onno M. Van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*, Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 17 (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1997), 46; see also Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 71, who makes reference to van Nijf. For the inscription in Greek, see “IG X.2.1 824,” in *Searchable Greek Inscriptions: A Scholarly Tool in Progress: The Packard Humanities Institute*, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org>. English translation is that found in van Nijf.

57 Van Nijf, *Civic World*, 46.

58 Harland suggests that the association’s membership may also comprise “immigrants to the area.” Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 69.

59 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 68; see also Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg, *Sourcebook*, *AGRW* 215, p. 130. English translation is from *AGRW*.

possible that this association is one of professional masons.⁶⁰ The inscription regulates that the tomb should remain for the sole use of association members; if a member wishes to leave the group, the other members may buy it from him, or the member may be refunded his share in the tomb. Most intriguing is that the term used to refer to fellow members in the described transactions is “brother” (*adelphos*): “if some brother (*adelphos*) wants to sell, let the other brothers (*adelphoi*) purchase it. But if the brothers so wish, let them receive the coins mentioned above and let them depart from the association.” This association of immigrants and possibly professional masons are not related cosanguinally: all the members listed are described as being a “son of” different fathers. Thus the references to brother are used to refer to all group members in a noncosanguinal fashion.

In sum, each of these examples demonstrate various professional associations using the term “brother” in a noncosanguinal sense, although the intended nuance of the term appears to vary. The reference to the brother may be a manner in which to refer to all group members equally, such as the “smith brothers” of *Industria* v 7487 (*CIL* v 7487), the multiple members identified as brothers in *P. Ryl.* IV 604 and *PSI* III 236, or the rules that apply to all member “brothers” in *IKilikiaBM* II 201 (= PH 285220 = *AGRW* 215). References to the “brothers” as equals does not preclude the ability to set some “brother” members apart as particularly honourable, however, such as the treasurer who was “the most pious brother” of *CIL* VI 9148 (*ILS* 7333). Successful accomplishment of a task that benefitted the association or the undertaking of a particularly important role in the association appears to be a reason to elevate certain “brothers,” such as the possible wine trader who was the “restorer of his brothers” identified in *CIL* VI 467 (*ILS* 3360). Finally, the term also appears to be used for the purpose of one member attempting to evoke feelings of brotherly honour and duty from other members, such as that observed by “Papsaus to Asklas his brother” in *PPetaus* 28 (*AGRW* 290), and even shame, if this honour is not upheld, observed in *IG* X.2.1 824.

None of these examples from professional associations concretely suggest that the use of “brother” language represents a mutable notion of shared kinship among association members. Harland’s conclusion appears accurate, namely that the term denotes family ideals of “solidarity, goodwill, affection, friendship, protection, glory, and honour” between association members.⁶¹ Professional associations appear to be exactly what the name suggests: associations of individuals whose primary commonality is a shared profession,

60 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 69.

61 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 81.

whether they be smiths, treasurers, wine traders, athletes, undertakers, ma-sons, or something else. Nothing further can be suggested. Ethnic features are not dominant in professional associations. Even when a professional association does lean in a cultic direction (such as the reference to revering a particular deity in *CIL* VI 467), which could signal the presence of other mutable features of ethnicity, nothing suggests that the brother language represents the ethnic feature of shared kinship. The use of brother language alone to denote fellow members is not enough to signify mutable shared kinship, and consequently shared ethnicity, among these brothers.

5.3 Greco-Roman Noncosanguinal Brothers: Cultic Associations

5.3.1 Nuclear “Families” and Hierarchical Relationships in Cultic Associations

References to brothers are also located within Greco-Roman cultic associations, which are affiliated with the worship of various gods.

Reidar Aasgaard argues that “most frequently the sibling metaphor was employed within the Mithras cult,” since inscriptions call the initiates “brothers” (“fratres”).⁶² One example may be noted in *CIL* XIV 4315 (*CIMRM* 308), an inscription on a small *cippus* opposite the theatre of a Mithraeum in Ostia Antica southwest of Rome, and dates to the first quarter of the third century CE.⁶³ The inscription identifies torchbearer “brothers,” at least one of whom is freed, who repaired a collapsed cave. The inscription confirms non-elite membership in the cult, and furthermore the unlikelihood that these “brothers,” as torchbearers and indeterminate equal status, would be related cosanguinally. A second cult of Mithras inscription, *CIL* VI 727 (*CIMRM* 510), located in Rome on a marble base at the bank of a bridge on the Tigris river, and dating between 176–192 CE, refers to the vow fulfilled by two “brothers” (“Her/mioneo et Balbino fratribus v(otum)).”⁶⁴

62 Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 110. A.D. Nock furthermore clarifies that the term “fratres” is used for members of cultic associations honouring not only Mithras, but also Jupiter Beelufarus and Bellona. A.D. Nock, “The Historical Importance of Cult-Associations,” *The Classical Review* 38 (1924): 105. See also Kloppenborg, “Associations,” 329.

63 The inscription reads as follows: “[Na]ma Victori Patri / Aur(elius) Cresce[n]s / Aug(usti) lib(ertus) / fratres ex / speleo dilap/so in melio/ri restaura/vit.” Maarten Jozef Vermaseren, *Corpus Inscriptionum et Monumentorum Religionis Mithriacae*, vol. 1 (Hagae Comitum: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956), 141–2, nos. 300 and 308. The “brothers” are identified as two torchbearers.

64 The inscription reads as follows: “Soli invicto / Mithrae / pro salute Commodi / Antonini Aug(usti) domini n(ostri) / M. Aurel(ius) Stertinius / Carpus una cum Carpo /

In addition, both inscriptions also refer to “fathers.” *CIL* XIV 4315 refers to a “victorious father” (“Victori patri”). *CIL* VI, 727, which opens with a tribute to “Soli invicto / Mithrae” (“Mithras, the only unbeaten”), also refers to a father who is the “procuratore kastrensi,” a term traditionally meant to represent the figure in charge of household financial matters.⁶⁵ In the imperial household, a “dispensator fisci castrensis” was a slave chosen to govern the funds belonging to the patrimonium and utilized for domestic purposes, and functioned as a sort of palace administrator.⁶⁶ Presumably the “procuratore kastrensi patre” in *CIL* VI 727 oversees finances of either the association, or some other related venue such as a camp, as his profession. The addition of the term “father” suggests his head status in the group. The cult of Mithras is especially known to contain references to “fathers,” who are argued to play some sort of leading role in the association.⁶⁷ Indeed, the “brothers” in these two examples are reminiscent of the hierarchical function of “brother” language in the DSS as observed by Wassen and Jokiranta.⁶⁸ The references to “father” and “brothers” denote membership and status, and furthermore mirror the language used among members of a nuclear family. In both examples of inscriptions related to the cult of Mithras, it appears that the “brothers,” whether they be freedmen or vow-makers, are members while not leaders of the association.

A number of references exist to members as “brothers” in cultic associations aside from the cult of Mithras. *CIL* VI 377 is an inscription with a provenance in Rome, ascribed to the cult of Jupiter, evidenced by the opening “Aram Iovi Fulge/ratoris” (“altar to Jupiter Fulgeratoris,” meaning “Jupiter the Lightning Hurler”).⁶⁹ The inscription refers to “brothers and sisters [who] dedicated” an altar to Jupiter (“fratribus / et sororibu(s) dedica/verunt”), which is different

proc(uratore) k(astrensi) patre et Her/mioneo et Balbino fratribus v(otum) s(olvit) f(eliciter). Vermaseren, *Mithriacae*, 204.

65 Julian Bennett, *Trajan: Optimus Princeps: A Life and Times* (London; New York: Routledge, 1997), 57.

66 Jérôme France, “Un dispensator [(f(isci) k(astrensis)?) des trois Augustes dans le port romain de Toulon (Telo Martius),” *ZPE* 125 (1999): 274–75.

67 Bernadette J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*, *BJS* 36 (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982), 71. According to Nock, within the cultic associations of Mithras and others, the head is referred to as the “pater.” Nock, “Importance,” 105.

68 See Chapter 4 of the present study, Section 4.1.6.

69 The inscription reads as follows: “Aram Iovi Fulge/ratoris ex pr(a)ecep/to deorum montensium Val(erius) Cres/centio pater deoru(m) / omnium et Aur(elius) Exu/perantius sacerdos / Silvani cu(m=N) fratribus / et sororibu(s) dedica/verunt.” Manfred Clauss, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby, “*CIL* 06, 00377,” in *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*, db.edcs.eu.

from the above-referenced cult of Mithras, into which Aasgaard argues only men were permitted as members.⁷⁰ The “sisters” would be nonleaders of the association, like the “brothers.”⁷¹ The inscription also identifies a priest within the association (“sacerdos / Silvani”), denoting an individual with a special status and higher role, as in those hierarchies listed in CD XIV, 3–6 and 4Q279 Four Lots (priests, Levites, children of Israel, and *gērîm*). These brothers and sisters would thus be members, but not leaders, within this cultic association.

References to association members as brothers exist within inscriptions related to the cult of Jupiter Dolichenus as well, a cult which gained popularity within the second and third centuries CE.⁷² A first example is *CIL VI 406* (*ILS 4316*), which has a provenance in Rome and consists of a marble inscription broken into several fragments.⁷³ The inscription opens with an honourific address: “B(ona) F(ortuna) / Ex praecepto I(ovis) o(ptimi) m(aximi) D(olicheni) aeterni” (“Good Fortune, On instructions from the great and good eternal Jupiter Dolichenus”). The inscription proceeds to list the names and roles of followers of Jupiter Dolichenus in a descending hierarchy, who are described as “fratres carissimos et collegas hon(estissimos)” (“most dear brothers and honourable colleagues”).⁷⁴ It seems unlikely that cosanguinal brothers would refer to one another as “honourable colleagues.”

A second example of an inscription from a cultic association honouring Jupiter Dolichenus is that of *CIL III 3908*, which is an altar inscription from the Roman province of Pannonia, in Trebnje (present-day Drnovo in Slovenia).⁷⁵ The inscription opens with a similar honourific address to Jupi-

70 Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 110.

71 Categories of leadership can be divided roughly into “siblings” and “parents.” “Sisters” and “mothers” are the female equivalents to “brothers” and “fathers.” For example, where early synagogues are concerned, Bernadette Brooten points to six inscriptions, all from Italy and dating between the second and sixth centuries CE, wherein references are made to “mothers” of the synagogue. Brooten concludes that these figures “had something to do with the administration of the synagogue.” The “mothers” have a higher level of authority in the association, albeit perhaps not as high as “fathers,” who have been established to represent the head of an association. Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 72.

72 Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 110. Aasgaard writes that “members of the Iuppiter Dolichenus cult (second and third centuries AD) seem to have called one another siblings.”

73 This inscription may be found in full in Monika Hörig and Elmar Schwertheim, *Corpus Cultus Iovis Dolicheni (CCID)* (vol. 106 of *Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’empire romain*); (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 246–47.

74 Hörig and Schwertheim, *Études préliminaires*, 247, n. re: lines 9 ff.

75 The inscription reads as follows: “I(iovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) D(olicheno) / et I(ovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) H(eliopolitano) / Aurelius Do/mittius cu/m Fl(avio) Casto/re et Aur(elio) Maxim/u fratribus e/x iuso num/inis v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).” Hörig and Schwertheim, *Études préliminaires*, 176, no. 274.

ter Dolichenus: “I(ovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) D(olicheno)” (“the great and good Jupiter Dolichenus”). Within *CIL* III 3908, a secondary address is also given to Heliopolitan Jupiter: “et I(ovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) H(eliopolitano)” (“and the great and good Heliopolitan Jupiter”). In this inscription, members Flavius Castor and Aurelius Maximus are identified as “brothers” (“Fl(avio) Casto/re et Aur(elio) Maxim/u fratribus”) who also fulfill a vow. Regarding the use of the term “brother,” Monika Hörig and Elmar Schwertheim suggest that the term in this inscription takes on a meaning pertaining to a religious (meaning cultic) association.⁷⁶ The suggestion can be made that based on the fact that sibling language is used among members, in tandem with “cultic” or “religious” features of common culture, the term “brother” may pertain to a full ethnic identity, which would comprise both those inseparable features of kinship and culture.

Both examples highlight that group members within Jupiter Dolichenus cultic associations were identified as “brothers,” but were nevertheless organized by a hierarchical ranking once again similar to the ranking observed in the DSS examples CD XIV and also 4Q279. In other words, “brothers” are members within a cultic association, but brotherhood does not signify that everyone ranks as hierarchical equals.⁷⁷

In the third century CE, the cult of Bellona also used sibling terminology to identify association members.⁷⁸ Stemming from Rome, *CIL* VI 2233 refers to a temple coin dedicated to “Bellonae pulvinensis,” which is an epithet for Bellona.⁷⁹ One member is identified in reference to another as “fratri et / domino suo” (“his brother and his master”). Again, a hierarchical rank appears evident within membership.

These examples of brother references within Greco-Roman cultic associations demonstrate a strong hierarchical structure within the group, similar to what one would find within a nuclear family where primary authority was

76 Hörig and Schwertheim, *Études préliminaires*, 176, no. 274. Regarding line 7: “Mit den *fratres* ist hier sicher eine religiöse Gemeinschaft gemeint.”

77 Recall that the language of brotherhood has been established by Jokiranta and Wassen to not equate with “egalitarianism,” both in the DSS correlated with the sectarian movement and in Greco-Roman society. Jokiranta and Wassen, “A Brotherhood at Qumran?” 195, 203.

78 See Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 110, and n. 25, for additional references regarding the cult of Bellona and use of sibling language. See also Waltzing, *Étude historique*, 329–30, n. 3.

79 The inscription reads as follows: “L(ucio) Lartio Antho cistopho/ro aedis Bellonae pulvinensis / fecit C(aius) Quintius Rufinus fratri et / domino suo pientissimo cui et / monumentum fecit interius ag/ro Apollinis argentei Quintius / Rufinus.” Manfred Clauss, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby, “*CIL* 06, 02233,” in *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*, db.edcs.eu.

given to the *paterfamilias*.⁸⁰ Indeed, multiple references appear to various “family” members: a “father” in *CIL* XIV 4315 and VI 727; and a “sister” in *CIL* VI 377. Furthermore, hierarchies exist among the “brothers” themselves, such as that observed in *CIL* VI 2233 with a reference to “his brother and his master.” Finally, the “brothers” are not cosanguinal, noted in the scholarly debate concerning *CIL* III 3908. Nevertheless, A.D. Nock suggests that the cultic association “is a family and feels itself as such.”⁸¹ Thomas Schmeller suggests that these familial references are the “fiction of a family.”⁸² Recall that the present study resists the term “fictive kinship,” or even that of metaphorical language suggested by Jokiranta with regard to the brothers of the DSS.⁸³ Just because kinship is not cosanguinal does not mean that kinship is necessarily esteemed “fictive” or “metaphorical” by the members who hold the familial titles. Therefore, the brother, while not appearing to be cosanguinal from birth, may subsequently uphold a notion of shared, mutable, kinship among members within these associations. All of these Latin inscriptions articulating familial language and hierarchical structures from within the Roman Empire highlight a Roman openness, and indeed necessity, to mutable notions of citizenship, with matters of kinship being connected to that.⁸⁴

The following grouping of cultic association inscriptions from the Bosporus region (contemporary northern coast of the Black Sea) will add yet another meaning to shared kinship where “brother” references are concerned.

5.3.2 *Adopted Brothers in Cultic Associations and Beyond*

The following inscriptions from the Bosporus region utilize brother language, and, in some cases, adoption terminology to describe the relationship among

80 Simply put, John North writes that “wherever Roman citizens established themselves and lived by Roman laws, the legal structure of the family placed great control in the hands of the oldest living male progenitor—the *paterfamilias*. In theory, at least, so long as your father, or indeed grandfather, was still alive, you remained in his control (*potestas*): that meant that only he could own property, only he could make a contract, only with his consent could sons and daughters marry, or stay married once they were, or get divorced if they wanted to.” North, “Religious Pluralism,” 185. For an overview on Roman family hierarchy, see Jeffers, *Greco-Roman World*, 238–47. See also Gardner and Wiedemann, *Roman Household*, Ch. 1.

81 Nock, “Importance,” 105.

82 Schmeller writes that the familial references are “die Fiktion einer Familie.” Direct citation translations from the German are my own. Thomas Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität: Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine*, sbs 162 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995), 48.

83 See the present study Section 4.1.6.

84 Here, one may interpret such a notion again from the perspective of “choosing” Greek law and culture, or choosing other markers of ethnic identity (such as kinship).

members. The purpose of cultic associations in the Bosphorus region extended to “due burial of the members” and “education of the young,” in addition to “worship of certain deities.”⁸⁵ Harland suggests that what was first an informal use of “fraternal language” developed into the use of “fictive sibling language” as an official title.⁸⁶ By way of example, Harland looks to *CIRB* 104 (*AGRW* 88), an early third century CE stone epitaph to mark the grave of a deceased association member, located at Pantikapaion in the Bosphorus region.⁸⁷ On the inscription the association calls the deceased member ἴδιος ἀδελφός (“its own brother”). Identical officers are listed on this epitaph from Pantikapaion as on inscriptions at Tanais, leading Ellis Minns to comment that this association behind *CIRB* 104 is a “precisely similar organization with the same purposes” as the association at Tanais.⁸⁸ In other words, a progression is noted between *CIRB* 104 and the related inscriptions that now follow below.

CIRB 1281; 1283 (*AGRW* 92); 1285; and 1286 are all from Tanais in the Bosphorus region, on the north shore of the Black Sea, and can be dated between 210–240 CE.⁸⁹ Each inscription refers to ἰσποιητοὶ ἀδελφοὶ σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὕψιστον (“the adopted brothers who revere Theos Hypsistos”). The nature of the association that took on this name as its official title has been debated by scholars at length. On the one hand, the association has been considered a Jewish syncretistic cult. Because the members are referred to as σεβόμενοι θεὸς ὕψιστον, literally “those who fear Theos Hypsistos,” parallels have been drawn between this

85 Ellis H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks: A Survey of Ancient History and Archaeology on the North Coast of the Euxine from the Danube to the Caucasus* (Cambridge: University Press, 1913), 620.

86 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 72–73. See references to *CIRB* 104 made also in Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 87, and n. 77; Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, 624; and Nock, “Importance,” 105.

87 Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 73. For Harland’s full English translation alongside the Greek, see Philip A. Harland, trans., “AGRW 88 Grave for a ‘Brother’ of the Synod (200–250 CE): Pantikapaion—Bosporan Region,” in *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, <http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=1764>: “To good fortune! Those gathered around the priest, Valeris son of Neikostratos, and the father of the synod, Kallistos the second, and the rest of the members of the synod (honoured) their own brother, Symphoros son of Philippos.”

88 Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, 624.

89 *CIRB* 1283 may be found as an English translation in Ascough, Harland, and Kloppenborg, *Sourcebook*, *AGRW* 92, pp. 66–67. The Greek alongside an English translation are also present at Philip A. Harland, trans., “AGRW 92 Dedication to Theos Hypsistos by the ‘Adopted Brothers’ (228 CE): Tanais—Bosporan Region,” in *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*, <http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=1842>. *CIRB* 1281; 1285; and 1286 are all be located on Searchable Greek Inscriptions: A Scholarly Tool in Progress, The Packard Humanities Institute online database: <http://epigraphy.packhum.org>.

cultic association and those Gentile “Godfearers” of Judaism observed in the New Testament, such as Lydia in Acts 16:14, as well as women and men Gentile sympathizers of Judaism described by Josephus in *Ant.* 14.110 and 20.34.⁹⁰ On the other hand, it has more recently been suggested that the association has nothing to do with Jewish influence but rather a deity that has undergone Hellenistic influence. There is no evidence of Judeans living in Tanais, and furthermore, the term “Godfearer” can be applied to individuals beyond Judaism, and can only be ascribed to a particular faith “when contexts supply additional indications concerning their religion” (which the Tanais inscriptions do not).⁹¹ Therefore the association behind these Bosphorus region inscriptions which use brother language may legitimately count as a Greco-Roman comparison to the DSS texts under consideration.

Critical to understanding the brother language of the Bosphorus region inscriptions is the manner in which one should understand the reference to the association’s members as “adopted brothers” (ἰσποιωτοὶ ἀδελφοί). Legal adoptions occurred within both Greek and Roman traditions, represented in both the verbs εἰσποιέω and also υἰοθεσία, the latter being a newer term attested from the second century BCE onward.⁹² In Greece, the institution of adoption arose generally for “a provision of family and testamentary law for the preservation of an *oikos* and its property.”⁹³ In fourth century BCE Athens, adoptions could occur for the purpose of a childless man having someone to look after him (and his spouse) in old age, to bury him properly, and to look after his tomb-cult.⁹⁴ Because grown sons had legal obligations to care for their aging parents, having a son was the only safe way to ensure this care. Another purpose for adoption

90 For example, Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 87; Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 114. See also Minns, who writes that “the epithets of the deity are clearly due to Jewish influence.” Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, 621, see also 622. Regarding Godfearers specifically, see also Ch.3, n. 21 of the present study.

91 Yulia Ustinova, *The Supreme Gods of the Bosporan Kingdom*, RGRW 135 (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1999), 238–39. See also Harland, *Dynamics of Identity*, 73, and ns. 43 and 44, who refers to Ustinova, and also identifies other scholarship that ascribes to the earlier view concerning a Judean influence for these inscriptions. An overview of the term and the debate concerning whether it indicates influence of Judaism within the association or not is offered in E. Leigh Gibson, *The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosporus Kingdom*, TSAJ 75 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 21–28.

92 W. v. Martitz, “υἰοθεσία. In the Greek World,” in *TDNT*, vol. 8, ed. Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 397.

93 E.E. Rice, “Adoption in Rhodian Society,” in *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, ed. Søren Dietz and Ioannis Papachristodoulou (Copenhagen: The National Museum of Denmark, Department of Near Eastern and Classical Antiquities, 1988), 139.

94 Lene Rubinstein, *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*, Opuscula Graecolatina 34 (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press: University of Copenhagen, 1993), 62–63, 76–77.

would be for an Athenian to interrupt the order of intestate succession and designate someone else to perform these tasks if he did not think the existing intestate heirs would successfully accomplish these tasks.⁹⁵ The inheritance would be left to the adopted son.

Roman adoptions were primarily undertaken for the purpose of providing succession of inheritance and continuance of family *sacra* (“sacred rights”) for independent men who did not have any sons. The adoption was performed by legally independent and typically older men who did not have children but were capable of procreating. Grown men were the adopted, since adoption entailed the transfer of *patria potestas* (“power of a father”).⁹⁶ Women, not having *patria potestas*, could not adopt and were rarely adopted. Adoption happened by way of *adrogatio* or *adoptio*. *Adrogatio* involved adoption of a legally independent male and involved investigation by the pontiffs. *Adoptio*, likely more common, took place in situations where the male adoptee was still under the authority of a *paterfamilias*. The existing *patria potestas* was broken and subsequently power was transferred to the new father. In both cases, the adoptee lost his right to inheritance in his family of origin, unless subsequently he became emancipated from the adopted father and would thus revert once more to the family of origin. The underlying point is that adopted sons were esteemed equal to natural-born sons.⁹⁷ One could argue that they had effectively undergone a kind of change in kinship through the process of adoption.

Returning to the “Hypsistos-Fearing Adopted Brothers” from the Bosphorus region, Franz Poland suggests that the “brother” of these inscriptions, although

95 Of course, any system is also open to forms of alteration. The tribal cycle of the priests of Athana Lindia, whereby “priests of the same tribe succeeded each other in office in 3-yearly intervals,” could be circumvented with adoption. According to Ellen Rice, “a priest of one tribe standing for election in a year which was restricted to a member of another tribe could be adopted by a man from a deme of the appropriate tribe, and so be eligible for the priesthood.” Rice, “Adoption in Rhodian Society,” 138, 141–42. See also Hugh Lindsay, *Adoption in the Roman World* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 60–61, 218. Rubinstein, *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*, 62–63, 76–77.

96 In the later Roman Empire it seems that *patria potestas* was not always a concern, at least not in Roman Egypt. In *P. Oxy.* IX 1206, dating to 335 CE, a husband and wife consent to the adoption of their two year old son. Nevertheless, the adopted son will become the heir of the adoptive father. Arthur S. Hunt, ed., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 9 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund: Graeco-Roman Branch, 1912), 242–44.

97 For a background on Roman adoption, see Lindsay, *Adoption*, esp. pp. 62–86, and pp. 97–122. See also James C. Walters, “Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance,” in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (Harrisburg; London; New York: Trinity Press International, 2003), esp. 51–55.

uncertain, is possibly a “real brother.”⁹⁸ By comparison, Nock concludes that “this phrase [‘the adopted brothers who revere Theos Hypsistos’] is important, since adoption constituted in antiquity as close a tie as blood-relationship.”⁹⁹ It is unclear whether Poland considers a “real brother” through the perspective of cosanguinal brothers from birth, or brothers who effectively assume the same parentage through the tradition of adoption. Certainly within the time period under consideration and within the tradition of Roman adoption, adoptive sons in their adoptive family were considered to be in the same legal position as real sons.¹⁰⁰ Within the tradition of Greek and Roman adoptions, adopted children became like “real” children. Therefore, whatever Nock’s intention concerning “real brother[s],” the “Hypsistos-Fearing Adopted Brothers” could in fact represent persons of newfound shared kinship. Furthermore, the shared kinship of the “Adopted Brothers” in a way exceeds that of the brothers and *gērîm* employed in the DSS: the Bosphorus region “Adopted Brothers” have become like “real” brothers, subsequently legitimizing the claim of “real,” meaning cosanguinal, brotherhood.

The Bosphorus inscriptions are not the only writings to use the Greek and Roman concept of adoption in the same manner, namely, members joining a group with a connection to a particular deity, with these members also identified as “brothers.” It has already been noted that fellow followers of Christ are named “brothers” in Pauline letters.¹⁰¹ Paul describes on numerous occasions community members receiving an “adoption.” On five occasions the letters of Paul refer to adoption: Rom 8:12–17; 8:18–23; 9:4; Gal 4:1–7; Eph 1:1–6 (this final reference is not esteemed within the authentic epistles).¹⁰² Some argue that Paul’s use of adoption language is to draw primarily on scriptural influences: Paul could have devised the language of adoption to symbolize Israel as God’s adopted son (for example from Hos 11:1). Or, as a second option, Paul could have devised the language of adoption from the account of Abraham’s adoptive son Eliezer who will not receive the inheritance (Gen 15:4), because a “real” son will replace him. Or, as a third option, Paul could have devised the language

98 “[W]irkliche Brüder.” Direct citation translations from the German are my own. Franz Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens: Unveränderter fotomechanischer Nachdruck der Originalausgabe 1909*, Preisschriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38 (Leipzig: Zentral-Antiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1967), 55.

99 Nock, “Importance,” 105.

100 Gaius, *Inst.* 2.136.

101 See the opening section of the present chapter.

102 For a discussion on the authentic letters of Paul, see, for e.g., Trobisch, *Paul’s Letter Collection*, 28–47.

of adoption from a notion of King David as an adopted son, drawing on 2 Sam 7:11–16. Finally, some argue that Paul's use of adoption language draws on a notion of Greek law.¹⁰³ However, most likely Paul relies upon the Roman tradition of adoption. One will note that the communities to which he writes these letters, since they were under Roman rule, would recognize the connotations of Roman adoption.¹⁰⁴ Therefore one gets a sense that Paul approaches the language of adoption from the Roman perspective that adopted sons are equal to natural born sons, and therefore effectively undergo a change in kinship.

Scholarship has already argued that for Paul, becoming a follower of Christ entails a change in kinship and consequently ethnicity. Denise Kimber Buell argues for a notion different than one in which Christianity is considered to be universal and transcending kinship and ethnicity, an argument that she claims is often taken with respect to Gal 3:28. Instead, she suggests the following:

By construing Christianness as having an “essence” (a fixed content) that can be acquired, early Christians could define conversions as both the transformation of one's ethnicity and the restoration of one's true identity. And by portraying this transformation as available to all, Christians universalized this ethnoracial transformation.¹⁰⁵

Kimber Buell is arguing that Paul defines Christianity as an ethnic group, to which anyone may convert by means of a mutable ethnicity. Placing the discussion within the wider scope of general Judaism in the late Second Temple period once more, Kimber Buell is another who argues against Cohen's notion of conversion entailing a shift in citizenship and way of life, but not kinship (defined as “ethnicity” by Cohen and Kimber Buell). Kimber Buell

103 For all of the above arguments regarding scriptural influences on Paul's configuration of adoption, see Trevor J. Burke, *Adopted Into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor*, New Studies in Biblical Theology 22 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 47–61; William H. Rossell, “New Testament Adoption—Graeco-Roman or Semitic?” *JBL* 71 (1952): 233–34. For a detailed study arguing in favour of Greek provenance for Paul's use of the term, see James M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*, WUNT 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

104 Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 61; Daniel Pollack, et al., “Classical Religious Perspectives of Adoption Law,” *Notre Dame Law Review* 79 (2004): 711–14. See also Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 29, wherein he also makes reference to the work of Francis Lyall, who emphasizes the presence of Roman authority over the Christ groups addressed in the letters of Ephesians, Galatians, and of course Romans. Francis Lyall, “Roman Law in the Writings of Paul—Adoption,” *JBL* 87 (1969): 465.

105 Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 138.

proposes instead that “the shift Cohen identifies entails a transformation in how ethnicity/race is defined, with greater emphasis on its fluidity.”¹⁰⁶ In addition, Caroline Johnson Hodge argues eloquently that where Paul is concerned, “kinship and ethnicity cannot be merely metaphorical, for lineage, paternity, and peoplehood are the salient categories for describing one’s status before the God of Israel.”¹⁰⁷ Johnson Hodge goes on to argue, also against Cohen within the context of conversions within ancient Judaism, that no features of ethnicity would remain immutable, “not even kinship.”¹⁰⁸ It can therefore be further argued that Paul intends these adoptions for “brothers” to instigate a change in kinship, seen as a requirement of a conversion for group membership.

The feature of mutable “Christian” kinship present in the adoption given to “brothers” within Pauline literature lends credibility to the notion that the “adoptions” undergone by the “Hypsistos-Fearing Adopted Brothers” also represent a change in kinship to one which is shared among group members. Thus the brother language in this cultic association of the Bosphorus region also demonstrates a mutable notion of shared kinship between group members, signifying an ethnic conversion for new members, just as for the “brother” *gērîm* of the DSS. In fact, that the brothers in this cultic association are “adopted” extends their notion of kinship beyond even that of the DSS, whereby the *gēr* is a brother who is related by kinship but not cosanguinity. Instead, the association’s adopted brothers are parallel to cosanguinal siblings, through the ideal of Greek and Roman adoption.

106 Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race*, 44. Kimber Buell is offering a critique of Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*. See Section 1.2.2 for Cohen’s argument and other critiques against it, by Mason and Esler.

107 Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 4. Johnson Hodge and Kimber Buell (see above) have been used as examples because of their specific approach to Paul’s notion of kinship by drawing on ethnicity studies. For a selection of succinct perspectives that address Paul’s use of kinship in other ways (in addition to those sources already utilized in the present chapter for the perspectives of siblingship and adoption), see, for example, S. Scott Bartchy, “Undermining Ancient Patriarchy: The Apostle Paul’s Vision of a Society of Siblings,” *BTB* 29 (1999): 68–78 (who argues that Paul sought a sibling solidarity that was antipatriarchal); David M. Bossman, “Paul’s Fictive Kinship Movement,” *BTB* 26 (1996): 163–71 (who argues that Paul draws on household kinship and develops the construct of God as the patron Father); and David G. Horrell, “From Ἀδελφοί to οἶκος θεοῦ: Social Transformation in Pauline Christianity,” *JBL* 120 (2001): 293–311 (who compares the Pauline and pseudo-Pauline letters to conclude that a shift occurs over time in organizational structure from that of an egalitarian community to a hierarchical household-community).

108 Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 54.

5.4 Shared Kinship and Mutable Ethnicity in the Brothers of Greco-Roman Associations: Conclusions

This chapter provided a sociohistorical comparison between the present study's findings concerning the *gēr* as a convert within the sectarian movement, and Greco-Roman associations. Scholarship has already called attention to general similarities in organizational structure and time frame between the sectarian movement and Greco-Roman associations. The introduction to this chapter also discussed similarities in mutability and permeability in features of ethnicity among the sectarian movement, Roman, and Greek traditions, allowing the possibility for kinship language to assume such permeability, as well. This chapter compared the "brother" language within the DSS against "brother" language found within various Greco-Roman associations, both professional and cultic. In the DSS, where a *gēr* is found to be a convert by means of mutable ethnicity, "brother" language represents a notion of shared kinship between members. Brother language exists within papyrological and epigraphic evidence from Greco-Roman associations as well, and the chapter set out to discover whether the brother language used in this other ancient Mediterranean context could signal a mutable notion of shared kinship between group members, just as it was found to do in the DSS. If evidence of brother language could demonstrate a mutable and shared kinship among new members, the finding would further confirm the study's conclusion that the *gēr*, who is frequently identified as coterminous with a Judean brother, has made a change in kinship and ethnicity.

In short, the chapter concludes that indeed, brother language demonstrates a newfound shared kinship among group members, but only in the associations whose identity is based on primary features and secondary indicators of ethnicity (according to Hall's descriptor in particular with regard to Hellenism). The make-up of Greco-Roman professional associations is not primarily based on ethnic features, since their *raison d'être* is simply the joining together of individuals who share in similar professions. Here, the conclusion reported by Harland holds true, that the purpose of brother language is to instill values of friendship and honour. In the examples assessed, brother language was used to elevate the status of certain group members, and also to encourage good behaviour.

However, once the study assessed the brother language used within the cultic associations whose primary feature was that of common culture in the act of revering particular gods, brother language was found to represent a notion of shared kinship among members subsequent to joining. First, brothers were found to assume kinship within the model of a nuclear family; association

members took on the titles of “father,” “sister,” and “brother,” and hierarchy was evident between members.¹⁰⁹ In this manner, brothers became cosanguinal upon joining. Second, a certain association from the Bosphorus region developed a formal title of “Adopted Brothers.” Based on the understanding within Greek and Roman tradition that adopted sons were equal to “real” sons, and furthermore that the language of adoption to represent shared kinship among new members within “cultic” groups was also being used elsewhere, the study concluded that these “Adopted Brothers” also shared in a mutable notion of kinship. In their adoption, these brothers also became cosanguinal, like the brothers of various cultic associations who joined, or converted, into “nuclear” families. With multiple features of ethnicity in addition to secondary indicators present (common culture in religious or cultic practice; shared notion of kinship; and even a common proper name in the case of the “Adopted Brothers”), the specific addition of familial and sibling language suggests these groups have at most, constructed an ethnic group along the lines argued by the “instrumentalist” pole of ethnicity theorists, or at least, are moving toward such an ethnic group. This conclusion implies that even if a group does not start out as particularly unified in terms of descent or kinship, it can become so through a process of social construction.

The above conclusions suggest that definitions of kinship, and models of brotherhood, are always group specific. Just as brothers are part of a “nuclear” family within some cultic associations, and represent “adopted” brothers in another, the “brother” of the sectarian movement is group specific, too. Within the tradition of D, the brother was found to be a Judean kin but not cosanguinal. Within the tradition of S, a brother would be “supra-Judean.” The chapter confirms the findings of the study, namely that the *gēr*, in his frequent identification as a brother, can represent shared kinship, and consequently shared ethnicity, with other members of the movement.

109 No “mothers” were present within the examples under scrutiny; only examples that also contained “brothers” were sought out for this exercise.

Conclusion

This study set out to investigate the meaning of the term *gēr* within scriptural rewriting in the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). More specifically, the study analyzed whether the term *gēr* within the DSS affiliated with the sectarian movement could represent a Gentile convert to Judaism, similar to the meaning of the term in rabbinical literature. There are two reasons for this question: first, because of the very fact that the term *gēr* has been found to change in meaning over time, from a meaning of “resident alien” to “Gentile convert to Judaism”; and second, because Gentile conversions were witnessed from the Hasmonean era onward, which is the time frame established for the DSS. While scholarship has not favoured such an interpretation, more than one tradition present within the movement could yield multiple applications of the term and false initial impressions.

Defining what is meant by a “conversion” was integral to the study of the term *gēr*. Within the ancient Mediterranean and Hellenistic milieu, persons could choose to change their ethnic identity, meaning that identity was mutable. The study established that ethnic identity is understood to consist of features of kinship and common culture (such as religious practice, customs, and language). Certain features of ethnicity were found to be dominant within late Second Temple Judaism generally, including the features of shared kinship, citizenship or connection to a land, and common culture in circumcision (defined by some as “religious practice”). Therefore, it seemed reasonable to question whether these particular features of ethnicity might be significant for the sectarian movement, and whether the *gēr* found within the scrolls might represent a convert who had made a change in these ethnic features, meaning that the individual’s conversion was made possible due to a notion of mutable ethnicity. The definitional problem was that even though converts were known to exist within late Second Temple Judaism, it was not clear which features of ethnicity were mutable in order to make it possible. Would every feature change? Or, would certain features remain immutable while others showed mutability in a conversion? In what way would a former Gentile no longer be a Gentile by means of conversion?

To answer the question regarding whether the term *gēr* of the sectarian movement is a convert, and furthermore whether the conversion takes place by means of mutable ethnicity, the answer in short is: yes. A comparison between the term *gēr* as it is employed in the DSS and scriptural predecessors has

shown that the term has changed in meaning through scriptural rewriting in the DSS. While some would argue that the *gēr* of the DSS refers to a resident alien, nevertheless the present study concludes that the term *gēr* refers to a Gentile convert to Judaism. Significant ethnic features within this convert's identity are a notion of shared kinship, connection to a land, and a common culture in the practice of circumcision. The study has found traditions within the sectarian movement to react differently to this definition broadly defined. The Damascus (D) and Serekh (S) traditions affiliated with the sectarian movement held different attitudes toward the mutability of these features, because the two traditions responded differently to the *gēr*. Where the D tradition is concerned, the *gēr* is a Gentile convert to Judaism who joined the movement affiliated with the D tradition. Where the S tradition is concerned, the *gēr* also represents a Gentile convert to Judaism, but the convert is excluded from the movement affiliated with S. The reason for this exclusion is because members of the S tradition believe that they have converted to an ethnicity which is beyond Judean (supra-Judean), by means of a secondary circumcision of the heart. This supra-Judean ethnicity is immutable to Gentile converts, for whom it is believed their Gentile nature was never relinquished.

The end result is a Gentile convert to Judaism who, while not exactly identical to the *gēr* of rabbinic literature, is on the road to becoming thus, with a gradual democratization of external rituals and mechanisms (such as circumcision) to recognize other internal changes in ethnicity.

6.1 Summary of Findings

The introductory chapter's review of contemporary scholarship on the *gēr* in the DSS found that scholarship has generally assumed that the sectarian movement would exclude Gentile converts to Judaism, or indeed anyone perceived as outsiders, due to the movement's socially closed sectarian nature. Two primary traditions were affiliated with the sectarian movement: the tradition of D behind the Damascus Document rule was established to be somewhat more permeable than the tradition of S behind the Serekh ha-Yahad, or Rule of the Community, although both have an overall sectarian nature. In light of the known conversions within the time frame of the writing of the scrolls, the nature of the *gēr* in the DSS demanded further inquiry. A review of *gēr* research within scriptural tradition more broadly confirmed that the term was seen to change in meaning over time from "resident alien" to "Gentile convert to Judaism," and that consequently a comparison of the term in the DSS against scriptural predecessors could potentially reveal that the term held such a new

meaning within the DSS. The chapter also discussed the nature of ethnicity in late Second Temple Judaism, and scholarship's views concerning which ethnic features might be construed as mutable and responsible for conversions. A critical question was whether the feature of kinship itself would also be involved in a conversion: Shaye Cohen argued against such a notion, and Philip Esler and Steve Mason argued in favour of the feature of kinship converting, along with all other features.¹

Chapter 2 provided the preliminary step of establishing the provenance and dating of the DSS that utilize scriptural rewriting in which the term *gēr* is employed. Assessment of literary devices, paleography, and orthography all came into service in an attempt to see whether each text could correlate first with the sectarian movement more generally, and second with either of the D or S traditions more specifically. The chapter determined that the movement itself, while defined as a sectarian movement in the introductory chapter, cannot necessarily be identified with any known Judean group (for example, Zadokites or Essenes) with certainty. Therefore, the sectarian movement would simply be assessed based on its two primary traditions of D and S. Because frequently the manuscripts are very fragmentary, the reading of the word *gēr* was also verified, and confirmed, in every document.

The chapter discovered a number of correlations, which can be categorized in the following manner. First, 4Q423 Instruction^s was established to precede the D and S traditions and serve as an early influencer for both. Second, a number of texts correlated with the D tradition: CD itself (in the two occasions of CD VI, 14–VII, 1 and XIV, 3–6); 11QT^a (11Q19) Temple Scroll; 4Q377 Apocryphal Pentateuch B; 4Q159 Ordinances^a; and 4Q279 Four Lots. Third, two texts correlated with the S tradition, namely 4Q169 Peshar Nahum, and 4Q174 Florilegium. And finally, three texts (4Q307 Text Mentioning Temple; 4Q498 Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments; and 4Q520 Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed Only on the Back) correlated with the sectarian movement overall, but results establishing a clear relationship to either the D or S traditions specifically were indeterminate. Because correlations were observed in the divergent traditions of both D and S, one might hypothesize that more than one attitude concerning the *gēr* could be attested. The majority of scholars reviewed held the view that only one, uniform, attitude concerning the *gēr* would prevail across the entire sectarian movement, apart from four scholars who had suggested more

1 All of the scholarship reviewed in this chapter concerning ethnic identity, conversion, the meaning of the word *gēr* as it is employed within the DSS, and brotherhood within Greco-Roman associations, is a recapitulation of arguments offered in further detail within the introduction chapter.

than one attitude concerning the *gēr*: Katell Berthelot, who separated the *gēr* of 4Q169 and 4Q174 as “posing” (possibly Idumean or Iturean) converts, from an overall meaning of the *gēr* as a “stranger associated with Israel”; Terence Donaldson, who argued that the *gēr* of CD VI is actually a resident alien, versus every other *gēr* who is esteemed a convert welcomed into an idealized and hypothetical era; Jutta Jokiranta, who noted the “errant” *gēr* of 4Q169, in opposition to every other *gēr* who is included as a full member in the movement; and Kengo Akiyama, who suggested the possibility of more than one uniform view toward the *gēr*. Even here, the first three scholars appear to indicate that the texts that treat the *gēr* differently are anomalous, and the fourth (Akiyama), does not offer further detail to his initial observation.

Chapter 3 proceeded with a comparison between the occasions where the *gēr* is employed in scriptural rewriting in the DSS, and scriptural predecessors (specifically referring to scripture from the Masoretic tradition which became the majority canon). The chapter discovered that purposeful changes had been made, and the changes highlighted a different meaning for the *gēr* from the scriptural meaning of “resident alien.” Even when the term *gēr* in the scriptural rewriting was clearly borrowed from a scriptural predecessor, the *gēr* was always understood by its subsequent meaning of a “convert,” and not an antiquarian meaning of “resident alien.” This finding contradicts an argument implied by Donaldson—that a recognizable reuse of the term *gēr* might indicate the earlier meaning of “resident alien.” The comparison between scriptural rewriting in the DSS and scriptural predecessors also reveals a flaw in the argument proposed by John Lübbe, that the established meaning of the *gēr* as a resident alien is adequate and need not change. Lübbe erroneously determines that the *gēr* can dwell as a resident alien among the sectarian movement because this figure is a slave and has been religiously dedicated as an object. However, Chapter 3’s comparison shows that the resident alien does not have an “established” meaning of an acquired slave in scriptural predecessors (Lev 25:45 pointing to one example), as opposed to merely a hired worker as is the case in Deut 24:14. Finally, the interpretation for the *gēr* as a convert also negates David Hamidović’s argument that the purpose of the rewriting is to consistently distance the cultural integration between the *gēr* and the Israelite.

In addition, the chapter discovered that even though the *gēr* employed within scriptural rewriting in the DSS always represented an individual with a Judean identity, differences in attitude toward the *gēr* existed between the traditions of D and S. These differences affected the *gēr*’s subsequent inclusion or exclusion. In the texts correlated with the D tradition, the *gēr* is always included and seems a full Judean member within the movement. For example, the *gēr* in 4Q159 Frags. 2–4, 1–3 was found to share in Israelite kinship with

other group members because of the manner in which the scriptural predecessor (Lev 25:47–55) was rewritten. Within the texts correlated with the S tradition (4Q169 and 4Q174), the *gēr* appears to represent a Judean convert who is nevertheless excluded from the movement, because the S tradition does not consider Judean kinship to be mutable for Gentiles. In this regard, the present study finds affinity with the work of Berthelot, who noted that the *gēr* of 4Q169 and 4Q174 might esteem himself a legitimate “convert,” and yet still be deemed illegitimate by the sectarian movement. This finding made sense in light of the S tradition’s more socially closed stance in relation to the D tradition. However, the study proposed that this fraudulent convert was simply any Gentile who attempted to convert, and was not necessarily affiliated with those Idumeans who underwent forced conversions by Hyrcanus.

Finally, while tentative due to their fragmentary nature and therefore excluded from further analysis, two of the additional three texts that correlated with the sectarian movement overall also contribute to the discussion concerning the *gēr*’s identity. In the examples of 4Q307 and 4Q520, the *gēr* is included within the movement as a Judean, because in the manuscript the *gēr* substitutes for Judean-born individuals or for Israel. (In the case of 4Q498, no firm deductions could be made with regard to the meaning of the *gēr* due to the fragmentary nature of the scroll.)

Overall, the findings of this chapter confirmed that attitudes toward mutable ethnic identity within Hellenism and late Second Temple Judaism, particularly as they relate to the features of kinship and land, clearly affected the sectarian movement.

Chapter 4 assessed to a greater extent the features of ethnic identity that are prevalent within the sectarian movement and how the features affect one another. First, the chapter collated the ways in which the *gēr* was observed to be included (or excluded) by means of the features of a shared notion of kinship, and also an inclusion in a connection to a land or the promise of land. The *gēr* showed signs of shared kinship in a number of ways, including representation as an Israelite “brother.” For example, in 4Q159, “brother” language in the scriptural predecessor was manipulated so that the resultant *gēr* was no longer differentiated from the brother. The “brother” within the sectarian movement was established to represent either a Judean (in the tradition of D), or someone who is “more than Judean,” in other words, a “supra-Judean” (in the tradition of S). In the D tradition, the *gēr* representing a Judean (Israelite) brother would be accepted as a full member. Whereas, in the tradition of S, there the *gēr* representing a Gentile convert to Judaism was found to be excluded because his ethnicity was considered immutable, and the *gēr* could not attain supra-Judean status.

In a number of instances, the *gēr* was also found to share with Israelites in a connection to land, or the promise of return to land. Kinship perceptions furthermore influenced a *gēr*'s inclusion in the land. For example, 4Q377 promised a land of honey to be given in the place of foreign nations, fashioned from the scriptural predecessor Exod 3:8, where a dichotomy is set up between Israelites and foreign nations. The *gēr* (established to share in Israelite kinship) would then be a part of the group that would replace the foreign nations in the land of honey.

Having established the prevalence and importance of the ethnic features of shared kinship and connection to a land within the sectarian movement by means of the study of the *gēr*, the chapter concluded with a study of the ethnic feature of common culture expressed in circumcision, as it is found within the D and S traditions. Because this feature was an important feature of conversions within late Second Temple Judaism more generally, a study of circumcision within the sectarian movement was deemed essential. The study also served as final proof that the inclusion of the *gēr* is representative of ethnic conversions. Even though no ritual of circumcision as a means of admission into the sectarian movement is mentioned within either of the rule texts of D or S, circumcision was found to play an important role in understanding the differences in the D and S traditions' understanding of the *gēr*. The chapter concluded that in the tradition of D, mention of Abraham's circumcision on the day of his knowing (CD XVI, 4–6), combined with an excerpt from Lev 12:3 requiring eighth day circumcision after birth (4Q266, Frag. 6, II, 6), suggest that physical circumcision held cultural significance within this tradition. The chapter observed that where the tradition of S is concerned, 1QS v, 6 and a number of correlated texts refer to either a circumcision of form (יצר, which is equated with a heart) or a circumcision of the heart. This circumcision of the heart is nowhere mentioned in the tradition of D, indicating that the circumcision of the heart is an understanding special to the S tradition. Because circumcision is a marker of conversion and Judean identity, the spiritual, metaphorical circumcision of the heart suggests that members of the S tradition have themselves undergone a kind of secondary conversion, corroborating the "supra-Judean" status of a member in the S tradition.

This supra-Judean status explains the exclusion of the *gēr* as a Gentile convert to Judaism in the S tradition. According to this tradition, Gentile converts are only "claiming" Judeanness (per Berthelot), and thus these *gērîm* have never lost their Gentile ethnicity. Supra-Judean ethnicity, achieved through a circumcision of the heart, is not available to an individual esteemed a Gentile, because this individual had never gained a Judean identity in the first place.

Finally, while Chapters 2–4 provided a literary and textual means of investigating the *gēr*'s identity as a convert within the sectarian movement, Chapter 5 added a sociohistorical comparison to serve as final proof. The element of sectarian movement “brotherhood” was compared with “brother” language found in Greco-Roman associations. This chapter concluded that the language of brotherhood among group members can express a notion of shared kinship that is constructed, if the group is primarily defined using the features of ethnicity (kinship in addition to secondary indicators of common culture, such as “religious practice” and language). Thus, Greco-Roman professional associations’ use of brother language only indicated sentiments of friendship and honour, as argued by Philip Harland. However, cultic associations’ use of brother language did represent shared kinship: in some cases, members of associations were defined by various titles of a nuclear family (such as father, sister, or brother) which represented the hierarchy within their newfound group kinship; in other cases, members seemingly took on the role of cosanguinal brothers through a formal association title of “Adopted Brothers.” This chapter demonstrated that kinship, in its social construction, is group specific, and explained the differences in kinship attitudes between the D and S traditions of the sectarian movement. It confirmed the conclusion from the literary and textual study of Chapters 2–4, namely that the *gēr*, described as a “brother,” shares in kinship and is indeed an ethnic convert.

6.2 Further Implications for Scholarship

A number of implications for scholarship may be drawn from the present study. First, the term *gēr* is definitely an indicator of perceptions toward mutable ethnicity and conversion in the late Second Temple period within this sectarian movement, and its study has shed light on other Mediterranean groups in this time period, including Second Temple Judaism more generally and also Greco-Roman associations, via the *gēr*'s description as a brother. Furthermore, this study of the *gēr*'s identity has also led to an understanding of the identity of the members of the sectarian movement more generally. Because the *gēr*'s ethnic identity has changed to correspond with the identity of the D or S traditions, consequently the features of shared kinship, connection to a land, and common culture that were integral features within the *gēr*'s conversion are also critical features of the ethnic identity of all members.

Second, whether a text is future oriented or not does not impact the outcome of inclusion or exclusion toward the *gēr*. For example, the *gēr* was

found to represent a Gentile convert to Judaism, who was included within the sectarian movement affiliated with D, in scrolls that clearly represented a “contemporary” era to the movement, such as 11QT^a and 4Q159. The *gēr* was equally found to represent a Gentile convert to Judaism within the sectarian movement affiliated with D, in 4Q279, which did contain a messianic understanding for distribution of lots. However, the *gēr* was excluded from the future eschatological temple described in 4Q174, a text correlating with the tradition of S. A convert can truly exist within the on-the-ground contemporary era of the sectarian movement as an included member within the tradition of D, negating the view of some scholars that the *gēr* would be only an included or excluded reality within a hypothetical or eschatological time (per Donaldson and Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, respectively).

Third, the study confirms that even though the *gēr* is always a “convert,” there is more than one uniform perception toward the convert-*gēr* of the DSS. In this regard, the study agrees and expands upon the hypothesis of Akiyama. Chapter 2’s study of the D and S provenance of the texts that employ the *gēr* proved to be vital to understanding the split in attitudes toward the *gēr*; different views toward the *gēr* exist between the D and S traditions, because their views toward kinship are different. This finding corroborates scholarship that considers D and S to be two different traditions within the sectarian movement, whereby both are sectarian, but D is less socially closed than S. In addition, the finding that the S tradition considers members to be of supra-Judean ethnicity because of a secondary circumcision of the heart, explains and clarifies the reason for that tradition’s added social closure. The sociohistorical comparison in Chapter 5 furthermore highlighted and confirmed that the nature of kinship is very group specific.

Related to that, while no definitive conclusions were drawn regarding the social realities of the sectarian movement, the study postulated that the *gēr* as a “fraudulent” convert, excluded from the S tradition, was not related to Idumeans who underwent circumcision and forced conversions. Indeed, the forced conversions promulgated by the Hasmoneans do relate to the time-frame of the scrolls, but only insofar as they fit within the general era of Hellenistic influence concerning mutable ethnicity. In this regard the study differs from the conclusion drawn by Berthelot, namely that the later date of 4Q169 and 4Q174 might relate to Idumean conversions. Instead, the study suggested that any Gentile converting would be excluded for reasons of genealogical impurity. It seems unrealistic that a closed, sectarian group in Judea would be concerned with events and individuals in Idumea. Instead, the difference in outlook of the D and S traditions toward converts mirrors other divergences in

views toward the integration of Gentiles, such as what is observed concerning views toward intermarriages with Gentiles.²

Fourth, the ethnic feature of kinship can show mutability in the process of conversion. In fact, in the D tradition, the mutability of the ethnic feature of kinship is critical. Shaye Cohen made the astute observation regarding the trio of important ethnic features within late Second Temple Judaism (kinship; citizenship and connection to land; and common culture), but the present study has disproven his conclusion that kinship is always immutable as a part of Judean conversions within Hellenistic Judaism. Steve Mason and Philip Esler were correct in their observation that in a conversion, all the features of an individual's ethnic identity will convert together. However, while kinship may not be the "prime test" of ethnicity (which was Esler's critique contra Cohen), it is certainly a dominant feature where the sectarian movement is concerned.

Fifth, the identity of the sectarian movement is closer in alignment with the mutable ethnicity of Hellenism, late Second Temple Judaism, and the ancient Mediterranean, rather than the Persian era of postexilic Judaism. For example, to argue that the *gēr* would only be associated with Israel for "religious" matters, as does Berthelot, implies an understanding of the *gēr* within the earlier context of the Holiness Legislation (HL), whereby the *gēr* is still a resident alien, yet must follow the ordinances and statutes as must Israelites for the sake of the land's holiness (Lev 18:26–28). Hamidović's argument that converts are only relevant outside of Israel, where the sanctity of the land is of little concern, is also more fitting to the early postexilic period and the priestly HL legislation to keep the land holy, than late Second Temple Judaism. The present study has demonstrated that matters of conversion and ethnicity are important for the identity of the sectarian movement, in spite of its location in Judea. A comparison to early (Persian) Second Temple period Judaism is outmoded.

Sixth, the language of brotherhood is a significant indicator itself to uncovering newfound notions of shared kinship among members who join groups that are defined primarily by ethnic features, across the spectrum of the ancient Mediterranean. The term "brother" signifies newfound notions of constructed kinship in Greco-Roman cultic associations, and not merely the sentiment of friendship and responsibility between members. Furthermore, the study confirms conclusions of prior scholarship that "brother" language need

2 For example, Cana Werman argues for three trends within Second Temple Judaism toward intermarriage, ranging from permissive to an absolute ban. See Cana Werman, "Jubilees 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage," *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22.

not show equality, and in fact, when used within ethnic groups, usually highlights levels of hierarchy between members (e.g., the *gēr* listed last among the classes of “brothers” listed in CD XIV, or the “brother” of Greco-Roman cultic associations when contrasted against members identified as “fathers”).

Seventh, the hypothesis that a comparison of the *gēr* as it is employed within the DSS against scriptural predecessors would signal sociohistorical changes in the meaning of the term, as it did in early scriptural traditions, proved sound. The present study confirms the work of prior scholars who have used such a technique, and encourages a continued use of the method into the future. Intriguingly, the technique of rewriting for the purpose of changing ethnicities extends beyond Judean texts and exists within Hellenic genealogies as well. Jonathan Hall’s comment that “relationships within genealogies are modified through the addition, omission, and substitution of certain names” mirrors the present study’s application of scriptural rewriting as evidenced in additions, conflation, omissions, or substitutions.³

Certain limitations in analyzing the *gēr* within the DSS must also be recognized. First, one notes an absence of women in this work presenting the *gēr* as a male Gentile convert to Judaism. Clearly women were members of the D tradition; how would, and could, a Gentile woman convert and subsequently join the D tradition since male circumcision was not an option for her? Would a Gentile woman have been absorbed through marriage to a Judean member of the D tradition, or would she be converted through simply adopting other Judean practices of common culture, or, is it possible the D tradition did not think women could “convert”?⁴ A second limitation of the present study is that even though scriptural rewriting reveals sociohistorical changes, there are limits to analyzing fragmentary texts. Sometimes, it is difficult to discern whether the presumed scriptural predecessors can actually be attributed to the work of the ancient scribe, or whether they are a product of the modern scholar’s own bricolage and act of rewriting.

6.3 Proposals for Further Research

Numerous additional avenues for research arise from the findings of this study. First, having studied scriptural rewriting in the DSS that employ the *gēr*, it

³ Hall, *Hellenicity*, 27.

⁴ For overviews of these notions elsewhere within late Second Temple and beyond, see, for example, Judith M. Lieu, “Circumcision, Women and Salvation,” *NTS* 40 (1994): 358–70; Schwartz, “Doing Like Jews or Becoming a Jew?”

would now be pertinent to study the *gēr* as it is employed within other late Second Temple period texts, such as Jubilees, Ben Sira, and Tobit. Does the *gēr* (or *prosēlutos*) in these texts also mean a convert, and furthermore, can the analysis of the *gēr* also reveal the mutability or immutability of ethnic features behind the groups that composed or used these texts, just as it did within the sectarian movement?

Second, the study addresses the ethnic feature of common culture in the practice of circumcision within the sectarian movement. The theme of circumcision of the heart arises in texts correlated with the S tradition of the sectarian movement. More analysis can be undertaken concerning this theme, which arises across the literature of early Judean groups or literature influenced by Judean groups (e.g. Jub. 1:23; Rom 2:29; Odes Sol. 11:1–3).

Third, it was discovered that for the S tradition of the sectarian movement, the conversion of the *gēr* as a Gentile convert to Judaism is considered illegitimate because the S tradition does not believe that Judean kinship is mutable for Gentiles. Christine Hayes argues that this immutability (or “genealogical impurity”) is due to the fact that “Qumranites” (the present study would argue the S tradition only) belong to a school of thought whereby the belief is held that a Gentile’s seed will always remain profane. Hayes argues furthermore that within this belief, in contrast to a Gentile’s profane seed, a Judean’s seed is holy, because the seed is priestly.⁵ A subsequent question which arises from this argument is how the D and S traditions might see themselves as priestly or not, considering their differences in attitude toward kinship mutability. Is it possible that members of the S tradition would equate their supra-Judean nature with a priestly nature?

Fourth, more research can be done on the subject of mutable ethnicity and the notion of “brotherhood” across early “congregations.” For example, Daniel Boyarin argues that Paul works within a dualist ideology according to which there is both a spiritual and a physical body, and the spiritual body enables one to escape the physical body and ethnicity.⁶ One might pursue the idea that instead of an escape from ethnicity, Paul’s “brothers” may have converted to a spiritual ethnicity, seeing that an individual can maintain multiple ethnicities, as Philip Esler argues.⁷

In sum, the study of the *gēr* in the DSS proved to highlight the complexity of the dynamics of conversion and mutable ethnicity within the sectarian

5 Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 73–75.

6 Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1994), 8–9, 61–72.

7 Esler, *Conflict and Identity*, 73.

movement and beyond. Communities have been discovered to be far more mutable, and permeable, than they were thought to be at first glance, and kinship was observed to contain individual variations in each group where this feature of ethnicity was found. Scholarship's fascination with the *gēr* can, and should, yield many exciting findings to come.

Bibliography

- Aasgaard, Reidar. *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!': Christian Siblingship in Paul*. Early Christianity in Context: JSNTSup 265. London; New York: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Abegg, Martin G. "The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians." Pages 81–97 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C.R. de Roo. JSJSup 71. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Abegg, Martin G., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook. *The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert*. In consultation with Eugene C. Ulrich. Vol. 3, Part 1 of DSSC. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Abegg, Martin G., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook. *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*. In consultation with Emanuel Tov. Vol. 1, Part 1 of DSSC. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Akiyama, Kengo. "The *Gēr* in the Damascus Document: A Rejoinder." *RevQ* 28 (2016): 117–26.
- Albertz, Rainer. "From Aliens to Proselytes: Non-Priestly and Priestly Legislation Concerning Strangers." Pages 53–69 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle. BZABR 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Alexander, Philip S., and Geza Vermes. "4QFour Lots." Pages 217–23 in *Qumran Cave 4, XIX: Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*. DJD 26. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Allegro, John M. "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim." *JBL* 77 (1958): 350–54.
- Allegro, John M. "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect." *JBL* 75 (1956): 89–95.
- Allegro, John M. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." *JBL* 75 (1956): 174–87.
- Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4: I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Allegro, John M. "An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4Q Ordinances)." *JSS* 6 (1961): 71–73.
- Allen, W.C. "On the Meaning of ΠΠΟΣΗΑΥΤΟΣ in the Septuagint." *Expositor* 4.10 (1894): 264–75.
- Ascough, Richard S., Philip A. Harland, and John S. Kloppenborg. *Associations in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press; De Gruyter, 2012.
- Ashton, John. "'Mystery' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Fourth Gospel." Pages 53–68 in *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*. Edited by Mary L. Coloe and Tom Thatcher. SBLEJL 32. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Awabdy, Mark A. *Immigrants and Innovative Law: Deuteronomy's Theological and Social Vision for the נג*. FAT 2, 67. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Baillet, Maurice. "Document de Damas." Pages 128–31 in *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*. By M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux. DJD 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

- Baillet, Maurice. "Fragments du Document de Damas. Qumrân, Grotte 6." *RB* 63 (1956): 513–23.
- Baillet, Maurice. *Qumran Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Baillet, M., J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux. *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran: Textes*. DJD 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. *Romans and Aliens*. London: Duckworth, 1979.
- Bamberger, Bernard J. *Proselytism in the Talmudic Period*. With a foreword by Julian Morgenstern and a New Introduction by The Author. New York: Ktav, 1968.
- Bartchy, S. Scott. "Undermining Ancient Patriarchy: The Apostle Paul's Vision of a Society of Siblings." *BTB* 29 (1999): 68–78.
- Barth, Fredrik. "Introduction." Pages 9–38 in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Edited by Fredrik Barth. Boston: Little, Brown, 1969.
- Baumgarten, Albert. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. JSJSup 55. Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I." *JJS* 33.1–2 (1982): 215–25.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "Proselytes." Pages 700–701 in *EDSS*, vol. 2. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Qumran Cave 4: XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. Transcriptions by Jozef T. Milik, contributions by Stephen Pfann and Ada Yardeni. DJD 18. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., and Daniel R. Schwartz. "Damascus Document (CD)." Pages 4–79 in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. PTDSSP 2. Tübingen; Louisville: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
- Beard, Mary. *SPQR: A History of Ancient Rome*. New York; London: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2015.
- Bennett, Julian. *Trajan: Optimus Princeps: A Life and Times*. London; New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "The Re-Presentation of 'Biblical' Legal Material at Qumran: Three Cases from 4Q159 (Ordinances^a)." Pages 498–517 in *Law, Peshet and the History of Interpretation*. Vol. 2 of *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*. STDJ 107. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "4Q159 Fragment 5 and the 'Desert Theology' of the Qumran Sect." Pages 43–56 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls*

- in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. Assisted by Eva Ben-David. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "4Q159: Nomenclature, Text, Exegesis, Genre." Pages 518–39 in *Law, Peshet and the History of Interpretation*. Vol. 2 of *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*. STDJ 107. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Berrin, Shani L. *The Peshet Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169*. STDJ 53. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Berthelot, Katell. "La notion de נָר dans les textes de Qumrân." *RevQ* 19 (1999): 171–216.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1–39*. AB 19. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Blidstein, Gerald. "4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources on Bastard and Proselyte." *RevQ* 8 (1974): 431–35.
- Bosman, David M. "Paul's Fictive Kinship Movement." *BTB* 26 (1996): 163–71.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1994.
- Brooke, George J. "Body Parts in *Barkhi Nafshi* and the Qualifications for Membership of the Worshipping Community." Pages 79–94 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Edited by Daniel Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Brooke, George J. "Crisis Without, Crisis Within: Changes and Developments Within the Dead Sea Scrolls Movement." Pages 89–108 in *Judaism and Crisis: Crisis as a Catalyst in Jewish Cultural History*. Edited by Armin Lange, K.F. Diethard Römheld, and Matthias Weigold. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Brooten, Bernadette J. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*. BJS 36. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Bultmann, Christoph. *Der Fremde im antiken Juda: Eine Untersuchung zum sozialen Typenbegriff "ger" und seinem Bedeutungswandel in der alttestamentlichen Gesetzgebung*. FRLANT 153. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Burke, Trevor J. *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 22. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006.
- Cayley, Rachel. "Introductions." explorationsofstyle.com.
- Chalcraft, David J. "The Development of Weber's Sociology of Sects: Encouraging a New Fascination." Pages 26–51 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. David J. Chalcraft. London: Equinox, 2007.
- Chalcraft, David J. "Is a Historical Comparative Sociology of (Ancient Jewish) Sects Possible?" Pages 235–86 in *Sects and Sectarianism in Jewish History*. Edited by Sasha Stern. IJS Studies in Judaica 12. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011.

- Charlesworth, James H., and Andrew D. Gross. "Temple Scroll-Like Document." Pages 227–33 in *Temple Scroll and Related Documents*. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. PTDSSP 7. Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Elisha Qimron. "Rule of the Community (1QS; Cf. 4QS MSS A-J, 5Q11)." Pages 1–51 in *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. PTDSSP 1. Tübingen; Louisville: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Chesnutt, Randall. *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Clauss, Manfred, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby. "CIL 06, 00467." In *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*. db.edcs.eu.
- Clauss, Manfred, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby. "CIL 06, 09148." In *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*. db.edcs.eu.
- Clauss, Manfred, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby. "CIL 05, 07487." In *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*. db.edcs.eu.
- Clauss, Manfred, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby. "CIL 06, 00377." In *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*. db.edcs.eu.
- Clauss, Manfred, Anne Kolb, and Wolfgang A. Slaby. "CIL 06, 02233." In *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby*. db.edcs.eu.
- Cohen, Matty. "Le 'ger' biblique et son statut socio-religieux." *RHR* 207 (1990): 131–58.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1999.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. "Conversion to Judaism in Historical Perspective: From Biblical Israel to Postbiblical Judaism." *Conservative Judaism* 36.4 (1983): 31–45.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew." *HTR* 82 (1989): 13–33.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. "From the Bible to the Talmud: The Prohibition of Inter-marriage." *HAR* 7 (1983): 23–39.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. "Respect for Judaism by Gentiles According to Josephus." *HTR* 80 (1987): 409–30.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Collins, John J. *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Collins, John J. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Collins, John J. "Prophecy and History in the Pesharim." Pages 209–26 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. JSJSup 141. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.

- Collins, John J. "Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 151–72 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Collins, John J. "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century." Pages 163–86 in *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs, Literary editor Caroline McCracken-Flesher. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Crook, Zeba A. *Reconceptualizing Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1958.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore; London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Cross, Frank Moore. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran." Pages 147–76 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Daniel, Robert W. "Notes on the Guilds and Army in Roman Egypt." *BASP*.1–2 (1979): 37–46.
- Davies, Philip R. "The 'Damascus Sect' and Judaism." Pages 70–84 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Davies, Philip R. "'Old' and 'New' Israel in the Bible and the Qumran Scrolls: Identity and Difference." Pages 33–42 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Others in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Congress Proceedings of IOQS, July 25–28 2004, Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. STDJ 70. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Davila, James R. *Liturgical Works*. ECDSS. Grand Rapids; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2000.
- de Groot van Houten, Christiana. *The Alien in Israelite Law*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- de Groot van Houten, Christiana. "Remember That You Were Aliens: A Tradition-Historical Study." Pages 224–40 in *Priests, Prophets, and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich, John W. Wright, Robert P Carroll, and Philip R. Davies. JSOTSup 149. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- de Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.

- Di Lella, Alexander A., and Patrick W. Skehan. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community." Pages 197–205 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hillhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Donaldson, Terence. *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Doudna, Gregory L. *4Q Peshar Nahum: A Critical Edition*. JSPSup 35. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Ebach, Ruth. *Das Fremde und das Eigene: Die Fremddarstellungen des Deuteronomiums im Kontext israelitischer Identitätskonstruktionen*. BZAW 471. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Edelman, Diana. "Ethnicity and Early Israel." Pages 25–55 in *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by Mark G. Brett. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1996.
- Elgvin, Torleif. "423. 4QInstructions." Pages 505–33 in *Qumran Cave 4, XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (Musar le Mevin): 4Q415ff*. By John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, in collaboration with Joseph A. Fitzmeyer. DJD 34. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Second ed. Anthropology, Culture and Society. London: Pluto Press, 2002.
- Eshel, E., and M. Stone. "4QExposition on the Patriarchs." Pages 215–30 in *Qumran Cave 4, XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. In consultation with James C. VanderKam. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Eshel, Hanan. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*. SDSS. Grand Rapids, MI; Jerusalem, Israel: Eerdmans; Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2008.
- Esler, Philip F. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. "Priests at Qumran: A Reassessment." Pages 243–62 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 90. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Faust, Abraham, and Adi Erlich. *The Excavations of Khirbet Er-Rasm, Israel: The Changing Faces of the Countryside*. International Series 2187. Oxford: B.A.R., 2011.
- Feldman, Ariel. "The Sinai Revelation According to 4Q377 (*Apocryphal Pentateuch B*)." *DSD* 18 (2011): 155–72.
- Fensham, Charles. "Widow, Orphan and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature." *JNES* 21 (1962): 129–39.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2002.

- France, Jérôme. "Un dispensator [(f(isci) k(astrensis)?] des trois Augustes dans le port romain de Toulon (Telo Martius)." *ZPE* 125 (1999): 272–76.
- Fredriksen, Paula. "Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2." Pages 235–60 in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Edited by Mark D. Nanos. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Paperback edition. Leiden; Boston: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Gardner, Jane F. *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*. Oxford; New York: Clarendon, 1998.
- Gardner, Jane F., and Thomas Wiedemann. *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook*. London; New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited and Enlarged. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2006.
- Gibson, E. Leigh. *The Jewish Manumission Inscriptions of the Bosphorus Kingdom*. TSAJ 75. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Gillihan, Yonder Moynihan. *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters' Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context*. STDJ 97. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Gillihan, Yonder Moynihan. "The 𐤒 Who Wasn't There: Fictional Aliens in the Damascus Rule." *RevQ* 25 (2011): 257–305.
- Goff, Matthew J. *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. VTSup 116. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Goodman, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.
- Grossman, Maxine. "Priesthood as Authority: Interpretive Competition in First-Century Judaism and Christianity." Pages 117–31 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*. Edited by James R. Davila. STDJ 46. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Hahn, Scott. *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Hall, Jonathan M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hall, Jonathan M. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

- Hamidović, David. "À la frontière de l'artérité, le statut de l'étranger-résident (גג) dans les milieux esséniens." Pages 261–304 in *L'étranger dans la Bible et ses lectures*. Edited by Jean Riaud. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2007.
- Hamidović, David. "4Q279, 4QFour Lots, une interprétation du Psaume 135 appartenant à 4Q421, 4QWays of Righteousness." *DSD* 9 (2002): 166–86.
- Harland, Philip A. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Harland, Philip A. *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities*. New York; London: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Harland, Philip A, trans. "AGRW 88 Grave for a 'Brother' of the Synod (200–250 CE): Pantikapaion—Bosporan Region." In *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*. <http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=1764>.
- Harland, Philip A, trans. "AGRW 92 Dedication to Theos Hypsistos by the 'Adopted Brothers' (228 CE): Tanais—Bosporan Region." In *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*. <http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=1842>.
- Harland, Philip A, trans. "Honours by a Society for Leaders Mentioning a Samaritan Member 1G II² 2943." In *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*. <http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=12116>
- Harrington, Hannah K. *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations*. SBLDS 143. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Harrington, Hannah K. "Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran." Pages 187–203 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. STDJ 70. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Hayes, Christine. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Hayes, Christine. "Intermarriage and Impurity in Ancient Jewish Sources." *HTR* 92 (January 1999): 3–36.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Laws of the Damascus Document*. STDJ 29. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1998.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 207–24 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "1QS 6:2c–4a—Satellites or Precursors of the Yaḥad?" Pages 31–40 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem, (July 6–8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011.

- Hempel, Charlotte. "4QOrd^a (4Q159) and the Laws of the Damascus Document." Pages 372–76 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
- Hengel, Martin. "Qumran and Hellenism." Pages 46–56 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Herodotus. *The Histories*. Further revised ed. Aubrey de Séincourt. London: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Hezser, Catherine. *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Holtz, Gudrun. "Inclusivism at Qumran." *DSD* 16 (1999): 22–54.
- Horgan, Maurya P. "Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)." In *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. James H. Charlesworth. P^TS^DS^SP 6B. Tübingen; Louisville: Mohr Siebeck; Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Hörig, Monika, and Elmar Schwertheim. *Corpus Cultus Iovis Dolicheni (CCID)*. Vol. 106 of *Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Horrell, David G. "From Ἀδελφοί to οἶκος θεοῦ: Social Transformation in Pauline Christianity." *JBL* 120 (2001): 293–311.
- Hultgren, Stephen. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 66. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Humphrey, Edith M. *Joseph and Aseneth*. GAP. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hunt, Arthur S., ed. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 9. London: Egypt Exploration Fund: Graeco-Roman Branch, 1912.
- Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D. Smith. "Introduction." Pages 3–14 in *Ethnicity*. Edited by John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Jacobs, Sandra. "Expendable Signs: The Covenant of the Rainbow and Circumcision at Qumran." Pages 563–75 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*. Edited by Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold. In association with Bennie H. Reynolds III. VTSup 140/2. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011.
- Jacobus, Helen R. "Group Identities and Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Paper presentation. Society of Biblical Literature International Meeting. University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 23 July 2012.

- Jacobus, Helen R. *Zodiac Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Reception*. IJS 14. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Jacobus, Helen R. "4Q318: A Jewish Zodiac Calendar at Qumran?" Pages 365–95 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 90. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Japhet, Sara. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*. Rev. ed. BEATAJ 9. Frankfurt; Berlin; New York; Paris: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Jeffers, James S. *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of Early Christianity*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999.
- Jenkins, Richard. "Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17 (1994): 197–223.
- Jenkins, Richard. *Social Identity*. Second ed. London; New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Translated by F.H. Cave and C.H. Cave. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1969.
- Johnson Hodge, Caroline. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "אור," *ThWQ*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011, 1:129–136.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "Conceptualizing *Ger* in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 659–77 in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*. Edited by Kristin de Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström. Leuven; Paris; Walpole, Maine: Peeters, 2014.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes." *RevQ* 20 (2001): 223–39.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "Sociological Approaches to Qumran Sectarianism." In *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Jokiranta, Jutta, and Cecilia Wassen. "A Brotherhood at Qumran? Metaphorical Familial Language in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 173–203 in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings on the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*. Edited by Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, and Mikael Winninge. STDJ 80. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Joosten, J. *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Joyce, Paul M. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. LHBOTS 482. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Kaplan, Philip. "Ethnicity and Geography." Pages 298–311 in *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Edited by Jeremy McInerney. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA; Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.

- Kellermann, D. "Ger." Pages 439–49 in *TDOT*, vol. 2. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Kennedy, Rebecca F., C. Sydnor Roy, and Max L. Goldman, select and trans. *Race and Ethnicity in the Classical World: An Anthology of Primary Sources in Translation*. Indianapolis; Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2013.
- Kidd, José Ramírez. *Alterity and Identity in Israel*. BZAW 283. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 1999.
- Kimber Buell, Denise. *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "Associations in the Ancient World." Pages 323–42 in *The Historical Jesus in Context*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Jr. Allison, and John Dominic Crossan. Princeton Readings in Religions. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "Collegia and *Thiasoi*: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership." Pages 16–30 in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg and Stephen G. Wilson. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Kloppenborg, John S, trans. "AGRW 290 Letter Concerning Transportation of a Corpse (II CE): Kerkesoucha Orous—Fayum Region." In *Associations in the Greco-Roman World*. <http://www.philipharland.com/greco-roman-associations/?p=2891>.
- Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. "Der Penal Code und das Verhältnis von Serekh-Ha-Yachad (S) und Damaskusschrift (D)." *RevQ* 25 (2011): 199–227.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. "Rewriting Within and Outside the Bible." Paper presentation. Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Qumran Section. San Francisco, 21 November 2011.
- Kugel, James L. *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*. JSJSup 156. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Kugler, Robert. "The War Rule Texts and a New Theory of the People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Brief Thought Experiment." Pages 163–72 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Lead ed Kipp Davis, Edited by Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint. STDJ 115. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Kuhn, K.G. "προσήλυτος." Pages 727–44 in *TDNT*, vol. 6. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

- Lange, Armin. "The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature." Pages 39–48 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2000.
- Le Déaut, Roger. "Le thème de la circoncision du coeur (Dt. XXX 6; Jér. IV 4) dans les versions anciennes (LXX et Targum) et à Qumrân." Pages 178–205 in *Congress Volume: Vienna 1980*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. VTSup 32. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- LeFebvre, Michael. *Collections, Codes and Torah: The Re-Characterization of Israel's Written Law*. LHBOts 451. New York; London: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Lemke, Werner E. "Circumcision of the Heart: The Journey of a Biblical Metaphor." Pages 299–319 in *A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller*. Edited by Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Levenson, Jon D. "The Sources of Torah: Psalm 119 and the Modes of Revelation in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 559–74 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Levinson, Bernard. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind*. La pensée sauvage. English edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Lieu, Judith M. "Circumcision, Women and Salvation." *NTS* 40 (1994): 358–70.
- Lim, Timothy H. *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*. AYBRL. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Lim, Timothy H. "4QText Mentioning Temple." Pages 255–58 in *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI, Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Edited by Stephen J. Pfann and Philip Alexander. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Lindsay, Hugh. *Adoption in the Roman World*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Poverty in the Laws of the Ancient Near East and of the Bible." *TS* 52 (1991): 34–50.
- Lübbe, John. "The Exclusion of the *Ger* from the Future Temple." Pages 175–82 in *Mogilany 1993: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Hans Burgmann*. Edited by Zdzislaw J. Kapera. Qumranica Mogilanesia 13. Kraków: The Enigma Press, 1996.
- Lyall, Francis. "Roman Law in the Writings of Paul—Adoption." *JBL* 87 (1969): 456–68.
- Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. SDSS. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2002.

- Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512.
- Mason, Steve. "What Josephus Says About the Essenes in His *Judean War*." Pages 423–55 in *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson*. Edited by Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 9. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2000.
- McCracken Flesher, Paul Virgil. *Oxen, Women, or Citizens? Slaves in the System of the Mishnah*. BJS 143. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Meek, T.J. "The Translation of Ger in the Hexateuch and Its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis." *JBL* 49 (1930): 172–80.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Creating Community Halakhah." Pages 279–301 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint: Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Problems in Reconstructing the Organizational Chart of the Essenes." *DSD* 16 (2009): 388–415.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Serekh Texts*. CQS 9. London; New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50–70 C.E.* New York: Newman, 2003.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The Alien in Your Midst." *BRev* 11.6 (1995): 18, 48.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel." *JBL* 101 (1982): 169–76.
- Milik, J.T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Translated by J. Strugnell. SBT. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959.
- Miller, David M. "Ethnicity, Religion and the Meaning of *Ioudaios* in Ancient 'Judaism.'" *CurBR* 12 (2014): 216–65.
- Minns, Ellis H. *Scythians and Greeks: A Survey of Ancient History and Archaeology on the North Coast of the Euxine from the Danube to the Caucasus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.
- Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "Sojourners and Levites in the Kingdom of Judah in the Seventh Century BCE." *ZABR* 14 (2008): 237–79.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism: The Haskell Lectures, 1972–1973*. Critique and commentary Mary Douglas. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Newsom, Carol. "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Pages 167–87 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

- Nihan, Christophe. "Resident Aliens and Natives in the Holiness Legislation." Pages 111–34 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle. BZABR 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Nock, A.D. "The Historical Importance of Cult-Associations." *The Classical Review* 38 (1924): 105–9.
- Nolland, John. "Uncircumcised Proselytes?" *JSJ* 12 (1981): 173–94.
- North, John. "The Development of Religious Pluralism." Pages 174–93 in *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. Edited by Judith Lieu, John North, and Tessa Rajak. London: Routledge, 1994.
- O'Loughlin, Thomas. *The Didache: A Window on the Earliest Christians*. Grand Rapids, MI; London: Baker Academic; SPCK, 2010.
- Palmer, Robert. "Severan Ruler-Cult and the Moon in the City of Rome." Pages 1085–1120 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung II*, vol. 2.16.2. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Principat. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 1978.
- Parkin, Robert. *Kinship: An Introduction to the Basic Concepts*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. "The Riverrun of Rewriting Scripture: From Textual Cannibalism to Scriptural Completion." *JSJ* 43 (2012): 475–96.
- Poland, Franz. *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens: Unveränderter fotomechanischer Nachdruck der Originalausgabe 1909*. Preisschriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38. Leipzig: Zentral-Antiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1967.
- Pollack, Daniel, Moshe Bleich, Charles J. Reid, and Mohammad H. Fadel. "Classical Religious Perspectives of Adoption Law." *Notre Dame Law Review* 79 (2004): 693–753.
- Porton, Gary G. "Who Was a Jew?" Pages 197–218 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 2. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1995.
- Puech, Emile. "Le Fragment 2 de 4Q377, *Pentateuque Apocryphe B: L'Exaltation de Moïse*." *RevQ* 21 (2004): 469–75.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (Heb. מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים). Vol. 1. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (Heb. מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים). Vol. 2. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2013.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (Heb. מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים). Vol. 3. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2014.

- Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. HSS 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*. Bibliography by Florentino García Martínez. JDS. Beer Sheva; Jerusalem: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press; Israel Exploration Society, 1996.
- Regev, Eyal. "Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organization: The Qumran Sects in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites and Amish." *Numen* 51 (2004): 146–81.
- Regev, Eyal. "דָּרָה," *ThWQ*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013, 2:121–130.
- Regev, Eyal. *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. *RelSoc* 45. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2007.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "The *Gēr* in the Priestly Laws of the Pentateuch." Pages 77–87 in *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Edited by Mark G. Brett. Boston; Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Rey, Jean-Sébastien. *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*. STDJ 81. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Rice, E.E. "Adoption in Rhodian Society." Pages 138–43 in *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*. Edited by Søren Dietz and Ioannis Papachristodoulou. Copenhagen: The National Museum of Denmark, Department of Near Eastern and Classical Antiquities, 1988.
- Rosenbloom, Joseph R. *Conversion to Judaism: From the Biblical Period to the Present*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Hebrew Union College Press, 1978.
- Rossell, William H. "New Testament Adoption—Graeco-Roman or Semitic?" *JBL* 71 (1952): 233–34.
- Rubinstein, Lene. *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*. *Opuscula Graecolatina* 34. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press: University of Copenhagen, 1993.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. "Sectarianism." Pages 853–57 in *EDSS*, vol. 2. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Schechter, Solomon. *Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Edited from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection Now in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge*. Vol. 1 of *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Ordinances and Rules: 4Q159 = 4QOrd^a, 4Q513 = 4QOrd^b." Pages 145–75 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and F.M. Cross. *PTSDSSP* 1. Tübingen; Louisville: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts." Pages 81–98 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. *SBLSS* 2. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996.

- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1985.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The *Temple Scroll* and the Nature of Its Law: The Status of the Question." Pages 37–55 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- Schmeller, Thomas. *Hierarchie und Egalität: Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine*. SBS 162. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995.
- Schmidt, Francis. *La pensée du Temple. De Jérusalem à Qoumrân: Identité et lien social dans le judaïsme ancien*. Editions du seuil, 1994.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "Prayers and Psalms from the Pre-Maccabean Period." *DSD* 13 (2006): 306–18.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 117–44 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1999.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Revised English ed. Eds Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Doing Like Jews or Becoming a Jew? Josephus on Women Converts to Judaism." Pages 93–109 in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, and Stephanie Gripentrog. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Ends Meet: Qumran and Paul on Circumcision." Pages 295–307 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature*. Edited by Jean-Sébastien Rey. *STDJ* 102. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*. *WUNT* 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Seely, David Rolph. "The 'Circumcised Heart' in 4Q434 *Barki Nafshi*." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 527–35.
- Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology*. *JSJSup* 117. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Seow, Choon-Leong. *A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew*. Rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- Shemesh, Aharon. "Biblical Exegesis and Interpretations from Qumran to the Rabbis." Pages 467–89 in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Shemesh, Aharon. "The Origins of the Laws of Separatism: Qumran Literature and Rabbinic Halacha." *RevQ* 18 (1997): 223–41.

- Smith, Morton. "Hellenization." Pages 103–28 in *Emerging Judaism: Studies on the Fourth & Third Centuries B.C.E.* Edited by Michael E. Stone and David Satran. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Sparks, Kenton L. *Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel: Prolegomena to the Study of Ethnic Sentiments and Their Expression in the Hebrew Bible.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1998.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation.* FAT 52. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Stark, Rodney, and William Sims Bainbridge. *A Theory of Religion.* Toronto Studies in Religion. New York: Lang, 1987.
- Strugnell, J. "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan.'" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276.
- Tajfel, Henri. *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- The Israel Museum, The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls. "The Temple Scroll." dss.collections.imj.org.il.
- The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library. deadseascrolls.org.il.
- The Packard Humanities Institute. "IG X.2.1 824." In *Searchable Greek Inscriptions: A Scholarly Tool in Progress: The Packard Humanities Institute.* <http://epigraphy.packhum.org>.
- Thiering, Barbara. "The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll." Pages 99–120 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987.* Edited by George J. Brooke. JSPSup 7. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Thiessen, Matthew. *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Thiessen, Matthew. "Revisiting the Προσέλυτος in 'the LXX.'" *JBL* 132 (2013): 333–50.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction.* STDJ 44. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "Assessing Emanuel Tov's 'Qumran Scribal Practice.'" Pages 173–207 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts.* Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. STDJ 92. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls." *Textus* 13 (1986): 31–57.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible.* Revised ed. Minneapolis; Assen: Fortress Press; Royal Van Gorcum, 2001.

- Trobisch, David. *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*. Bolivar, Miss.: Quiet Waters Publications, 2001.
- Tuell, Steven S. "The Priesthood of the 'Foreigner': Evidence of Competing Politics in Ezekiel 44:1–14 and Isaiah 56:1–8." Pages 183–204 in *Constituting the Community: Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride Jr.* Edited by John T. Strong and Steven S. Tuell. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Unione Accademica Nazionale. *Supplementa Italica: Nuova Serie*. Supplementa Italica 12. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1994.
- Ustinova, Yulia. *The Supreme Gods of the Bosporan Kingdom*. RGRW 135. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1999.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees*. Translated by James C. VanderKam. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. 88 Scriptorum Aethiopicum. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- VanderKam, James, and Monica Brady. *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran Cave 4, XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*. DJD 28. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Van Nijf, Onno M. *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 17. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1997.
- van Peursen, Wido. "Who Was Standing on the Mountain? The Portrait of Moses in 4Q377." Pages 99–113 in *Moses in Biblical and Extra-Biblical Traditions*. Edited by Axel Graupner and Michael Wolter. BZAW 372. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2007.
- Vermaseren, Maarten Jozef. *Corpus Inscriptionum et Monumentorum Religionis Mithriacae*. Vol. 1. Hagae Comitum: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956.
- Vermes, Geza, and Martin D. Goodman, eds. *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Vlassopoulos, Kostas. *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- von Martitz, W. "ἡθρολογία. In the Greek World." Pages 397–98 in *TDNT*, vol. 8. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.
- von Rad, Gerhard. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E.W. Trueman Dicken. London: SCM, 1984.
- Wagner, Ross J. "From the Heavens to the Heart: The Dynamics of Psalm 19 as Prayer." *CBQ* 61 (1999): 245–61.
- Walters, James C. "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance." Pages 42–76 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg; London; New York: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Waltzing, Jean Pierre. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident. Mémoire couronné par l'Académie royale de Belgique*. Vol. 1. Louvain: Louvain C. Peeters, 1895–1900.

- Wassen, Cecilia. *Women in the Damascus Document*. SBLAB 21. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Wassen, Cecilia, and Jutta Jokiranta. "Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*." Pages 205–45 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. Edited by David Chalcraft. London: Equinox, 2007.
- Weinert, Francis. "4Q159: Legislation for an Essene Community Outside of Qumran?" *JSJ* 5 (1974): 179–207.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. Fribourg, Suisse; Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Weinfeld, Moshe, and Rolph Seely. "Barkhi Nafshi." Pages 255–334 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetic and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Eds Esther Chazon et al. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Weitzman, Steven. "Forced Circumcision and the Shifting Role of Gentiles in Hasmonean Ideology." *HTR* 92 (1999): 37–59.
- Werman, Cana. "Jubilees 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage." *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22.
- Werman, Cana. "The Price of Mediation: The Role of Priests in the Priestly Halakhah." Pages 377–409 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SDSS. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Wise, Michael O. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. SAOC 49. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1990.
- Wise, Michael O. "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and The *Floruit* of His Movement." *JBL* 122 (2003): 53–87.
- Wise, Michael O. "The Eschatological Vision of the Temple Scroll." *JNES* 49 (1990): 155–72.
- Wöhrle, Jakob. "The Integrative Function of the Law of Circumcision." Pages 71–87 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, and Jakob Wöhrle. BZABR 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Yadin, Yigael. "A Note on 4Q 159 (Ordinances)." *IEJ* 18 (1968): 250–52.
- Yadin, Yigael. *Introduction*. Vol. 1 of *The Temple Scroll*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983.

- Yadin, Yigael. *Text and Commentary*. Vol. 2 of *The Temple Scroll*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983.
- Zahn, Molly M. "Talking About Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology." Pages 93–119 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2011.

Index of Modern Authors

- Aasgaard, Reidar 160, 165, 167, 168, 172, 174, 175, 178
Abegg, Martin G. 15, 17, 32, 68, 72, 106, 148
Akiyama, Kengo 23, 188, 192
Albertz, Rainer 13, 142, 143
Alexander, Philip S. 75, 76, 78, 113
Allegro, John M. 72, 74, 75, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 119, 148
Allen, W.C. 14
Ascough, Richard S. 169, 170, 177
Ashton, John 57
Awabdy, Mark A. 11
- Baillet, Maurice 33, 59, 60, 61, 62, 87, 88, 89, 90, 123, 124, 141, 149
Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 3
Bamberger, Bernard J. 16
Bartchy, S. Scott 182
Barth, Fredrik 4, 27, 28
Baumgarten, Albert 6, 57
Baumgarten, Joseph M. 9, 20, 44, 49, 59, 60, 61, 63, 84, 117, 119, 146
Beard, Mary 163
Bennett, Julian 173
Bernstein, Moshe J. 73, 74, 112
Berrin, Shani L. 79, 81, 116
Berthelot, Katell 19, 20, 71, 72, 83, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 111, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 134, 135, 136, 137, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193
Blenkinsopp, Joseph 117
Blidstein, Gerald 119
Boccaccini, Gabriele 49
Bossman, David M. 182
Bowley, James E. 15, 17, 32, 72, 106
Boyarin, Daniel 195
Brady, Monica 68, 69, 70, 106, 108, 109
Brooke, George J. 52, 84, 85, 102, 103, 120, 149
Brooten, Bernadette J. 173, 174
Bultmann, Christoph 11
Burke, Trevor J. 181
- Cayley, Rachel 5
Chalcraft, David J. 6
Charlesworth, James H. 9, 50, 62, 65
Chesnutt, Randall 139
- Clauss, Manfred 167, 168, 173, 175
Cohen, Matty 11
Cohen, Shaye J.D. 12, 13, 25, 26, 27, 29, 73, 101, 130, 136, 144, 181, 182, 187, 193
Collins, John J. 8, 31, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 74, 80, 81, 82, 84, 139, 144, 152
Cook, Edward M. 15, 17, 32, 72, 106
Crook, Zeba A. 31
Cross, Frank Moore 43, 44, 53, 143, 144
- Daniel, Robert W. 168, 169, 170
Davies, Philip R. 2, 18, 48, 49, 123
Davila, James R. 149, 150
de Groot van Houten, Christiana 10, 11, 13, 14
de Vaux, Roland 11, 33, 43, 88
Di Lella, Alexander A. 139
Dimant, Devorah 1
Donaldson, Terence 2, 21, 31, 32, 97, 101, 103, 104, 117, 119, 120, 188, 192
Doudna, Gregory L. 81
- Ebach, Ruth 11
Edelman, Diana 28
Elgvin, Torleif 55, 56, 57, 95, 96
Eriksen, Thomas Hylland 156
Erich, Adi 26
Eshel, E. 35
Eshel, Hanan 80, 81
Esler, Philip F. 3, 26, 27, 29, 130, 141, 182, 187, 193, 195
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef 43
Faust, Abraham 26
Feldman, Ariel 68, 106
Fensham, Charles 10
Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T. 68, 70
France, Jérôme 173
Fredriksen, Paula 31
- García Martínez, Florentino 49, 76, 83, 100
Gardner, Jane F. 164, 176
Gärtner, Bertil 43
Gesenius, Wilhelm 100, 101
Gibson, E. Leigh 178
Gillihan, Yonder Moynihan 22, 23, 32, 36, 37, 116, 192

- Goff, Matthew J. 56, 57, 58
 Goldman, Max L. 3
 Goodman, Martin D. 23, 24, 46
 Gross, Andrew D. 65
 Grossman, Maxine 44, 153
- Hahn, Scott 143
 Hall, Jonathan M. 4, 28, 36, 160, 162, 163, 164, 183, 194
 Hamidović, David 20, 21, 35, 63, 71, 76, 98, 110, 111, 113, 115, 116, 134, 188, 193
 Harland, Philip A. 37, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 171, 177, 178, 183, 191
 Harrington, Hannah K. 7, 19, 120
 Hayes, Christine 120, 195
 Hempel, Charlotte 43, 48, 50, 58, 62, 63, 73
 Hengel, Martin 37
 Hezser, Catherine 16
 Holtz, Gudrun 9
 Horgan, Maurya P. 148
 Hörig, Monika 174, 175
 Horrell, David G. 182
 Hultgren, Stephen 141
 Humphrey, Edith M. 138, 139
 Hunt, Arthur S. 179
 Hutchinson, John 4, 26, 27, 161
- Jacobs, Sandra 145, 152
 Jacobus, Helen R. 5
 Japhet, Sara 13
 Jeffers, James S. 165
 Jenkins, Richard 4, 28
 Jeremias, Joachim 15, 16
 Johnson Hodge, Caroline 160, 182
 Jokiranta, Jutta 1, 6, 8, 9, 22, 23, 115, 135, 136, 141, 175, 188
 Joosten, J. 13, 96
 Joyce, Paul M. 138
- Kaplan, Philip 162
 Kellermann, D. 11
 Kennedy, Rebecca F. 3
 Kidd, José Ramírez 10, 11, 117
 Kimber Buell, Denise 160, 181, 182
 Kloppenborg, John S. 159, 165, 166, 169, 170, 172, 177
 Knibb, Michael A. 151
 Knohl, Israel 11
- Kolb, Anne 167, 168, 173, 175
 Kratz, Reinhard G. 49
 Kugel, James L. 30
 Kugler, Robert 156, 162
 Kuhn, K.G. 14, 16, 31, 101
- Lange, Armin 95
 Le Déaut, Roger 151, 152
 LeFebvre, Michael 24, 25
 Lemke, Werner E. 151, 152
 Levenson, Jon D. 139
 Levinson, Bernard 10
 Lévi-Strauss, Claude 94
 Lieu, Judith M. 194
 Lim, Timothy H. 34, 86, 87, 122
 Lindsay, Hugh 179
 Lohfink, Norbert 10, 98
 Lübbe, John 2, 18, 19, 117, 118, 188
 Lyall, Francis 181
- Magness, Jodi 44, 45, 74
 Mason, Steve 27, 29, 34, 47, 130, 182, 187, 193
 McCracken Flesher, Paul Virgil 16
 Meek, T.J. 11
 Meeks, Wayne A. 167, 177, 178
 Metso, Sarianna 8, 39, 43, 44, 68, 77, 88, 89, 124
- Milavec, Aaron 160
 Milgrom, Jacob 11, 13
 Milik, J.T. 33, 43, 49, 59, 60, 61, 88
 Miller, David M. 29
 Minns, Ellis H. 177, 178
 Moore, George Foot 16
 Murphy O'Connor, Jerome 49
- Na'aman, Nadav 11
 Neusner, Jacob 43
 Newsom, Carol 5
 Nihan, Christophe 13
 Nock, A.D. 172, 173, 176, 177, 180
 Nolland, John 152
 North, John 24, 176
- O'Loughlin, Thomas 160
- Palmer, Robert 168
 Parkin, Robert 3, 159, 163, 164
 Petersen, Anders Klostergaard 34

- Pohlod, Alexandra 166
 Poland, Franz 179, 180
 Pollack, Daniel 181
 Porton, Gary G. 29
 Puech, Emile 68
- Qimron, Elisha 9, 20, 61, 64, 69, 71, 75, 76,
 77, 78, 79, 83, 110, 111, 112, 125
- Regev, Eyal 6, 8, 47, 49, 50, 82
 Rendtorff, Rolf 12
 Rey, Jean-Sébastien 57, 58
 Rice, E.E. 178, 179
 Rosenbloom, Joseph R. 16
 Rossell, William H. 181
 Roy, C. Syndor 3
 Rubinstein, Lene 178, 179
- Saldarini, Anthony J. 6
 Schechter, Solomon 43, 59
 Schiffman, Lawrence H. 16, 31, 65, 66, 67, 71,
 72, 73, 74, 103, 111
 Schmeller, Thomas 176
 Schmidt, Francis 7, 8, 18, 120
 Schuller, Eileen M. 9, 149
 Schürer, Emil 16
 Schwartz, Daniel R. 9, 59, 101, 145, 156, 194
 Schwertheim, Elmar 174, 175
 Scott, James M. 181
 Seely, David Rolph 148, 149, 150, 151
 Segal, Michael 36
 Seow, Choon-Leong 125
 Shemesh, Aharon 94, 134, 136, 137
 Sims Bainbridge, William 6
 Skehan, Patrick W. 139
 Slaby, Wolfgang, A. 167, 168, 173, 175
 Smith, Anthony D. 4, 26, 27, 161
 Smith, Morton 24
 Sparks, Kenton L. 28
 Stackert, Jeffrey 11
 Stark, Rodney 6
 Stauber, Chad 89
- Stone, M. 35
 Strugnell, J. 68, 69, 71, 72, 74, 79, 148
- Tajfel, Henri 161
 Thiering, Barbara 65
 Thiessen, Matthew 14, 15, 30
 Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. 54, 55, 57, 76, 83, 100
 Tov, Emanuel 13, 35, 54, 67, 70, 87, 88
 Trobisch, David 160, 180
 Tuell, Steven S. 117
- Ustinova, Yulia 178
- VanderKam, James C. 30, 36, 68, 69, 70, 106,
 108, 109, 147
 Van Nijf, Onno M. 170
 van Peursen, Wido 68, 108
 Vermaseren, Maarten Jozef 172, 173
 Vermes, Geza 46, 75, 76, 78, 113
 Vlassopoulos, Kostas 163
 v. Martitz, W. 178
 von Rad, Gerhard 114
- Wacholder, Ben Zion 68
 Wagner, Ross J. 139
 Walters, James C. 179
 Waltzing, Jean Pierre 167, 168, 175
 Wassen, Cecilia 6, 8, 9, 99, 135, 136, 175
 Weinert, Francis 71, 72, 73, 111, 112
 Weinfeld, Moshe 11, 12, 36, 37, 148, 149, 159
 Weitzman, Steven 26
 Werman, Cana 104, 193
 White Crawford, Sidnie 34, 38
 Wiedemann, Thomas 164, 176
 Wise, Michael O. 44, 45, 53, 102, 103, 104,
 105, 119
 Wöhrle, Jakob 143
- Yadin, Yigael 35, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 103
- Zahn, Molly M. 33

Index of Ancient Sources

Hebrew Bible

Genesis

12:43–49	143n22
13:11	101
15:4	180
15:13	35, 35n143
15:13–16	35
17:9–11	30
17:9–14	143n22, 146
17:12	30
17:14	30n132
21:22–34	143
23:4	69n108
26:26–33	143
31:43–54	143

Exodus

3:7	109
3:8	108, 109, 109n46, 110, 131, 133, 138, 190
12	88n191
12:14–17	13n44
12:19	96, 97
12:43–49	142
12:48–49	33n134
12:49	33n134, 122
13	88n191
14:20	100
15:17–18	119n77
18:16	69, 106, 107n39, 108, 110, 131, 132
19:6	120
20	88n191
20:24	10n34
21–23	10, 10n34, 11n39
24:10	106
26:3	100n19
32	73
32:20	73
33	73
33:2	109n45
33:7	73
33:11	69
34:11	108, 109, 109n46, 110

34
35

65
65

Leviticus

12	146
12:3	190
16:29	55n46, 122
17–26	11, 11n39, 12, 12n40, 13, 96, 98, 101, 118, 131
17:8	96
17:10	96, 97, 122
17:12	96
17:13	122
17:15	96
17:15–16	12
18:24–30	96
18:26	95
18:26–28	12, 193
19	98
19:9–10	71n115
19:10	97, 98
19:16–18	134
19:17	98
19:18	98, 99, 130, 135
19:34	96, 98, 99, 122, 131
20:2	96
23:22	71n115, 97, 98
24:16	55n46, 96
24:22	96
25	113, 131
25:35 ff.	72
25:39	112n53
25:42	111
25:45	188
25:47	69n108, 72, 110, 111, 112, 112n53, 113
25:47–48	112, 113, 131
25:47–52	111
25:47–55	72, 72n124, 110, 111n51, 112, 131, 140, 189
25:48	110, 111, 112
25:48–52	110
25:53	110, 110n48, 111n48
	113
25:55	110, 111, 111n49, 113

Numbers

3:5-51 114n63
 6:25 70
 15:14 13n44
 15:30 55n46, 96, 97
 18:20 114, 114n63, 115, 132
 18:30 35, 71n15
 26:55 114
 30:17 [Eng. 16] 69, 106, 107n38
 34:16-35:8 114n63
 36:2 114, 115, 132, 140

Deuteronomy

11, 101, 114, 124, 152
 11:6 69, 106, 107, 107n39, 108,
 109, 110, 131, 132
 5 88n191
 5:14 88, 124n93
 5:15 111n49
 6 88n191
 6:5 150n49
 6:18 114, 114n60
 6:23 114n60
 8:1 114, 114n60
 8:7 124
 8:18 114n60
 9:5 114n50
 9:27 114n60
 10 88n191
 10:9 114n63
 10:11 114n60
 10:16 151
 10:19 33n134, 88
 11 88n191
 11:8ff. 114n60
 11:18-21 114n60
 12-26 10, 10n34, 11
 12:12 114n63
 12:13-15 10n34
 14:21 12, 104, 105, 132
 14:27 114n63
 14:29 35, 71n15, 97
 15:4 98n10
 15:11 98n10
 16:11 97
 16:14 97, 114n63
 17:8-13 72
 18-22 65
 18:1 114n63

21:10-14 13
 22:5 73
 22:13-21 73, 112
 23 73
 23:2 119n77
 23:2-9
 [Eng. 1-8] 103, 105
 23:3-4
 [Eng. 2-3] 21n89, 119, 119n78
 23:8-9
 [Eng. 7-8] 103, 104, 132, 140
 23:9 [Eng. 8] 64
 23:11-15 94n4
 24:14 19, 97, 97n9, 98, 98n11,
 188
 24:17-21 97
 24:19-21 1
 24:19-22 71n15
 26 124, 128
 26:3 114n60
 26:8 111n49
 26:11 114, 115, 132, 141
 26:11-12 114n63
 26:12 88, 124
 26:13 124
 26:15 114n60
 28:11 114n60
 29:9-10 99
 29:9-11 [Eng.
 10-12] 99, 99n15, 102, 113n56, 131
 30 138
 30:6 151
 31:7 114n60
 31:12 69n108
 31:20 114n60
 34:4 114n60

Joshua

114
 13-19 95n5
 18 106
 21 114n63

Judges

114

1 Samuel

14:9 76n147
 15:9 76-77, 76n147

2 Samuel			Nahum	
7:11–16	181		2:12	81
14:6	101		2:13	80
			3:4	78, 116, 118
1 Kings			Zephaniah	
6:36	69n108		2:4	125, 126
2 Kings			Haggai	
22–23	10n34		2:3	122
25:22	122		Zechariah	
Isaiah			2:15	117
1–39	117		3:2	125, 126
6:3	100		9:6	119n78
14:1	79n156, 117, 117n71, 118, 133		Psalms	
34:17	95		19	138, 139n17
40:3	46		19:2–7	
49:8	106, 110, 140		[Eng. 1–6]	139n17
54:6	125, 126		19:8–15	
56:3	117		[Eng. 7–14]	139n17
56:6	117		19:10–11	139
60:15	125, 126		98:2	108, 110
62:4	125, 126		119	139, 139n17
Jeremiah			119:103	139
	152		Proverbs	
4:4	151			139n17
4:29	125, 126		1:21	100n18
7:5	69, 106		8:21	106, 110, 140
9:24–25	151		11:21	100n18
50:5	117, 117n73		Esther	
Ezekiel			9:27	117
3:1–3	138		Daniel	
22:29	98		11:34	117
36:27	152		Ezra	
44:7–9	152			139n17
44:9	21, 119, 119n79		1:4	122, 123, 128
44:15	44, 153		9:1–2	120
47:13	115n63		Nehemiah	
47:21	115n63			139n17
47:22–23	115n63		Chronicles	
Hosea				13n46
7:16	79			
11:1	180			
Amos				
9:11	85			

2 Chronicles

2:16 [Eng. 17] 14n46
30:25 14n46

Samaritan Pentateuch

Exodus

3:8 109
34:11 109

Deuteronomy

10:19 124n93

Septuagint (LXX)

Exodus

3:8 109
12:19 14n47
22:20 14n52
23:9 14, 14n52
23:12 15
33:2 109n45
34:11 109

Leviticus

19:34 14n52

Deuteronomy

10:19 14, 14n52
14:21 15
23:8 15

Job

31:32 14n47

Isaiah

14:1 14n47

Deuterocanonical Books

Tobit

117n72, 195
1:8 117, 117n72

Judith

117n72
14:10 117, 144n30

Sirach

57n56, 139n17, 195
24:19–22 138
24:20 138n16

1–2 Maccabees

25m107

1 Maccabees

2:46 26

Pseudepigrapha

Joseph and Aseneth

138, 138–137n16, 139n17
16 138

Jubilees

120n86, 195
1:23 195
15:14 30, 30m132, 147, 147n35
15:25–26 30, 30m132, 147, 147n35
15:25–34 30m132
50:7 35, 36n146

Odes of Solomon

11:1–3 195

Dead Sea Scrolls

CD (Cairo Damascus Document)

8, 8n25, 9n30, 22, 34, 38,
41, 49, 50, 50n32, 58–59,
59n69, 60, 61, 62n80, 67,
74, 85, 91, 98, 100, 102n25,
129, 142, 152n56, 160, 186,
187
I, 5–11 43
I, 11 42
I, 13 85
I–VIII 58
II, 6 85
III, 12–15 144
III, 12b–
VIII, 20 85
III, 18–IV, 11 43
III, 21–IV, 1 44
IV, 3–4 85

CD (Cairo Damascus Document) (cont.)

IV, 4	85
IV, 4–6	153n59
IV, 13–18	85
V, 7–10	9, 9n32, 47
V, 13–VI, 20	60n70
V, 19	135
VI	188
VI–VII	98, 127
VI, 9–10	150n49
VI, 11	85
VI, 11–VII, 4	135
VI, 14–21	21
VI, 14–VII, 1	17, 18, 58, 59–62, 60, 60n70, 97–99, 130, 187
VI, 19	151
VI, 19–VII, 1	60, 61
VI, 19–VII, 3	60n70
VI, 20	60, 61, 99
VI, 20–21	60, 60n70, 98, 99, 131, 135
VI, 20–VII, 1	60, 61, 98
VI, 20–VII, 2	60n70
VI, 21	20, 21, 22, 60, 61, 63, 85, 99, 102n25
VI, 21–VII, 1	61
VI–VII	22, 59, 135, 136
VII, 4–5	60n70
VII, 6	9, 46
VII, 6–7	9, 47
VII, 7–9	107n38
VII, 8–9	69, 107, 107n38
VII, 16	85
VII, 17–VIII, 3	60n70
VIII, 1	60
VIII, 4	85
VIII, 6	98
VIII, 16	85
VIII, 21	151
IX–XVI	58, 99n15
XI, 2	18, 19n70
XI, 14	132
XI, 14–15	18, 31, 102
XII	145n33
XII, 1–2	7, 66
XII, 10–11	18, 19n70, 145
XII, 19	9, 33n134, 46
XII, 22	100n17
XII, 22–23	9, 46
XIII, 2b	50
XIII, 12	113

XIII, 13	48
XIII, 15–17	9n29
XIII, 16	9, 47
XIII, 17–18	9, 47
XIII, 20	9, 100, 131
XIII, 22–	
XIV, 10	62n81
XIV	22, 59, 76, 77, 86, 99n15, 113n56, 115, 127, 131, 135, 136, 136n13, 175, 194
XIV, 3	63, 99, 100
XIV, 3–4	62
XIV, 4	99
XIV, 3–6	17, 18, 31, 58, 62–63, 76, 76n145, 77, 77n153, 78, 99–102, 113, 113n56, 130, 131, 174, 187
XIV, 4	20, 85
XIV, 4–6	21, 102n25
XIV, 5	100, 101, 134
XIV, 5–6	62, 62n81, 63, 135
XIV, 6	20, 63, 85, 99, 100
XIV, 17	46
XV	99n15
XV, 8	48
XVI	145n33
XVI, 4–6	145, 146, 190
XVI, 10–12	9, 47
XIX, 17	85
XIX, 29	85
XIX, 34	151
XIX–XX	58
XX, 12	151
XX, 14–15	49
XX, 17–18	134
XX, 18	134n6

1Q14 (Peshar Micah)

Frgs. 8–10, 8	82
---------------	----

1QpHab (Peshar Habakkuk)

XI, 6–7	5n14
XI, 12–13	148
XII, 4	82, 150

1QS (Rule of the Community)

8, 8n26, 9n30, 38, 41, 43n6, 44n9, 48, 49, 50n32, 57, 58, 62n80, 82, 85, 152, 160, 186

I, 1–5	22		
I, 12	46		
I, 22b–27a	22		
I, 24	85		
I, 25b–3a	22		
II	77		
II, 1–4	70		
II, 5	85		
II, 19	85		
II, 19–23	76n145, 77, 77n151, 78		
III, 9–10	151		
III, 13–IV, 26	57n59		
IV, 15–16	55n46		
IV, 25	55n46		
IV, 26	95		
V, 1	150		
V, 2	9, 46, 85		
V, 2–3	43		
V, 4–5	150, 151		
V, 6	153, 190		
V, 7–20	39n152		
V, 9	43, 77, 77n153, 85		
V, 26	150		
VI, 1–8	46		
VI, 3	50		
VI, 11–12	48		
VI, 13	18n63		
VI, 17–22	9		
VI, 19–20	46		
VI, 22	46		
VI, 25	46		
VII, 12	49		
VII, 12–16	94n4		
VIII, 1–2	7–8n23		
VIII, 4–10	9n29		
VIII, 14	46		
IX, 3–6	9n29		
IX, 10–11	85		
IX, 15–18	134		
IX, 20	85		
IX, 21–23	134		
X	57n59		
X, 21	85		
XI	57n59		
1QSa (Rule of the Congregation)			
	8n26, 9, 51		
I, 25–27	7n23		
II, 2	83n170		
II, 8	83n170		
II, 11	83n170		
1QSB (Rule of the Blessings)			
	70		
1QM (War Scroll)			
	145		
I, 1	22		
II, 6	83m170		
XIII, 9	95		
1QH (Hodayot)			
	57		
XI, 23	95		
XV, 37	95		
XVIII	58		
4Q159 (Ordinances ^a)			
	17n61, 22, 72, 73, 74, 75, 85, 85n179, 92, 111, 111n51, 112, 113, 127, 129, 131, 136, 140, 141, 142, 155, 187, 189, 192		
Frag. 1, 16–17	73		
Frag. 1, 11, 3	35, 71n115		
Frags. 1 + 9	73		
Frags. 2–4	71n115, 72, 74, 112		
Frags. 2–4, 1	72, 72n120, 110, 110n48, 111, 112, 112n53		
Frags. 2–4,			
1–2	140		
Frags. 2–4, 1–3	17, 71–75, 72, 110–113, 130, 131, 188		
Frags. 2–4, 2	110, 111n 48, 49, and 51, 112		
Frags. 2–4, 3	71n116, 110, 111n49		
Frags. 2–4, 3–6	72		
Frags. 2–4, 6–7	72–73		
Frags. 2–4,			
8–10	73		
Frags. 2–4 + 8	73		
Frag. 5	73		
Frag. 5, 1	73		
Frag. 5, 4–5	73		
4Q164 (Peshar Isaiah ^d)			
Frag. 1, I, 2	82		
4Q169 (Peshar Nahum)			
	18, 19, 22, 23, 74, 79, 80, 80n160, 81n163, 82, 92, 116, 118, 118n75, 120n85, 127, 129, 133, 137, 142, 154, 187, 188, 189, 192		
Frags. 3–4, I, 2	80		

- 4Q169 (Peshar Nahum) (cont.)
- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Frgs. 3-4, I, | |
| 2-3 | 81n163 |
| Frgs. 3-4, I, 5 | 80 |
| Frgs. 3-4, I, | |
| 7-8 | 80 |
| Frgs. 3-4, II, 2 | 81 |
| Frgs. 3-4, | |
| II, 7-9 | 21 |
| Frgs. 3-4, | |
| II, 7-10 | 17, 78-82, 116-119, 133 |
| Frgs. 3-4, | |
| II, 8-9 | 133 |
| Frgs. 3-4, | |
| II, 9 | 20, 78n155, 79, 79n156, 116,
116n67, 117 |
| Frgs. 3-4, | |
| II, 10 | 79, 79n157 |
| Frgs. 3-4, | |
| IV, 5-6 | 81 |
- 4Q171 (Peshar Psalms^a)
- | | |
|--------|----|
| II, 15 | 82 |
| III, 5 | 77 |
| IV, 9 | 82 |
- 4Q174 (Florilegium)
- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| | 18, 19, 22, 75, 77, 82n167,
84, 84n175, 85, 85n179, 86,
92, 102, 102n25, 103,
103n25, 118n75, 119nn 77
and 80, 120, 120nn 83 and
85, 121, 121n87, 127, 129, 137,
142, 154, 187, 188, 189, 192 |
| Frag. 1, I, 1-4 | 17, 82-86, 84, 119-121,
119nn 78 and 79 |
| Frag. 1, I, 1-7 | 21 |
| Frag. 1, I, 2 | 84 |
| Frag. 1, I, 3 | 84, 119n79 |
| Frag. 1, I, 3-4 | 22 |
| Frag. 1, I, 4 | 20, 83nn169 and 170, 84,
85, 102n25, 119, 119n78 |
| Frag. 1, I, 6 | 84 |
| Frag. 1, I, 7-9 | 85 |
| Frag. 1, I, 10-13 | 84n176 |
| Frag. 1, I, 12 | 84, 85 |
| Frag. 1, I, 14 | 85 |
| Frag. 1, I, 15 | 84, 85 |
| Frag. 1, I, 17 | 86 |
- Frag. 1, I, 17-19 85
- Frag. 1, I, 19 84
- 4Q177 (Catena A)
- | | |
|------------|-------------|
| | 82n167, 150 |
| I, 1, 16 | 150 |
| II, 10, 13 | 150 |
| III, 5 | 150 |
| Frag. 9, 8 | 148, 148n38 |
- 4Q255 (Rule of the Community^a)
- | | |
|--|----|
| | 44 |
|--|----|
- 4Q256 (Rule of the Community^b)
- | | |
|----------|----------|
| | 43n6, 77 |
| IX, 6-13 | 39n152 |
- 4Q258 (Rule of the Community^d)
- | | |
|---------|----------|
| | 43n6, 77 |
| I, 5-11 | 39n152 |
- 4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules)
- | | |
|--|----------|
| | 8n26, 51 |
|--|----------|
- 4Q266-273 (4QD)
- | | |
|--|---|
| | 8, 8n25, 50, 58-59, 60,
71n115, 102n25 |
|--|---|
- 4Q266 (Damascus Document^a)
- | | |
|------------------|------------------------|
| | 44, 59, 60, 61, 100n17 |
| Frag. 3, II | 60n70 |
| Frag. 3, II, 19- | |
| III, 2 | 60 |
| Frag. 3, III | 60n70 |
| Frag. 3, III, | |
| 1-2 | 60 |
| Frag. 3, III, 24 | 60 |
| Frag. 5, I, 16 | 43 |
| Frag. 6, II, 6 | 146, 147, 190 |
| Frag. 10, II, | |
| 6b-7 | 62n80 |
| Frag. 10, II, | |
| 9-10 | 49 |
- 4Q267 (Damascus Document^b)
- | | |
|-------------|--------|
| | 59, 63 |
| Frag. 9, V | 62n81 |
| Frag. 9, V, | |
| 7-8 | 62 |

- Frag. 9, v,
 8–10 63
 Frag. 9, v, 10 63
- 4Q268 (Damascus Document^c)
 59
 Frag. 2 62n81, 63
- 4Q269 (Damascus Document^d)
 59, 60, 61, 63
 Frag. 4, 11 60n70
 Frag. 4, 11, 1–5 60, 61
 Frag. 4, 11, 2 61
 Frag. 4, 11, 3 61
 Frag. 4, 11, 4 61
- 4Q271 (Damascus Document^f)
 Frag. 3, 8–9 58
- 4Q279 (Four Lots)
 22, 77, 77n153, 78, 92, 106,
 113n56, 114, 114n62, 115,
 115nn 63 and 64, 127, 129,
 136, 139, 141, 142, 155, 174,
 175, 187, 192
 Frag. 5, 1–6 17, 75, 75–78, 113–115,
 113n56, 115, 131
 Frag. 5, 3 76, 131
 Frag. 5, 4 77
 Frag. 5, 4–6 76, 140
 Frag. 5, 5 76
 Frag. 5, 6 75
- 4Q307 (Text Mentioning Temple)
 87, 92, 122, 123, 126, 127,
 128, 187, 189
 Frag. 1, 1–8 17, 86–87, 122–123
 Frag. 1, 6 86, 122, 123
 Frag. 1, 7 123
- 4Q318 (Zodiology and Brontology ar)
 6n14
- 4Q365a (Reworked Pentateuch)
 65n91
- 4Q368 (Apocryphal Pentateuch A)
 108n44
- 4Q374 (Apocryphal Moses A)
 70
 Frag. 2, 11, 8 70
- 4Q377 (Apocryphal Pentateuch B)
 68nn103 and 106, 69, 70,
 70nn11, 92, 105, 107,
 108n44, 109, 126, 127, 129,
 131, 132, 136, 138, 139, 140,
 141, 142, 155, 187, 190
 Frag. 1, 1, 1 131
 Frag. 1, 1, 1–9 17, 67–70, 105–110, 130,
 138
 Frag. 1, 1, 2 106, 106n35
 Frag. 1, 1, 3 108
 Frag. 1, 1, 4 106, 139–140
 Frag. 1, 1, 5 68
 Frag. 1, 1, 6 68, 106, 107, 108, 109
 Frag. 1, 1, 8 108, 109, 109n46
 Frag. 1, 1, 9 108, 109
 Frag. 2, 1 108
 Frag. 2, 11 108
 Frag. 2, 11, 4 69n108
 Frag. 2, 11, 6–7 69, 107
- 4Q394–399 (MMT)
 120n86
- 4QInstruction (4Q415–4Q418c, 4Q423)
 55, 56, 57, 58, 95
- 4Q415 (Instruction^a)
 Frag. 11, 6 58
- 4Q418 (Instruction^d)
 Frag. 55 58
 Frag. 81, 4–5 95
- 4Q423 (Instruction^g)
 56, 91, 96, 97, 107, 113, 127,
 137n14, 187
 Frag. 5, 1a 55n46
 Frag. 5, 1–4 17, 55–58, 55n46, 95–97
 Frag. 5, 2 56
 Frag. 5, 3 95
 Frag. 5, 4 55n46, 95, 107, 107n39, 110
- 4Q434–438 (Barkhi Nafshi)
 149, 149n42

- 4Q434 (Barkhi Nafshi^a)
Frag. 1, 1, 4 148
Frag. 45, 2 125
Frag. 45, 3 89, 125, 126
- 4Q464 (Exposition on the Patriarchs)
Frag. 3, 11, 4 35
6Q15 (6QD)
58–59, 60, 71n15, 91,
102n25
- 4Q496 (War Scroll papM^f)
89, 90
Frag. 1–4 62
Frag. 4, 1–4 60
Frag. 4, 1–5 60n70
Frag. 5 61
- 4Q497 (papWar Scroll-like Text A)
89, 90
8Q3 (Phylactery)
88, 88n91, 124n93
Frag. 17–25, 9 33n134
Frag. 17–25, 13 33n134
- 4Q498 (Hymnic or Sapiential Fragments)
88, 88n190, 92, 123, 126,
127, 128, 187, 189
Frag. 2, 2 124
Frag. 7 17, 87–88, 123–124
Frag. 7, 1 124
Frag. 8 87n189
11Q19 (Temple Scroll^a)
17n60, 18, 19, 22, 64,
64n90, 65, 65n91, 66,
66n101, 67, 92, 102,
102n25, 103, 104, 104n31,
105, 129, 132, 136, 136n13,
140, 142, 155, 187, 192
- 4Q499 (papHymns/Prayers)
90
4Q501 (Apocryphal Lamentations B)
1 141
I–V 65n91
VI–LXVII 65n91
XXIX, 8–10 103
XXX, 5–11 103
XXXIV 66
XXXIX, 5 20, 35
XL 127, 136, 141
XL, 5 63
XL, 5–6 17, 21, 63, 63–67, 102–105,
131, 132, 140
- 4Q503 (Daily Prayers)
90
4Q504 (Words of the Luminaries^a)
149
XL, 6 20, 64, 102n25, 123, 132,
140
Frag. 4, 11 149
XL, 7 64
XLIV, 7–8 104n32
XLV, 11–12 7, 66
XLVI, 7–8 104, 104n32, 132
XLVIII, 1–14 104n30
XLVIII, 6–7 104, 105, 132
LVI, 15 104n30
LVI, 12–LIX, 21 65
LVII, 2–11 104n30
LVII, 13–16 104n30
- 4Q506 (Words of the Luminaries^c)
89, 90
4Q509 (Festival Prayers)
150
Frag. 287 149
4Q512 (Purification Ritual B)
89, 90
4Q520 (Nonclassified Fragments Inscribed
Only on the Back)
89, 89n193, 90, 91, 92, 125,
126, 127, 187, 189
Frag. 1, 2 89
Frag. 45 17, 88–91, 125–126, 128
11Q20 (Temple Scroll^b)
64, 64n90, 65, 65n91
X, 5 77n150

11Q21 (Temple Scroll^c)
64, 64n90, 65

Ancient Jewish Writers

Philo

Hypothetica

11.2 46
11.3 46
11.4 46

On the Special Laws

1.1–11 144n30
1.51 111
1.51–53 15
1.308–309 111, 15

On the Virtues

102 2n8, 28, 161

Questions and Answers on Exodus

2.2 152n58

That Every Good Person Is Free

76 46

Josephus

The Life

113 144n30

Against Apion

2.210 27n121
2.259–261 27n121

Jewish Antiquities

12.239–241 2n7
13.257–258 111, 26, 26n112
13.318–319 111
13.372–83 80n160
14.110 101n21, 178
20.139 111
20.145 111
20.34 178

Jewish War

2.120 46
2.123 46
2.160–161 46
2.454 144

New Testament

Matthew

23:15 15

Acts

2:11 15
6:5 15
13:43 15
16:14 178

Romans

160, 181n104
2:29 195
8:12–17 180
8:18–23 180
9:4 180

1–2 Corinthians

160

Galatians

160, 181n104
1:19 165
3:28 181
4:1–7 180

Ephesians

181n104
1:1–6 180

Philippians

160

1 Thessalonians

160

Philemon

160

Rabbinic Works

Mishnah

Bikkurim

1:4 15

'Eduyyot

5:6 16n57

Ketubbot

1:2 16n57

1:4 16n57

3:1 16n57

3:2 16n57

4:3 16n57

Yebamot

6:5 16n57

8:2 16n57

11:2 16n57

Babylonian Talmud

Horayot

13a 16

Early Christian Writings

Didache

16on9

Greek and Latin Works

Greek and Roman Authors

Gaius

Institutiones

1.8–47 163n20

2.136 18on100

Herodotus

Histories

1.56.2–57.3 2n6

7.101–105 24n104

Livy

History of Rome

43-3 163n21

Pliny the Elder

Natural History

5-73 46

Tacitus

Historiae

5-5 144n30

Greco-Roman Inscriptions

AGRW

88 (see
CIRB 104) 177, 177n8792 (see
CIRB 1283) 177, 177n89215 (= *IKilikiaBM*
II 201 =
PH 285220) 170, 170n59, 171290
(= *PPetaus* 28) 169, 169nn52 and 53,
171

CIL

III 3908 174, 174n75, 175, 176

V 7487
(= *Industria*) 167, 167nn38, 39, and
40, 171

VI 377 173, 173n69, 176

VI 406
(= *ILS* 4316) 174VI 467
(= *ILS* 3360) 168, 168nn43 and 44,
171, 172VI 727
(= *CIMRM* 510) 172, 172n64, 173, 176

VI 2233 175, 175n79, 176

VI 9148 (= *ILS*
7333) 167, 167n41, 171XIV 4315
(= *CIMRM*
308) 172, 172n63, 173, 176

CIRB

104 (see
AGRW 88) 177, 177n86
 1281 177, 177n89
 1283 (see
AGRW 92) 177, 177n89
 1285 177, 177n89
 1286 177, 177n89

IG

II² 2943 164n26
 X.2.1 824 170, 170n56, 171

IGLAM

503 a and b 159n5

IMylasa

544 159n5

MAMA

X, 437 159n5

P. Oxy.

IX 1206 179n96

P. Ryl.

IV 604 168, 169, 171
 IV 604,
 (line) 12 169
 IV 604, 15 169
 IV 604, 28 169
 IV 604, 31 169
 IV 604, 33 169

PSI

III 236 168, 169, 171