

MEGHILLOT  
Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls  
XI-XII



# MEGHILLOT

Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls

XI-XII

2014-2015

Edited by

Jonathan Ben-Dov

Menahem Kister



University of Haifa  
Faculty of Humanities



The Bialik Institute,  
Jerusalem



The Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
Mandel Institute of Jewish Studies  
The Orion Center

This volume was funded by the generosity of  
The Perry Foundation for Biblical Research,  
The Mandel Institute for Jewish Studies  
\* \* \*  
The Faculty of Humanities and the Center for Dead Sea Scrolls  
Research, University of Haifa  
\* \* \*  
Ministry of Culture and Sport—Culture Authority

Copyediting by Lilach Chelnov

ISBN 978-965-536-196-4

ISSN 2309-3501

©

Copyright by the Bialik Institute, Jerusalem, The University of Haifa,  
and The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2015

Computerization: Pardes Publishing

Printed in Israel

<http://megillot.haifa.ac.il>  
<http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il>  
<http://bialik-publishing.co.il>

# Contents

## Texts, Editions and Languages

Chanan Ariel, Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky, Elisha Qimron	The <i>Pesher on the Periods</i> A–B (4Q180–4Q181): Editing, Language, and Interpretation	3
Rony Yishay	The Problem of Reconstructing the <i>War Scroll</i> (Integrating Manuscripts 4Q491–4Q493)	41
Noam Mizrahi	The <i>Cycle of Praises</i> of the Sixth Sabbath Song: Text, Language, and Liturgy	65
Mordechay Mishor	<i>kohāga</i> = <i>kohāka</i> (4Q504)	97
Ariel Feldman	An Unknown Prayer from 4Q160 and 4Q382	99
Menahem Kister	The Root <i>NDB</i> in the Scrolls and the Growth of Qumran Texts: Lexicography and Theology	111
The Bible at Qumran		
Zipora Talshir	The Census (2 Samuel 24 // 4QSam <sup>a</sup> // 1 Chronicles 21): The Relationship between the Textual Witnesses of the Book of Samuel	133
Michael Segal	The Text of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls	171
Steven D. Fraade	‘If a Case is Too Baffling for You to Decide ...’ (Deuteronomy 17:8–13): Biblical Interpretation in the Pericope on the High Court—Between the <i>Temple Scroll</i> and Tannaitic Interpretation	199
Ideology, Halakha, and History		
Shlomi Efrati	The Second Exile: A Note on the Development of the <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	221
Jonathan Ben-Dov	Language, Prayer, and Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls	257

Atar Livneh	Two Sons, Four Curses: The Parallels between Canaan and Esau in <i>Jubilees</i>	281
Shlomo Naeh and Aharon Shemesh	Deuteronomy 19:15–19 in the <i>Damascus Document</i> and Early Midrash	293
Eshbal Ratzon	Where is the Garden of Eden? Shifts in the Location and Function of the Garden of Eden as Revealed through the Composition and Redaction of <i>1 Enoch</i>	317
Nadav Sharon	The <i>Kittim</i> and the Roman Conquest in the Qumran Scrolls	357
Book Review		
Christian Stadel	Review of: Gregor Geiger, <i>Das hebräische Partizip in den Texten aus der jüdischen Wüste</i>	391
	List of Abbreviations	397
	English Abstracts	VII

# English Abstracts

## **The *Peshar on the Periods* A–B (4Q180–4Q181): Editing, Language, and Interpretation**

**Chanan Ariel, Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky, Elisha Qimron**

The present paper offers new readings of 4Q180 and 4Q181, the *Peshar on the Periods*. The readings were obtained using the new photographs recently published by the Israel Antiquities Authority in the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Online Digital Library. The high quality of these photographs significantly assisted us in deciphering fragments 2–4 of 4Q180; the new readings thus obtained shed new light on the content and structure of the whole composition.

The question is debated as to whether or not 4Q180 and 4Q181 reflect a single composition. We believe that the parallels in content and structure between the two manuscripts attest to two distinct versions of the *Peshar on the Periods*: the longer is preserved in 4Q181, and the shorter is reflected by 4Q180. In any case, the textual restorations we propose here have no dependence upon this question.

At the beginning of the paper we offer an integrated edition of the opening paragraphs of the two scrolls (frag. 1 of 4Q180 and frag. 2 of 4Q181); the new edition enables improved restoration of the lacunae and leads to a better interpretation of the text. The next section of the paper deals with frag. 1 of 4Q181, which consists of a theological discussion concerning the relationships between angels and human beings. In addition, we consider the connections between this fragment and the text of 1QS col. 11.

Further, we suggest a new restoration of 4Q180 fragments 2–4, accompanied by notes on the new textual readings and their interpretation. It has become clear through these new readings that fragments 2–4 comprises a *Peshar on Genesis*, the form of which resembles that of 4Q252.

The paper also examines some fundamental issues, such as the differences between versions of similar compositions in the Qumran collection and the various genres found among the nonbiblical scrolls; it also poses some interesting linguistic questions.

## **The Problem of Reconstructing the *War Scroll* (Integrating Manuscripts 4Q491–4Q493)**

**Rony Yishay**

Qimron's new edition of the *War Scroll* (*War Scroll* [A + B]) integrates the sources of Qumran war literature into a continuous literary text. 1QM forms the core of part A of the edition, into which the text from manuscripts 4Q491–4Q496 has been integrated. In the course of preparing the edition, Qimron concluded that the manuscripts from the fourth cave are actually copies of the version in 1QM. This paper critically examines the integration of manuscripts 4Q491–4Q493 into a unified text of the *War Scroll*.

Eighteen successive columns of 1QM were preserved, in which the lower parts of the columns were faded and torn. At the top of each column there are 16–18 continuous lines. Qimron thought it correct to complete the text at the base of the columns, to a height of 30 lines. He was of the opinion that the height of the majority of columns in the scroll manuscripts was double their width. Accordingly, the text of 4Q493, and that of sections 4, 10A, 10B, and 13 of manuscript 4Q491 was placed in the lower parts of various columns in 1QM. Qimron thought that the text of these sections supplied the missing content for some of the columns of 1QM. My own examination suggests that the added text does not complete the sequence of preceding and following columns, and in some instances interrupts the continuity of content in the columns in 1QM.

In Qimron's edition, the text of fragments 1+2+3 of 4Q491 was placed as the final column of *War Scroll A*. This combination, however, raises some problems: a new, exceptionally wide column was formed (no similar column exists in either 1QM or in the manuscripts 4Q491–4Q496). The content of these combined three fragments is neither continuous nor thematically structured. Above all, the content of the three fragments is not suitable as the ending of *War Scroll A*. According to Qimron, the texts under discussion are part of the *War of Divisions* (מלחמת המחלקות), which was thought to occur after seven years of the first war, and thus in his opinion the added text would seem an appropriate conclusion to *War Scroll A*. Yet the word לְמַחְלָקוֹתֵיהֶם 'according to their divisions' (4Q491 1+2+3 line 6), which introduces the *War of Divisions*, appears only once, in the context of march and encampment. In contrast, the word מְעִרְכָּה, rather than מַחְלָקָה, is the frequent term in 4Q491 1+2+3 lines 10–16. In addition, fragments 1+2+3 of 4Q491 repeat ordinances on subjects such as contamination and purification, war vestments of the priests, and placement

of ambushes, all of which appear in the earlier columns of Qimron's *War Scroll A*. It seems illogical to repeat this information at the end of the scroll.

This examination has thus led to the conclusion that manuscripts 4Q491–4Q493 are *not* in fact copies of 1QM; therefore, it is incorrect to combine them into a single text with 1QM. Most importantly, the paper demonstrates—as claimed in my earlier published articles—that the Qumran war literature consists of a number of independent literary consolidations. All of these, including the *War Scroll* (1QM), are based on and draw from a common literary tradition dealing with the subject of eschatological war. Since these are independent literary consolidations and not copies of a single 'original,' they should not be combined into a single version of one text.

### **The Cycle of Praises of the Sixth Sabbath Song: Text, Language, and Liturgy**

**Noam Mizrahi**

The *Cycle of Praises* is one of the poetic units that comprise the sixth of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (Mas ii || 4Q403 1 i 1–9 || 4Q404 1 || 4Q405 3 i). The paper investigates the literary structure of the poem and offers a linguistic and text-critical analysis of variant readings (witnessed by the various manuscripts) that have implications for the proper understanding of several aspects of the poetic text: its literary delineation, discursive structuring, liturgical performance, and thematic content. On the basis of this analysis, it is suggested that the poem depicts a liturgical performance of an antiphonal nature. The intricate relations between the poem's constituents are shown to follow a music-like logic; namely, they constitute a poetic construction of sevenfold variations on a single theme, which culminates in an underscoring of God's holiness.

### ***kohāga* = *kohāka* (4Q504)**

**Mordechay Mishor**

While working in the Historical Hebrew Dictionary Project of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, just after the publication of *DJD VII* (1982), I proposed a new reading of 4Q504 5 ii 4 (p. 156). I read [וב]רובך יוֹחַגָה גְּאֹלֵתֵנוּ [by] your great power you have redeemed [us]; instead of [ובך נחגה גאלתנו] 'let us

celebrate [our] redemption', the *gimel* of גִּמְלָה being a substitution *kaf*. This substitution is to be understood as an attraction the *gimel* in the following word גִּמְלָה, supported by the phonetic similarity between *g* and *k*.

### **An Unknown Prayer from 4Q160 and 4Q382**

**Ariel Feldman**

Exploring the previously unnoticed textual overlap between the scrolls 4Q160 2+6+10 and 4Q382 104 ii, this paper offers a detailed study of the overlapping text, which comprises a prayer. I tentatively suggests that the two scrolls may contain copies of the same composition reworking Samuel—Kings.

### **The Root *NDB* in the Scrolls and the Growth of Qumran Texts: Lexicography and Theology**

**Menahem Kister**

This article combines a lexical scrutiny of the root נָדַב and a study of the growth and transformation of Qumranic texts. Both have significant implications for the study of the religious worldview of the Qumran sect, for—I contend, in contrast to the views of other scholars—this root does not have a connotation of 'free will,' nor is it related to the Temple cult.

While many words and expressions in the Hebrew of the Second Temple period are derived from biblical rather than contemporary usage, I argue that the basic meanings of *nadav*, 'to urge,' and *hitnaddev*, 'respond (enthusiastically) to (someone's) urging,' do not belong to this category, but rather continue to be in natural usage from the early stages of biblical Hebrew to Qumran Hebrew. Ben Sira and the Qumran texts reflect, not a secondary usage of the biblical lexemes and expressions, but rather a continuity of the original meanings. The military usage of this root ('those who respond eagerly to the exhortation to fight') is discernible in 1QM, while the term *mitnaddevim* means 'those who respond enthusiastically such urging'; but never should this root, as used in the Qumran texts, be translated as 'volunteer' or considered as reflecting notions of 'free will' as such. In two occurrences the word *nedava* in Qumran designates joining the sect; these occurrences add the taste of two biblical verses (Hos 14:5; Ps 119:108) to a well-known term.

No less important, this article aims to demonstrate that many Qumran texts underwent considerable changes and transformations in the process of transmission. The dynamics of textual transformation can be discerned by comparing passages both within the same scroll and in other Qumran scrolls. Identifying 'clusters' of phrases and recurring formulae in the Qumran texts enables one to gain insight into the process of expansion, growth, and evolution of texts. Layers that underlie the text as it stands are thus revealed, and such insights inevitably affect the interpretation of the text. The article discusses the phenomena of the textual growth in passages from 1QM, 1QS, and 1QS<sup>d</sup>.

**The Census (2 Samuel 24 // 4QSam<sup>a</sup> // 1 Chronicles 21):  
The Relationship between the Textual Witnesses  
of the Book of Samuel**

**Zipora Talshir**

The question approached in this study concerns the relationship between the texts of Samuel preserved in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, on the one hand, and paralleled in Chronicles, on the other hand. A comparison of all such texts, excluding 2 Samuel 24, shows an unequivocal affinity between the scroll and Samuel, rather than Chronicles, in terms of both literary and text-critical issues. Why then do scholars assert that the author of the book of Chronicles used the text type preserved in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> rather than a text such as MT Samuel? The answer lies in the intriguing case of 2 Samuel 24, where Chronicles is clearly closer to the scroll than it is to MT Samuel. In my view, 2 Samuel 24 is an exception and does not reflect the relationship between the texts in general. In contrast to the commonly held view that takes the version of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> to be the original version of the story (a version that also served the Chronicler), I argue that the revised version of the story should be attributed to the Chronicler. The comparison of Samuel and Chronicles throughout the story clearly demonstrates the Chronicler at work: he elaborates on a text similar to MT Samuel, takes care of the discrepancies, fills in gaps, and remodels the story into a *hieros logos*. The role of the angel is enhanced *throughout* the story, not only in the passage preserved in the scroll; this includes the concluding part, characteristically the Chronicler's very own contribution. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is dependent on the Chronicler's version, and is, in fact, aware of both Samuel and Chronicles. 2 Samuel 24 does

not endorse the definition of 4QSam as either ‘rewritten Bible’ or ‘Midrash’; it rather represents a different edition of the book of Samuel, featuring occasional far-reaching interventions in the text, but still mainly concerned with the transmission of the running text of the book of Samuel.

## **The Text of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls**

**Michael Segal**

The book of Daniel, the latest of the biblical books, is preserved in at least eight manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls (with a fragment from a ninth manuscript presented in this study). This article analyzes the textual status of Daniel at Qumran in light of the complex textual history of Daniel as attested in other versions of the book. Outside of the scrolls, one can identify three distinct literary editions of Daniel: (1) the Masoretic text; (2) the Old Greek translation, which contains three additional significant passages (the ‘Additions’ to Daniel), and markedly different versions of chapters 4–6; and (3) the translation attributed to Theodotion, which covers the same material as the Old Greek version, but has been corrected towards a Hebrew text similar to MT.

The first section of the article demonstrates that the Qumran copies of Daniel reflect the MT edition of the composition, in those scrolls where positive evidence is available (due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence, we cannot make this claim for all of the scrolls). The evidence includes the absence of the long Addition in the middle of chapter 3; the presence of Dan 4:5–6 (which are absent in the Old Greek) and the formulation of 4:15 according to the MT version; the presence of Dan 5:17–22 (which are absent in the Old Greek); and perhaps the use of various divine epithets in Daniel 2. Despite agreements in minor details between the Qumran Daniel scrolls and the Old Greek or Theodotion translations, the overall textual affiliation of these scrolls is decidedly with the MT edition of this composition.

The second half of the article suggests that, in contrast to the exclusive affiliation of the DSS Daniel manuscripts with the MT literary edition, two nonbiblical compositions discovered at Qumran may show evidence of alternate literary editions of Daniel. First, it is suggested that the *Genesis Apocryphon*, column 13, formulates its description of Noah’s dream of a felled tree based upon the OG version of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in Daniel 4 (in addition to other biblical passages). Second, the sectarian scroll 4Q174 contains an

explicit quotation from the book of Daniel that does not match any of our extant versions. The exegetical background of this otherwise unknown passage is examined in light of the internal development of the book of Daniel itself, leading to the cautious consideration of the potential implications of this citation for understanding the development of the text of Daniel.

The combination of the evidence from the biblical and nonbiblical manuscripts demonstrates the complexity of the ancient textual evidence for Daniel in particular, and biblical books in general, and the necessity of investigating both in order to arrive at a complete picture of the book's textual history.

**'If a Case is Too Baffling for You to Decide ...' (Deuteronomy 17:8–13): Biblical Interpretation in the Pericope on the High Court—Between the *Temple Scroll* and Tannaitic Interpretation**

**Steven D. Fraade**

The biblical pericope on the centralized high court of referral (Deut 17:8–13), commanded by Moses to be instituted by the Israelites upon entering into the land of Canaan, is remarkable for the relative autonomy of its judgments from prophetic means and authority, especially when compared to its wilderness antecedents. The present study compares two exegetical responses to this Deuteronomic legislation, that of the *Temple Scroll* (11Q19 56:1–11) and that of *Sifre Deuteronomy* 152–155. The former (or some antecedent) 'rewrites' the Deuteronomic text with seemingly subtle yet significant requirements that the court derive its rulings 'from the book of the Torah,' and that it transmit them 'in truth.' The latter exercises considerable exegetical license so as to give yet greater latitude to the court's composition and location, and especially to its legislative authority, even if in contradiction to what would appear to be objective truth. Consideration is given to the views of previous scholars who claimed that these two approaches were in direct polemical response to one another (notwithstanding the considerable chronological gap between the extant texts in which they are manifested), especially with respect to the protorabbinic (or Pharisaic) claims for the authority of oral teaching. The author argues, rather, for an exegetically based source of difference which reflects the broader hermeneutical and rhetorical practices of the two texts and their interpretive and discursive communities.

## **The Second Exile: A Note on the Development of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs***

**Shlomi Efrati**

The Greek composition entitled *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is one of the most controversial works among the Pseudepigrapha. Modern scholarship is deeply divided as to the extent of the Christian materials included in this seemingly Jewish composition, and what they signify: Are the *Testaments* a Jewish composition that has gone through a Christian redaction; or should the *Testaments* be regarded a Christian work which utilized Jewish sources?

In any attempt to identify the composer or redactor of the *Testaments*, special attention should be given to passages of more or less uniform structure and content, which occur repeatedly within the different testaments and constitute their literary framework. It can be assumed that such passages were composed by the same hand which gave the *Testaments* their unified character. In my paper I deal with one group of such corresponding passages that describe the sin, exile, and return of Israel, known as S.E.R. passages. After describing the form and function of this pattern in general, I examine selected S.E.R. passages from the *Testaments* that show important divergences from the common pattern. This study thus contributes to a better understanding of this literary form, its function within the *Testaments*, and its implications for their redaction and composition.

## **Language, Prayer, and Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls**

**Jonathan Ben-Dov**

The article discusses the role of language as a medium for communication between the human and the divine. Both directions of communication are studied here: prayer and prophecy. The Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as several rabbinic texts, show an awareness of the analogical character of these two directions, and therefore many of the phenomena described in one direction may also apply to the other. An awareness of the problems with human language as medium for contacting the Divine is attested in several statements in *1 Enoch*: 14:1–2 (concerning prophecy), and 84:1 (concerning prayer). The article begins with an examination of the role of prayer in biblical prophecy, with special emphasis on Isaiah chapters 6, 8, and 28, and Ezekiel 3. The *Hodayot* are surveyed

next, first those (cols. 10, 12) that develop the imagery of Isaiah 28. The *Hodayah* of column 9 is then studied. This poem contains a short hymn on the creation of language, which is studied here in its literary context. The general outcome of the study is that the Qumran scrolls reveal a special awareness of the role and efficacy of language, but emphasize that this language must be properly measured and quantified, in a similar way to the sectarian treatment of the theme of creation.

### **Two Sons, Four Curses: The Parallels between Canaan and Esau in *Jubilees***

**Atar Livneh**

*Jubilees* pairs the figures of Canaan and Esau in apparent reflection of the fact that the biblical narrative treats them similarly, both having been cursed with slavery by their forebearers. *Jubilees* presents this condemnation as falling upon their immediate descendants, whom Jacob subjugates in military combat. It also understands both figures to be subject to a further curse—i.e., that their descendants are to be annihilated on the ‘day of judgment.’ Unlike the biblical curses against Esau and Canaan, this latter-day annihilation is attributed to their making of vain oaths. The curse upon Esau and Canaan and their descendants thus stems from their failure to observe God’s ordinances, while at the same time, their wickedness and lawlessness constitute a paradigm for the relationships between their descendants and with the people Israel. *Jubilees* therefore suggests that since the ‘lessons of the past’ demonstrate that Esau and Canaan cannot keep their oaths, the Israelites should not enter into any alliances with these neighbors.

### **Deuteronomy 19:15–19 in the *Damascus Document* and Early Midrash**

**Shlomo Naeh and Aharon Shemesh**

*Damascus Document* 9:16–10:3—the sectarian rule of testimony—presents serious difficulties that have challenged scholars for years. In light of the evidence from Qumran Cave 4, we suggest an emendation and a new reading of the passage. This reading reflects an understanding of the pentateuchal laws of testimony in Deut 19:15–19 that is markedly different from the conventional reading of this biblical pericope and the established halakhah. A similar

interpretation of the biblical passage is also echoed in early rabbinic sources, and may well be the key to understanding an enigmatic dispute between Simon ben Shataḥ and Judah ben Tabbai, recorded in *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* to Exod 23:7. An earlier, less developed version of this article was published in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20 (2013), pp. 179–199.

## **Where is the Garden of Eden? Shifts in the Location and Function of the Garden of Eden as Revealed through the Composition and Redaction of *1 Enoch***

**Eshbal Ratzon**

The Garden of Eden as described in the Hebrew Bible is an earthly place, where Adam and Eve lived before their sin. Early sources do not express any human desire to return to the Garden. Yet by the first century CE, several Jewish and Christian texts understand the Garden as a heavenly reward for the righteous. The discrepancy between these conceptions of the Garden of Eden must be explained by developments within Second Temple literature, which bridge the gap between the earlier sources and the literature of first-century Christianity and Judaism. The book of *1 Enoch* serves as a good example of these developments, as it was composed in several stages during the Second Temple period and contains quite a few descriptions of Eden.

In the first section of the paper I analyze the compositional process of the *Book of the Watchers*, one of the earliest sections of *1 Enoch*. I then proceed to demonstrate that the sources of this composition actually speak of two separate gardens. One is the Garden of Eden, here called the ‘Garden of Truth,’ where the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil (here called the ‘Tree of Wisdom’) stands; this garden is off-limits to humans. The other garden features a tree that will give life to the righteous and is described with only vague allusions to Eden. Following the redaction of the *Book of the Watchers*, these two gardens were made to parallel one another, and each thus imparts some of its features to the other. In this way, the earthly Garden of Eden receives eschatological meaning in the *Book of the Watchers*.

Chapters 60 and 70 of the *Book of Parables*, the latest section of *1 Enoch*, were composed from several truncated and integrated sources. In some of these sources, the role of the Garden of Eden as the final resting place of the righteous is presumed, but it is still an earthly garden. However, other sources integrated

into these chapters describe heavenly phenomena. Synchronically reading these chapters allows the reader to 'relocate' the Garden of Eden in heaven.

This textual analysis is based on a new translation by the author from the extant Aramaic, Greek, and Ethiopic versions of *1 Enoch*. The translation is partly quoted in the article, together with a commentary on difficult expressions.

## **The *Kittim* and the Roman Conquest in the Qumran Scrolls**

**Nadav Sharon**

This paper examines the significance, for the Qumran sectarians, of the Roman conquest of Judea in 63 BCE. A first step in such an examination is the establishment of an inventory of Qumran texts that are likely to reflect the Roman conquest or refer to the Romans. For this purpose, I first explore the identity of the 'Kittim' in the scrolls. Whereas the term 'Kittim' clearly denotes the Romans in some scrolls, such as *Pesher Nahum* and *Pesher Habakkuk*, which appear to have been composed in the aftermath of the conquest, various scholars assert that in some scrolls, particularly the war texts, 'Kittim' designates the Greeks. This paper reexamines that question and concludes, in contrast, that in the *War Scroll* and other war texts, 'Kittim' likely signifies the Romans; thus those texts, too, were composed in the years after the Roman conquest. In addition, the paper suggests that certain other scrolls also likely allude to the Romans and the Roman conquest.

The second part of the paper analyzes the significance of the Roman conquest for the Qumran sectarians. It argues that the Roman conquest was of profound significance for them, because it 'proved' to them that they had been right all along, and that the Jerusalem authorities were impious. However, whereas some scholars assert that the sect was initially quite neutral towards the Romans, seeing them as a tool in God's hand, this paper argues that those same scrolls actually convey a deep hatred of Rome and a hope for its impending downfall. Thus the Roman conquest forced the sectarians to develop a new eschatological scenario.