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Introduction

The theme of this conference (The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts) is well chosen inasmuch as these ancient manuscripts provide us with firm ancient, and one would like to say first-hand, evidence of such processes. One of the texts that has received a great deal of attention in terms of its textual history is the Community Rule as attested particularly in the well preserved copy from Cave 1 and the more recently published ten Cave 4 manuscripts of the text.1 There are good reasons why the Rule texts are a particularly fruitful field to harvest in the quest laid out by the organizers of this conference. Whereas scholars are frequently at pains to draw attention to small but significant differences between different copies of the same work attested at Qumran such as the War Scroll from Caves 1 and 42 and most recently also the manuscripts of MMT,3 the evidence of the Rule manuscripts has been available since the early 1990s. In the particular case of the Community Rule, the differences between 1QS and the various 4QS manuscripts are substantial and varied and

* A version of this paper was presented at a workshop hosted by Prof. Reinhard Kratz and Dr. Annette Steudel of the University of Göttingen in February 2009. I am grateful to them and to the organizers of the Toronto Conference for the opportunity to explore these issues in a congenial and stimulating environment.


2 For recent studies of the War texts see Jean Duhaime, The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts (CQS 6; London: T & T Clark, 2004) and Brian Schultz, Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered (STDJ 76; Leiden: Brill, 2009) and earlier literature cited there.

allow us, therefore, to try and glimpse first-hand the transmission and production of a complex web of ancient traditions and texts. Though it is impossible to deny that the S tradition evolved and did so in complex ways, scholars are still debating the direction of the developments which we witness: from earlier manuscripts to later ones (the position of Alexander followed by Tov and Dimant who stress paleography as a key criterion);\textsuperscript{4} from short to long (Vermes, Metso, and others);\textsuperscript{5} from “the many” to “the sons of Zadok” in 1QS 5 or vice versa. A great deal of the initial discussion of the intriguing relationship between 1QS and 4QS focused on differences and on exploring how to account for these differences in as cogent an argument as possible. In my own most recent contribution to this discussion I emphasized the fruitfulness of noting those places where we can observe equally remarkable similarities and overlaps between S manuscripts that diverge radically in other places. In an article that appeared in Revue de Qumran in 2006 I suggested that our initial excitement about finally having access to significant new variants in 4QS partially blinded us for a time from noting the importance of overlapping material in other places. Whereas much of the early scholarly debate about the literary growth of S was chiefly concerned with determining which manuscripts or family of manuscripts represents the earlier text,\textsuperscript{6} I proposed that the quest for the beginning of the growth of this textual tradition is to be found in the shared material found across the manuscript spectrum.\textsuperscript{7} Such a more balanced approach is now also advocated by Schofield.\textsuperscript{8}

In particular, I identified important common ground between different S manuscripts in the material mandating a careful separation from the people of injustice (הוֹאָלֶגֶן יָשָׁשׁ) shared by 1QS 5 and 4QS\textsuperscript{db}


\textsuperscript{6} Note, for instance, Metso’s now famous and helpful stemma where the guiding criteria at the time were differences between manuscripts, see Metso, Textual Development, 147.

\textsuperscript{7} Hempel, “Literary Development.”

\textsuperscript{8} See her From Qumran to the Yahad, 137.