In his article “Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll”, *VT* 28 (1978), pp. 28-36, Philip R. Davies offers a critique of my earlier article “The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic”, *VT* 25 (1975), pp. 596-612. Unfortunately, his discussion involves several major misunderstandings of my argument in that article, and the force of his criticisms depends on these misunderstandings. In this note I wish to correct the erroneous impressions of my position which may be created by Davies’s article.

1. Davies questions “the existence of holy war mythology” in Daniel because Daniel expresses little interest in the practice of holy war and the myth of the victory over chaos does not necessarily belong to “the holy war complex” (p.29). The relevance of these considerations to my article rests on the implication that holy war mythology entails the practice of holy war and that the two together constitute “the holy war complex”. I should like to point out that this implication has no basis in my article. I have argued at length elsewhere that Daniel stands in sharp contrast to the militaristic tactics of the Maccabees (and so to the practice of holy war) 1). What I find in Daniel is the mythology of holy war: the representation of violent conflict between supernatural beings 2). Since Dan. x 20 refers explicitly to fighting (‘ehillahëm) between the angelic princes, it is difficult to see how Davies can deny that such mythology is found in Daniel, or how Daniel’s reliance on a divine act shows that he “uses no war imagery”. The use of holy war mythology, or of war imagery, does not indeed entitle us to infer a “holy war complex” which includes the practice of holy war. On the contrary, if the fighting is done on the supernatural level it may enable the faithful human beings to take a non-violent stance and leave the fighting to God or the angels. The idea of a holy war complex, including practice, is however introduced by Davies as a straw-man in the discussion. It is not a correct representation of what I have written.
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2. Davies interprets my use of the phrase "fundamental shift" as an affirmation that "Jewish apocalyptic can be so simply described, as if progressing in a straight line through Daniel and 1 QM" (p. 30). Not only is this not my intention, but I explicitly state that the shift in question was not irreversible (p. 612), and so I expressly repudiate the theory of a straight-line development of apocalyptic, which Davies attributes to me. I claim that the shift in question is basic to the dualism of Qumran. I do not claim that the thought of the Qumran sectarians was so consistent that this dualism must be found in every writing subsequently produced at Qumran, and I certainly do not claim that other Jewish apocalypses (many of which show no dependence on Daniel, 1 QM or holy war mythology) were bound by the shift. Such a straight-line view of apocalyptic would indeed be an oversimplification, but it is not implied by what I said in my article.

3. Contrary to Davies's assertion (p. 29) I do not claim that 1 QM I, XV-XIX show no signs of sectarianism. In fact, one of the main points in my article is that "the dualistic myth in a Jewish context was essentially sectarian" (p. 610). I claim that the sectarian implications of this myth are less clear in the War Scroll than in 1 QS but my article shows plainly that I do not hold that any section of 1 QM shows no signs of sectarianism.

Another misunderstanding (perhaps more understandable) is related to this. I do not date "the War Scroll at a point prior to the foundation of the Qumran sect" (p. 29). I suggest that the dualistic sections were written "before the people who formed the community realised that their basic group identity was not the political nation Israel" (p. 610). This point was not necessarily prior to the foundation of the community. What is at issue is the way in which the self-understanding of the community was formulated.

4. The heart of Davies's critique is that my thesis rests on two assumptions: a) that cols. I, XV-XIX can be regarded as a unified literary composition and b) that this composition is the earliest stratum of the work. Here again he fails to represent my argument correctly.

a) The point at issue here is what is meant by "a unified literary composition" (p. 30; the phrase is Davies's not mine). Since Davies attempts to refute me by arguing that different stages can be identified, he implies that I regard the work as an instantaneous product of a single author who cannot have used sources or incorporated