

English Abstracts

Expelling the Unclean from the “Camp” according to 4Q274 1 i, 11QT^a and the Writings of Josephus

Hanan Birenboim

4Q274 1 i addresses the removal of impure individuals from inhabited areas and the repercussions of contact with various types of impure individuals. The text asserts (like 11QT^a) that only lepers need to be excluded from the cities of Israel while afflicted. Other impurity bearers are not removed from the cities while discharging, but are isolated within them, according to the idea of “graded purification”. Josephus also claims that only lepers and *zavim* are to be distanced from the cities.

This difference between lepers and other impure individuals ensues from an attempt to resolve the inconsistency between disparate scriptural traditions concerning the expulsion of different impurity bearers from the camp.

Time and Identity: The Hellenistic Background of the Calendar Treatise in *Jubilees* 6

Jonathan Ben-Dov

This paper explores the ideology underlying the calendar treatise in *Jubilees* chapter 6. In this chapter, for the first time in Hebrew literature, the calendar finds a central place as a marker of Jewish identity, departing from the biblical rhetoric. This idea continues in early rabbinic literature. The change in *Jubilees* 6 occurred as part of the effort to advance a new national identity throughout the *Book of Jubilees*. It is claimed here that the calendar has not been a national marker in previous texts. It is further

claimed that previously, Jews counted their time according to the calendars of the empires (Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Seleucid) with no particular Jewish reckoning. The calendar became part of the discourse of identity as a reaction to the prominent theme of the calendar in Greek ethnological literature from Herodotus onwards. It is shown how a similar ideological move took place in Ptolemaic Egypt, in the famous Decree of Canopus (discussed here in some detail). The 364-day calendar tradition should thus be conceived as part of the construction of Jewish identity under the Hellenistic cultural crisis, with the *Book of Jubilees* playing a significant part in this endeavor.

The Authority of Early Hebrew Scripture Scrolls

Emanuel Tov

This paper discusses the authoritative status of ancient Scripture scrolls and other sources. Were they all authoritative, if we take into consideration the fact that they differed from one another? And if all or some of them were authoritative, did they have the same level of authority, and for which communities? Likewise, did individual scrolls have authority before Scripture as a whole became authoritative? Different forms of Scripture were granted an authoritative status by religious communities. These two entities are closely connected: without such communities no authority was granted. In the period preceding the first century CE, it is difficult to analyze authority because Scripture was still in the making.

Before the time of the earliest textual witnesses from Qumran (the middle of the third century BCE) many authoritative scrolls must have circulated that contained different textual forms. It is necessary to make this assumption if the LXX of the Torah was indeed prepared in 285 BCE, since its *Vorlage* differed from MT, which probably already existed at that time. However, we have no further tangible evidence for textual plurality in earlier periods.

Such evidence for textual plurality exists for the Qumran corpus. This paper suggests that the default assumption for that corpus should be that most Qumran scrolls were considered authoritative: (1) the fact that the scrolls were copied, and in such quantities; (2) subsequent authoritative

status; (3) quotation by the community members who did not favor any specific text or text group.

Authoritative scrolls are scrolls that were considered to contain “Scripture,” which one could study, from which one could quote, which one could read in religious gatherings or in one’s personal meditation, and which formed the basis for religious practice, especially *halakhah*. Such authoritative Scripture scrolls differed from Scripture-like scrolls, which were not authoritative as Scripture, viz., partial Scripture scrolls and liturgical scrolls, all of which were found at Qumran.

In the period following the first century CE a new situation was created: MT became authoritative for the whole Jewish people, the SP for the Samaritans, and the Greek LXX for the Christians.

The Noahide Laws: The Building Blocks of a Rabbinic Conceptual Framework in Qumran and the Book of Acts

Moshe Lavee

The article traces the building blocks of the rabbinic concept of Noahide laws as they appear in *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*: the commandments given to Noah or by him to his sons; the motif of blaming the sons of Noah for violating the commandments; and the rejection of the sons of Noah and the election of Israel, including its eschatological dimensions. The article also presents the precedents of legal discrimination against non-Jews in the context of the ban against theft and murder. These various elements were later incorporated into a well-developed rabbinic conceptual framework of the Noahide laws. However, it is only in the rabbinic corpus, and especially in the Babylonian Talmud, that the Noahide laws are framed in terms of a binary model of distinction between Jews and Gentiles. The elements, motifs and conventions that later constituted the rabbinic concept are found in the earlier corpora in different contexts and settings. For example, the laws given to Noah or his sons are seen as part of a continuous chain of covenants rather than as a different legal system for non-Jews. Blaming the sons of Noah appears in the ideological context of the election of the Qumran sect rather than of the election of Israel as a whole. Finally, the halakhic context of the Noahide laws in rabbinic

literature is an important development. It reflects a generic shift towards the development of distinct legal systems for Jews and non-Jews. It is also suggested that Acts 15 may be seen as the earliest legal concretization of the laws, leading from Second Temple and sectarian origins to the later rabbinic framework.

Affinity and Competition between Biblical Figures in Post-biblical Literature

Menahem Kister

In post-biblical traditions, biblical figures gained new dimensions through associations drawn between biblical passages and affinities with other biblical figures. Quite often, the affinity was transformed into competition between the figures. Sometimes this transformation had no ideological motives; other times it was related to religious ideas set in contrast to other religious groups. The present article examines some case studies for this process.

The article moves from stressing the affinities between biblical figures—Abraham and Job (section 1), Abraham and Moses (section 2), Abraham and Noah (sections 3–4), Enoch and Noah (section 5)—to their contrast in a competitive manner. The *Testament of Abraham*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and rabbinic traditions demonstrate that this dynamic is inherent in Jewish post-biblical literature, although some of these competitions also arose in the context of polemics with Christianity and (possibly) other groups. The competition between Enoch and Noah, which may be inferred from *Jub* 10:15–17, explains the addition of the verse concerning Enoch in *Sir* 44:16, in which phraseology similar to *Jubilees* is used. Sections 6–7 deal with the figure of Enoch in *Jubilees*, including *Jub* 10:17, especially Enoch's portrayal as a “witness.” The author concludes that this book probably used various sources in which a similar phrase had received different interpretations.

The Stepped Water Installations of Qumran are indeed *Miqwa'ot!*

Ronny Reich

The identification of the stepped and plastered water installations unearthed at Qumran has recently been challenged by Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, who identified them as part of a potter's workshop. According to this suggestion, the function of these installations was to catch the suspended clay in the water which ran as a desert flood through Wadi Qumran and was captured by means of an aqueduct and led into the site.

The article deals with several topics related to these installations and the water gathered in them. Relying on geomorphological studies which have gauged the suspended sediment in the neighbouring wadis, the six large water installations of Qumran (Nos. 49, 56, 71, 117, 118 and 138) could gather, on average, c. 450–500 liters of wet clay (equal to some 900 kg) per annum. This amount is insufficient to operate a potter's workshop on an industrial basis.

Other topics discussed are the exceedingly large size of the Qumran installations, as well their abundance in Qumran, against similar installations in other sites, and particularly in Jerusalem. Both features seem to be the outcome of the fact that these installations are located in the desert, where regular water supply is neither guaranteed nor self evident.

בע"ר and בע"י in Hebrew and Aramaic

Chanan Ariel and Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky

The present paper discusses the roots בע"ר and בע"י in Hebrew and Aramaic with regard to their meaning and grammatical forms. The verse Ex 22:3 כִּי יִבְעֵר אִישׁ שֶׂדֶה אוֹ כָרֶם... and its parallels in the DSS, the Samaritan Pentateuch and in the Targums are examined in an attempt to describe relations between various versions. In some of them the verb בע"י substitutes בע"ר. In this context, the verb בע"י "eat" is argued to be an original Hebrew one which seems to have had no relationship with the Aramaic בע"י "ask".

From Qumran to Cairo: The Lives and Times of a Jewish Exorcistic Formula

Gideon Bohak

The number of non-canonical Second Temple period texts that survived into the Middle Ages is extremely small. The present study traces a rare example of the transmission of a Jewish exorcistic formula from Second Temple period literature to the Cairo Genizah. This formula is first attested in 11Q11, a scroll containing exorcistic psalms attributed to David and perhaps also to Solomon. It re-emerges more than a thousand years later, in the Genizah fragment T(aylor)–S(chechter) K 1.123, and in between, it surfaces in several Jewish incantation bowls from Sasanian Babylonia. As it was not codified in any canonical text or transmitted in rabbinic literature, its survival probably attests to its continuous use by Jewish exorcists during the Second Temple period, Late Antiquity, and the Middle Ages.

The *Apocryphon of Moses*: A Composition Representing the High Priest as the Supreme Judicial Authority

Liora Goldman

The *Apocryphon of Moses*, four copies of which were discovered at Qumran (1Q29, 4Q375, 4Q376, and 4Q408), reworks various laws given in the *Book of Deuteronomy*, with the apparent aim of establishing that the High Priest—named “Anointed Priest”—bears supreme authority for determining legal issues lying beyond human powers of resolution. Inquiring the *Urim* (either by seeking God’s will or by requesting His answer behind the veil), the verdict was given by means of the illumination of the stones on the breastplate and the shoulders of the *ephod*, and then relayed by the High Priest to the people waiting outside the Temple. The *Apocryphon* asserts that this method is to be employed when a man is suspected of being a false prophet, when the king is unsure whether to engage in a permitted war, and seemingly also in other cases—whose nature cannot be ascertained

due to the scroll's fragmentary condition. It also preserves two prayers of praise to God—apparently thanksgiving hymns recited by the High Priest in gratitude for God's revelation to him or prior to his inquiry of the *Urim*. One, which praises God for His creation of the luminaries, appears to compare the priests with the celestial cycles.

This article addresses Strugnell's theory that the composition deals exclusively with the identification of the true/false prophet, demonstrating the difficulties attendant upon this theory and suggesting that it rather reworks *various* legal matters brought to the priest for his verdict, thereby establishing him as the supreme authority over all other juridical offices—the judge, the prophet, and the king.

The Periphrastic Clause in the Language of the Scrolls

Gregor Geiger

The paper describes periphrastic participial clauses in the Scrolls, i.e., clauses containing a form of the root HYH + participle, and compares the findings to other Hebrew sources, particularly Biblical Hebrew. These clauses are especially frequent in the *Temple Scroll*. The clauses without conjunction begin normally with the theme (which is often the subject of the clause), while the verbal form takes second place in the clause. The few clauses that start with the participle seem to function as simple participial clauses which start with the participle, i.e., present tense. The use of the periphrastic construction often seems optional, i.e., there does not seem to be any difference between this construction and the normal finite verbal form.

**Three Questions and Three Answers
regarding the Hebrew Documents from Judaea
between the First and the Second Revolts**

Uri Mor

This article deals with the corpus of epigraphic Hebrew documents from the Judaeian desert composed between the first and second Jewish revolts. The linguistic classification and characterization of this body of documents are presented here in light of three cardinal aspects:

1. The uniformity of the corpus—although the corpus can be divided both chronologically (documents of the first revolt vs. documents of the second revolt) and literarily (mainly letters vs. legal documents), the linguistic features reveal that it reflects a homogeneous linguistic system, and that it should, therefore, be treated as a single group, with its alternatives and variations.
2. The typology of the corpus—the Hebrew dialect reflected in the documents accords with our knowledge of other Hebrew dialects and the chronological development of early Hebrew, but is not identical with any of the other Hebrew dialects of that time (Rabbinic Hebrew, Qumranic Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, Samaritan Hebrew, Babylonian Hebrew). However, it shows great resemblance to Rabbinic Hebrew.
3. The status of Hebrew—the language of the documents represents a natural living dialect of Hebrew rather than a dead literary language or a mix of Aramaic and Hebrew. This dialect demonstrates linguistic features that cannot be interpreted as an imitation of classical Hebrew literature or an outcome of Aramaic influence. Moreover, it shows signs of a struggle with the growing effect of Aramaic on everyday life.