English Abstracts

Second Temple Period Sectarian Polemic Concerning the Half-Shekel Commandment in Light of Early Karaite Halakhah

Yoram Erder

During the Second Temple period, three different interpretations were current for the pentateuchal commandment to offer a half-shekel to God, which was to serve as "atonement money" (Exod. 30:11–16). One viewpoint was that of the rabbinic sages. They ruled that the half-shekel donation was a commandment for the generations, to be performed yearly, with the donation slated for purchase of the animals for the daily burnt offering (עולת התמיד), which functioned as a communal sacrifice. A second viewpoint was the Sadducean one, attested in the scholium to the first date in *Megillat Ta'anit*. The Sadducees opposed the use of the half-shekel donation for public sacrifices, arguing that these should be funded by individual donations. In the third, Qumranic perspective, the half-shekel donation was seen as a commandment for all generations, but the requirement was that each male had to offer it only once in his lifetime, after age twenty (see 4Q159 [*Ordinances*[a]]).

  This paper focuses on aspects of early Karaite halakhah that shed light on this ancient polemic. The Karaite sages were unanimous in their opinion that the half-shekel commandment had no connection to the sacrifices. Based on his understanding of the biblical text as indicating that the Israelites in the wilderness paid the half-shekel only once in their lifetimes, the proto-Karaite Benjamin al-Nahāwandī stipulated that, although the half-shekel donation was a commandment for the generations, Jewish males should pay this tax only once in their lifetimes, after reaching age twenty. Karaite and Muslim sources mention that Benjamin was influenced by the "caves sect", which was active in antiquity. With this in mind, the similarity between Benjamin's halakhah

and Qumranic halakhah on the issue of the half-shekel is apparent and serves as but one example of the influence of Qumran sources on his halakhic interpretations.

   Early Karaite circles that were influenced by Qumranic halakhah argued that, after leaving Mount Sinai, the Israelites did not offer sacrifices in the wilderness. It appears that the Qumranites also used this scriptural argumentation as a precedent for not offering sacrifices at the Qumran site. Given that the Qumranites did not offer sacrifices at the Jerusalem Temple, this meant that, for them, the half-shekel donation for sacrifices would not have been an issue. Furthermore, like the Karaites at a later date, the Qumranites saw no connection between the half-shekel and sacrifices.

   Another halakhah of Benjamin al-Nahāwandī is his determination that, until the building of the Solomonic Temple, the Israelites ate only "desired meat" (Deut. 12:20–23), which was slaughtered on the "altar of stone" (Exod. 20:25). This halakhah sheds light on the cult that was developed by the Qumranites as a substitute for sacrificial worship in the Jerusalem Temple.

The Proper Marriage according to the
Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts

Esther Eshel

This paper investigates how the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* refers to women, in particular the anonymous women in his composition: the daughters of men who had relations with the Watchers, and the women from Noah's family – his wife, daughters, daughters-in-law, and granddaughters. These two groups are counterposed. If the behavior of the women who had relations with the Watchers was inacceptable, Noah's actions altered the future: he followed the truthful path and made appropriate matches for his sons and daughters, with his brother's children.

   Comparison of the description of the postdiluvian period in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* shows some differences with regard to marriage.

In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, following the Flood, the sons of Ham married the daughters of Japheth, and the sons of Japheth the daughters of Ham, according to "the eternal law for marrying an uncle's daughters". On the other hand, the children of Shem, the chosen line, married their sisters, following the practice of the children of Adam and Eve. Because of the *Genesis Apocryphon*'s poor preservation, the picture remains incomplete. In *Jubilees* emphasis is placed on the rivalry between Noah's sons, and women do not receive mention as leaving the ark, or participating in the celebration of the fourth-year produce. The question of who were the women *Jubilees* refers to as having married Noah's sons remains open. Even Noah's sons receive but brief mention here.

An additional difference between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* relates to the continuation of the line. In the *Apocryphon* Arpachshad is listed as Shem's firstborn (12:10) and, as VanderKam suggests, it appears that, like Shem's other children, he married one of his sisters. The author of *Jubilees* only refers to the marriage of one of Noah's grandchildren, Arpachshad, here Shem's third son, who married Rasuya, his brother Elam's granddaughter.

Also discussed here are the similarities between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and Tobit with respect to the clear preference for first-cousin marriages. In both texts, we find emphasis on choosing the right spouse – a first cousin on the paternal side. This similarity sheds light on this central motif in Tobit – a point also found in *Jubilees*. Tobit expands on this topic, noting that the punishment for an unacceptable wife is death, and that the daughter ruins her father's name, just as a priest's daughter does in the Pentateuch. Thus, in Tobit, the seven inappropriate husbands of Sarah die at the hands of an evil spirit, until she makes a suitable marriage to Tobit, the son of her father's brother. Presumably, the references to Noah as a prophet and the reference to marrying relatives (Tob 4:12) are based on the author's familiarity with the tradition in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which he developed by adding the prohibition against, and punishment for, exogamy.

The Elohistic Psalter
and the Writing of Divine Names at Qumran

Jonathan Ben-Dov

The Elohistic Psalter (EP) constitutes a unique phenomenon in the transmission of biblical literature. The present article addresses and advances the growing corpus of recent EP scholarship by linking the textual character of EP with a similar phenomenon, albeit significantly late, attested in a group of scrolls from Qumran. In contrast to some recent scholarly opinions, I maintain that the psalms contained in EP were originally composed using the divine name YHWH and only subsequently modified. The modification resulted not only in the replacement of YHWH with Elohim but also in a surprising plethora of compound divine names and epithets. Since the psalms contained in EP do not appear in non-elohistic form in any textual witness, we must assume that the elohistic modifications took place at a very early date.

Despite the large time gap between EP and the scrolls from Qumran, the only large-scale parallel to the modifications made in the EP is attested in these scrolls. More precisely, the special treatment of divine names at Qumran appears only in a limited corpus: several biblical scrolls (notably 1QIsaᵃ) attest to the practice of augmenting the divine name; and a group of sectarian nonbiblical manuscripts attests to the avoidance of the Tetragrammaton altogether or its replacement. In contrast, the great majority of biblical scrolls from Qumran do not attest to any modification of the Tetragram. This points to a canonical awareness among the scribes who copied the biblical scrolls. Other trajectories of the analogy between EP and the Qumran scrolls, as well as the basic motivation for modifying the divine name, are further pursued in detail.

Blessings before the Meal
in Second Temple Period and Tannaitic Literature

Moshe Benovitz

The dominant view in talmudic and halakhic literature, from tannaitic times until the present, is that the grace after meals is a scripturally mandated practice, whereas the blessings recited before eating are a rabbinic innovation. It is thus surprising that the grace after meals is barely alluded to in the Bible and Second Temple literature. In its original context, Deut. 8:10, the verse cited by the tannaim as enjoining the recitation of grace after the meal, is merely a general exhortation to be grateful to God for the land of Israel and its produce, not necessarily a requirement to recite a benediction following each meal. In biblical narrative the benediction precedes rather than follows the meal, and the same is true of the numerous attestations of blessings over food in Second Temple literature and in the New Testament. In most of these examples the priest or another religious authority is the one who recites the benediction before the meal. It seems that, in ancient times, because all of creation was deemed divine property, the blessing before the meal was considered mandatory in order to render the food permissible for consumption. Eating any food, whether devoted to the Temple or ostensibly "secular", without first acknowledging God, was considered a form of sacrilege. According to Philo, sancta devoted to the Temple are permissible for consumption by laypeople only if formally released by a priest or religious authority. It seems that the blessing before the meal recited by the priest or religious authority functioned in much the same way: nonsacred food, which also belongs to God, is formally released for consumption when the priest or religious authority utters the blessing over it.

   While echoes of this notion are found in rabbinic literature, the connection between food and divine property became more tenuous following the destruction of the Temple, when the Temple sancta ceased to exist. At this point the notion of sacrilege was reinterpreted as mere metaphor, and the blessings before the meal as rabbinic injunctions. The weakening of the link between the benediction and the release of food for

consumption enabled a very literal rendering of Deut. 8:10, according to which the scripturally mandated blessing should follow rather than precede the meal.

Joshua in Jewish Sources from the Second Temple Period

Katell Berthelot

The article analyzes references to Joshua in Qumranic texts, apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature, as well as Jewish texts written in Greek. Although not a prominent figure in Qumran sources, Joshua is central in at least one composition, the so-called *Apocryphon of Joshua* (4Q378–379), in which he is portrayed as the servant of Moses and as a prophet who predicts future events, in connection with Josh. 6:26. 4Q522 also emphasizes Joshua's prophetic ability, but at the same time criticizes it, due to Joshua's inability to foresee that the Gibeonites would deceive the children of Israel (according to Josh. 9). Moreover, the text strongly underscores Joshua's subordinate position vis-a-vis the priest Eleazar: the will of God is made known through the Urim and Tummim rather than through direct revelation to Joshua. With regard to the issue of prophecy, and insofar as the fragmentary remnants of both texts allow any definitive conclusions, it is doubtful that 4Q522 is another copy of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*.

In the other Jewish texts from the Second Temple period (up to the end of the first century C.E.), Joshua is generally a minor figure, mentioned only in passing. The only exceptions are the writings of Josephus and the *LAB*. Moreover, the only texts that describe or designate Joshua as a prophet are Eupolemus' book *On the Prophecy of Elijah* (summarized by Polyhistor and quoted by Eusebius); Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (which, however, does not mention any prophecy apart from the *arai* or curses referred to in Josh. 6:26); and the *LAB* (which, however, does not call Joshua a prophet, and explicitly states that the people had to turn to Eleazar in order to know the will of God, through the Urim). On the whole, one may conclude that, as compared to biblical and other Hellenistic-Roman Jewish texts, the Qumran ones place greater emphasis

on the issue of prophecy. As noted, however, in 4Q522 the assessment of Joshua's prophetical skills is not without reservations.

The Inheritance of the Land of Israel
according to the Ideology of the Qumran Community

Devorah Dimant

The passages dealing most explicitly with this theme are found in the initial section of the *Damascus Document* (I, 3–8), and in the *Pesher of Psalms* (4Q171), especially in its interpretations of Ps. 37:11, 22, and 29. The *Damascus Document* sees the demise of Israel at the hand of the Babylonians as a punishment for its sins against the covenant commandments. However, God left Israel a remnant (שארית – see, e.g., Isa. 37:32; Jer. 23:3; 40:11, 15), from which a "root of planting" grows, evidently the community itself. Because of its faithfulness to the true and correct practice of the Covenant, namely Torah commandments, this planting will inherit the land. Thus, the passage imparts the notion that while Israel had forfeited its right to inherit the land through its sins against the covenant, the Qumran covenanters gained the land through their fidelity to the covenant.

This idea is also pegged to Isaiah's "plant of God" (60:21, 61:2), which symbolizes Israel as a righteous people who will "inherit the land". This image is taken up by Psalm 37, where the heirs to the land are the righteous and the meek. The pesher of this psalm (4Q171) equates the righteous and the meek with the members of the Qumran community, and thus affirms their being the rightful heirs to the land. Here the inheritance of the land is still applicable to the real, concrete piece of earth. At the same time another, more abstract notion is already present, namely, that the inheritance of the land is acquired by, and even equated with, the proper practice of the Torah commandments. The full transition from the inheritance of a real land to the inheritance of what is gained by righteousness, is effected in *m. Sanh.* 10:1's interpretation of Isa. 60:21, and similarly in Matthew 5:3, 5, an interpretation of Ps. 37:11.

The Book of *Jubilees* and Its Aramaic Sources

Cana Werman

This paper evaluates the relationship between the book of *Jubilees* and two Aramaic sources known from Qumran, the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Vision of Amram*. The first part of the paper compares the descriptions, found in *Jubilees* and the *Apocryphon*, of the division of the world among Noah's sons and grandsons. Close consideration reveals that both the *Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* used the Ionian map, placing Jerusalem at its *omphalos* instead of Delphi. The article also points out *Jubilees'* use of the *Apocryphon* in its description. In translating the *Apocryphon* into Hebrew, *Jubilees'* author makes editiorial changes in order to emphasize Shem's priority over his brother, also adding data which he converts into propaganda against the Hellenistic world.

  The second part of the paper evaluates the description of the Exodus found in the *Vision of Amram* and in *Jubilees*. It concludes that *Jubilees'* author uses motifs from the *Vision*, expanding them for his own purposes: adjusting the Exodus story so that it reflects the structure of the anti-Jewish version current in the second-century-B.C.E. Hellenistic world.

Column 19 of the *War Scroll* (1QM)

Rony Yishay

Column 19 of the *War Scroll* (1QM) has neither a continuous physical connection to any of the sheets of the *War Scroll*, nor a logical connection to the preceding text in Column 18 in terms of content. The extant text contains two literary units: a portion of the last part of a prayer (lines 1–8), and a prose text describing the warriors the day after victory (lines 9–14).

  Comparative study has shown that both of these literary units appear with the same structure and order in 4Q492 1 and in column 19. In addition, as found there, the texts match entirely in content, wording,

vocabulary, and spelling. Thus, it is possible to determine that both column 19 and 4Q492 1 are copies of the same document and that this document is not a copy of the *War Scroll*, as all it shares with the *War Scroll* is the prayer section. Comparative study has shown, moreover, that the prayer section in Column 19, lines 1–8 and in manuscript 4Q492 1 represents one version of the prayer, whereas a second version of the same prayer can be found in *War Scroll* 12, lines 7–16, with some expansions and minor orthographical and lexical differences.

It has also been demonstrated that war literature contains routine prayers, which the authors adapted to their needs. Accordingly, we cannot automatically assume that the text in the *War Scroll* and the text found in Column 19 and 4Q492 1 represent two versions or two editions of a single text, if all they have in common is the prayer section that appears in two versions. That is, we can conclude that column 19 and manuscript 4Q492 1 represent one document, and that this is not a copy of the *War Scroll*. This forms the basis for my conclusion that column 19 does not belong to the sequence of columns of the *War Scroll*.

How Long Did Abraham Sojourn in Haran?
Traditions on the Patriarch in Compositions from Qumran

Atar Livneh

Although the Bible is silent regarding the length of Abraham's sojourn in Haran (Gen. 11:31), three exegetical compositions found at Qumran – *Jubilees*, a copy of the composition known as *Pseudo-Jubilees* (4Q225), and the *Commentary on Genesis A* (4Q252) – specify the length of time the patriarch dwelt in the city. Analysis of the chronological data reveals that the disparate number given in each of these texts embodies each composition's specific purposes. This reflects the plurality of attitudes and exegeses exhibited by works belonging to the Qumran library. Comparison of the chronological data in *Jubilees* and *Pseudo-Jubilees* is of special interest. Although Milik assigned the latter its title on the grounds that it contains terms and/or motifs familiar from *Jubilees*,

examination of the material relating to Abraham's sojourn in Haran indicates that *Pseudo-Jubilees* represents a divergent tradition. Given that the two compositions exhibit additional dissimilarities, such as a different selection of reworked biblical passages and significant disparities in their version of Isaac's sacrifice, I suggest that the name "Pseudo-Jubilees" is an inappropriate title for 4Q225.

"Choosing the Path of Lenience":
Qumranic Stringency or Tannaitic Leniency?

Vered Noam

Scholarly research tends to attribute extreme stringency to the legislation of the sect of the *Yaḥad*. It is indeed undeniable that the sect generally adopts stringent positions as compared to rabbinic halakhah. However, closer examination indicates that Qumranic law reflects simple, necessary inferences from Scripture itself, whereas tannaitic leniency represents a surprisingly revolutionary divergence from Scripture's plain meaning. In other words, the strictness of Qumranic law is not "objective" but relative. The understanding that sectarian law reflects a series of inductions not altogether removed from the simple sense of Scripture facilitates a more accurate appreciation of the depth of tannaitic halakhah's groundbreaking leniency.

The Story of Shechem and Dinah in *Jubilees* 30

Michael Segal

The story of Shechem and Dinah was frequently the focus of Jewish interpreters in antiquity. This study addresses the version of the story as presented in *Jubilees* 30 which, as numerous scholars have noted, presents the biblical story as a paradigm for a ban on intermarriage. This article

analyzes the literary development of this chapter and posits that, contrary to the general scholarly consensus, the chapter is not the work of one author. Instead, as I have suggested in M. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Leiden, 2007), one can often identify internal contradictions within the book, primarily between the rewritten narratives on the one hand, and the legal and chronological passages on the other. In the case of *Jubilees* 30, two such contradictions are investigated.

The first contradiction is between the rewritten narrative and the chronological framework: according to the rewritten narrative, Dinah was twelve years old at the time of her rape. This suggests that this reflects a proto-rabbinic halakhah according to which the definition of a נערה is a girl of that age. In contrast, according to the information in the chronological framework, Dinah was only nine years old at the time of this incident. I suggest that this blatant contradiction is the result of the process of literary development of the book in which the chronological author/redactor has superimposed this framework upon already extant rewritten narratives.

There is also a second contradiction, between the rewritten narrative and the legal passage: the role of Jacob in the biblical story is ambiguous, especially with regard to his stance regarding Dinah's potential marriage to Shechem. In the rewritten narrative, Jacob is clearly grouped with his sons in rejecting any possibility of this union. In contrast, I propose that a close textual analysis of the legal passage allows for the recognition of a subtle critique of Jacob, as having been willing to consider Shechem's request to marry Dinah. A similar critique is found in *Testament of Levi* 6. In contrast to the chronological contradiction discussed above, the analysis of Jacob's role in the story does not prove the process of literary development suggested here, but is rather a reading made possible based upon this approach to the book.

Body and Purification from Evil:
Prayer Formulas and Concepts in Second Temple Literature and Their Relationship to Later Rabbinic Literature

Menahem Kister

In the first part of the article, several aspects of Abraham's prayer in the book of *Jubilees* (12:19–21) are scrutinized. Section 1 of this part argues that the author of *Jubilees* used an existing prayer, placing it in the mouth of Abraham and reinterpreting its wording. Section 2 notes that an apotropaic prayer, strikingly similar to *Jub.* 12:20, is found in a medieval Palestinian *siddur* from the Genizah. The Hebrew wording in both prayers is: הרוחות הרעות המושלות ביצר לב האדם. Section 3 presents a detailed investigation of the term *yeṣer* in *Jubilees*, at Qumran, and in Judith. The term *yeṣer* is applied to the human mind, thoughts, and decisions. Usually used in negative contexts, positive ones also occur in Judith and at Qumran. This term is barely related to dualistic notions (the term *yeṣer* at Qumran in the meaning of 'creature', which is related to Qumranic dualism, seems irrelevant to this discussion). From the terminological perspective, it appears that the expression יצר רע in 11Q5 (*Psalms*[a]) 19:14–16 as well as in *Jub.* 12:20 is related to the meaning of this expression in rabbinic literature. The evil *yeṣer*, which is ruled by demons, became in rabbinic literature a quasi-demonic entity of evil and lust *within* the human personality. As discussed in section 4, a study of the term *yeṣer* elucidates the ideological significance of this phrase in *Jub.* 12:20. Is human evil conceived of as caused by evil spirits, or by innate human decision, or are the two somehow related? The *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* emphasizes that evil spirits have no power over the righteous. This seems to also be the notion expressed in *Jub.* 12:20. Several conflicting answers to the fundamental question of the nature of evil in ancient Jewish literature are also surveyed and analyzed. These conflicting answers serve as the *ideological* background for the rabbinic concept of the (evil) *yeṣer* as a quasi-demonic inherent power. As shown in section 5, the rabbinic concept of *yeṣer* is by no means a reaction to Qumranic dualistic notions, as has been argued. The demonic origin of evil is disputed as early as Sirach (22:27–23:6; 21:27), where evil and lust,

attributed elsewhere to demonic powers, are explicitly and implicitly transformed into an innate quality of the human condition. This is the forerunner of the rabbinic concept of *yeṣer*, although the meaning that the term *yeṣer* acquired in rabbinic literature does not occur in Sirach.

The second part of the article deals with a pattern shared by prayers for the purification of the human body. In various ideological contexts (among them Qumran, Paul, and rabbinic midrash), evil has power over human beings through their bodies, but the body is not conceived of as innately evil. Therefore, the purification of the body was supposed to yield a perfect state of being. A pattern of prayer for the purification of human limbs may be traced at Qumran, as well as in rabbinic prayers and in Sirach. There seems, however, to be no genetic relationship between the various prayers; each elaborates, in different theological contexts, an ancient pattern of prayer. Comparison of the relationship between *4Q Barkhi Nafshi* and Paul (Col. 3:8–12) is especially instructive.

Qumran Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew

Moshe Bar-Asher

The article examines the connections between Qumran Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew, one of the dialects spoken in Erets Yisrael in the era when the scrolls were written. The scrolls contain many words and expressions known from Mishnaic Hebrew, such as להוכין, (לֵירֵד=) לרד, גודל (=גָּדֵל, אֲגֵדֵל), כנסת, עכשיו, לשון הקודש, among others. Although Qumran and Mishnaic Hebrew share dozens of words and expressions, a comprehensive examination of the scrolls shows that words from Mishnaic Hebrew usually appear there only once, or a small number of times. Only several of the grammatical categories characteristic of Mishnaic Hebrew occur frequently in the scrolls; for example, the first person plural pronoun אנו (=אָנוּ) is more frequent than the biblical אנחנו.

Other categories, such as the verbal noun (gerund) of the *qal* and *nif'al* patterns – פְּעִילָה, and the verbal noun of *pi'el* and *nitpa'el* – פְּעוּל, are very frequent at Qumran, but most of these nouns were already used in biblical Hebrew; for example: הִלּוּלִים, שָׁלוֹם, חֲלִיפָה, סְלִיחָה. However, some nouns

known for centuries from Mishnaic Hebrew alone were discovered in Qumran documents, for example: פֵּרוּשׁ, כִּיּוּר, רְחִיצָה, מְשִׁיכָה.

The discovery of words and grammatical forms known only from Mishnaic Hebrew in the scrolls is important because it indicates their authenticity in Mishnaic Hebrew when it was a spoken language. For example, the discovery of the form גדפן in the פַּעְלָן pattern in the scrolls indicates that this pattern existed in Erets Yisrael and was not a literary byproduct of Babylonian Mishnaic Hebrew, as was formerly thought.

And it is not just the authenticity, but also the antiquity of the phenomena that is important to the history of the language. If a form known from the Mishnah (which was edited in the late second or early third century) is found in one of the Qumran scrolls (which were written as early as the Second Temple period – the first or the second centuries B.C.E. to the first century C.E.), we can then conclude that this form existed in the language for centuries prior to the Mishnah. One example of this phenomenon is the verb הֶעֱשָׂה (or הֶעֱשִׂיא), the *hif'il* of the verb עָשָׂה, which was hitherto known only from Mishnaic Hebrew. Its discovery in a Qumran scroll shows its existence in the language centuries prior to the tannaitic period.

The Qumran material also teaches us about the dialects of vernacular Hebrew, of which Mishnaic Hebrew is a representative, during the period of the scrolls. In the manuscripts of the Mishnah we find both נִתְאַלְמְנָה and נִתְאַרְמְלָה. If previously scholars thought that the form נִתְאַרְמְלָה was a late borrowing from an Aramaic root, which occurred in Babylon when Mishnaic Hebrew was no longer a living language, the discovery of the verb הִתְאַרְמְלָה in one of the Qumran scrolls shows that one of the Hebrew dialects borrowed this verb from Aramaic as early as the Second Temple period.

It should be stressed that phenomena previously designated as Babylonian are already reflected in the scrolls and in the Bar-Kosiba letters; for example the forms הֵמֶן, הֵמְנּוּ, הֵמְנָה (as opposed to מֶן, ממנו, ממנה); the form פַּעְלָן as opposed to פָּעְלָן (פּוֹעְלָן); the form נתארמלה as opposed to נתאלמנה, etc. It may be argued that there is a dialectical connection between the features of Babylonian Mishnaic Hebrew and those of Mishnaic Hebrew as reflected in the scrolls.

In brief, the article summarizes the research that has been conducted so far regarding the links between the language of the scrolls and the language of the Mishnah, and also marks a path to a comprehensive study of this issue. One can only hope that it will be thoroughly researched in the future.

The Rules Regarding Fighting a Permitted War in 4Q376

Liora Goldman

Contra Strugnell's opinion, 4Q376 (*Apocryphal Moses*[b]) constitutes a reworking of the biblical laws concerning permitted wars rather than a continuation of the laws regarding the prophet dealt with in 4Q375 (*Apocryphal Moses*[a]). It consists of a single fragment with three columns, each of which contains three extant lines. The original text does not appear to have been significantly longer, since the subject matter runs consecutively through the three columns. The first and second columns describe the rules and ceremonies to be observed prior to going to war; the third sets out the rules for the conduct of the war itself.

The scroll harmonizes the requirement to consult the Urim and Tummim before setting out to war (Num. 27:21) with the rules of war laid down in Deut. 20:1–20, 23:10–15. A similar association occurs in 11QT (*Temple Scroll*) 58–62. These two texts thus appear to present a similar understanding; namely, that the military-political commander must accept the answer given to the priestly inquiry of the Urim before he departs for war. This conception raises the significant historical question of whether the Urim and Tummim were understood to be in active use at the time of the scroll's composition.

Although the biblical text does not detail the manner in which the divine answer is made to the inquiry, 4Q376 maintains that the response is given publicly, in the presence of all the people, apparently reflecting an exegetical tradition regarding the shining of the onyx stones set into the High Priest's breastplate (Josephus, *Ant*. 3.215–18). It also contains a unique interpretation concerning tongues of fire issuing from

the high priest's ephod. This interpretation appears to represent a further tradition, known from other scrolls (4Q164 [*pIsa^d*] 1 5 and 4Q175 [*Test*] 17), according to which the divine response took the form of light.

The Relation between the Biblical Text
Reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Masoretic Notes

Rafael Zer

The masoretic notes came into being against the background of ancient disputes regarding the version of the Bible, whose echoes reached the Masoretes. As scholars have shown, among the wealth of masoretic notes are those whose purpose was to preserve the Masoretic Text as opposed to previous versions. Of these, the most important are the *Sebirin* notes. Obviously, the Masoretes had neither the translations of the Bible into Greek, Latin, and Syrian, nor manuscripts from the era of the Judean Desert Scrolls at their disposal. On the other hand, we can state with confidence that the ancient variants did not disappear immediately and did in fact reach the Masoretes.

For their part, the Masoretes saw these ancient versions (whether original or copied) as an immediate and concrete threat to the uniformity of the Bible version which they safeguarded. We can also, with caution, describe a similar, but opposite process; namely, the *Sebirin* notes can assist us by pointing to no longer extant, ancient versions.

The Coincidental Textual Nature
of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures

Emanuel Tov

The textual theories launched over the past two centuries depict the presumed development of various aspects of the textual transmission, but

do not sufficiently clarify the textual background of the diverse Hebrew
and translational collections. My working hypothesis suggests that these
collections, in Hebrew and translation, are textually heterogeneous
because the collections were composed of scrolls of different nature and
background. I suggest that, in addition to visible elements of planning, we
should also recognize many unplanned elements. In some cases, the lack
of planning is visible in differences between parts of the same book,
implying that at an earlier stage the compositions included in the
archetype could have consisted of a number of small scrolls, sometimes of
differing nature.

Within the LXX, the study focuses on the differences in translation
character between the parts of Samuel-Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, as
well as on the different translation styles in the various books of the LXX.
Within the Masoretic Text the study focuses on the textual idiosyncrasies
of the book of Samuel, and the special nature of the Elohistic Psalter and
of Jeremiah 27–29.

The Reworking of the Exodus Story in 4Q422

Ariel Feldman

The present paper explores the reworking of the Exodus story in the third
column of 4Q422 (*4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus*). With the
exception of studies published by Emanuel Tov, the scholarly literature
on 4Q422 has focused primarily on its first two columns, which rework
the Creation and Flood stories. Based on Tov' s work, the present paper
offers further observations on the text of 4Q422 iii and on the exegetical
methods and strategies employed by its author in reworking Exodus. It
offers several new readings and restorations and analyzes the use of
Scripture by its author, particularly, the extensive use of Psalms 78 and
105. It also addresses the issue of the order of the Ten Plagues and offers a
possible solution to the deviation from order of the plagues as described
in Exod. 7–12. The analysis of scroll's exegetical strategies suggests that
its reworking of the Exodus story, as well as of Gen. 1–3 (col. I) and 6–9
(col. II), has a parenetic purpose.

Hebrew Influences on the Language
of the Aramaic Qumran Scrolls

Christian Stadel

With both Hebrew and Aramaic scrolls found in the Qumran caves it is evident that these were 'languages in contact' among the sectarians. Though the Aramaic influence on the Hebrew in Qumran has been scrutinized closely, the effect of Hebrew on Aramaic has not attracted much attention. In my *Hebraismen in den aramäischen Texten vom Toten Meer* (Heidelberg, 2008) I tried to fill this gap and examined all the Hebrew influences on spelling, phonology, morphology, syntax, and the vocabulary in the Aramaic literary texts from Qumran. The implications of the findings for determining the status of Hebrew at the time of the writing of the scrolls are presented in this article.

By examining the Hebraisms from different angles, stressing stylistic influences from the Hebrew Bible in particular, precise insights are gained as to the standing of Hebrew and Aramaic. The Hebrew influx into Qumran Aramaic is best explained as the influence of one literary language, namely biblical Hebrew, on another, Qumran Aramaic. This is suggested by the origin of the Hebraisms and their semantics. Neither influence of spoken Hebrew of any kind, nor influence of Mishnaic Hebrew is discernible in the corpus. The former contrasts with the Aramaic influence on Qumran Hebrew and points to dominance of Aramaic as a spoken language, though the tentativeness of such generalizations from written texts must be kept in mind.