

# English Abstracts

## Semantic and Exegetical Observations on Metaphors for Sin in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Chanan Ariel

This paper examines four metaphors for sin in Second Temple Period literature: מתמוטט, כושל, נידה ושבו, כושל, נידה ושבו (tottering, stumbling, banishment, and captivity). A similar semantic shift may be noted in relation to all four—that is, a move from concrete meanings to spiritual applications concerning the heart of a human being.

The first section of the paper is devoted to the root M-W-Ṭ. In the Bible, this verb usually describes failures in the earthly sphere. Nevertheless, in Second Temple Period literature, מתמוטט (one who totters) designates an evil-doer; he stands in contrast to the righteous, who are protected by a fortress that prevents them from staggering. The chiasmus in the fourteenth column of the Thanksgiving Scroll between the spiritual breakdown of the sinners and the fortress of the righteous proves that the fortress provides protection from negative spiritual influences; notwithstanding its concrete descriptions, which appear to be marshalled as a defense against attempts by the enemies of the righteous to harm them.

The second section is devoted to an examination of the use of the root K-Ṣ-L in the descriptions of disease, stumbling, and captivity in the Thanksgiving Scroll. After treating passages in which the metaphors of disease and stumbling seem to refer to spiritual collapse, I discuss two cases in which it is difficult to determine whether these metaphors describe physical weakness, spiritual weakness, or perhaps both simultaneously.

The final section deals with a new reading by Alexey Yuditsky and Esther Haber in the Melchizedek Peshar (11Q13). This reading sheds new light on the portrayal of Belial. Belial is described as one who “pushes away” (מדיה) the righteous from the ways of the Torah. After this, Belial acts as a creditor, collecting the debts accrued due to their sins. These debts are redeemed by banishing (מדיה) them from the inheritance of Melchizedek and the lot of light, and into the lot of darkness, as Belial’s prisoners (שבויים).

## **On Some Words in Two of the Dead Sea Scrolls** (*ptyl*/פתיל, *r<sup>δ</sup>dw<sup>δ</sup>yh*/רעדודיה, *b<sup>δ</sup>w<sup>δ</sup>rh*/בעורה)

Moshe Bar-Asher

In this article I treat three words that appear in two Qumran texts, and discuss their meanings: (1) The word *ptyl*, interpreted as “belt” (הגורר) in the Commentary (*Pesher*) on Genesis C (4Q254). (2) The term *r<sup>δ</sup>dw<sup>δ</sup>yh* = *ra<sup>δ</sup>adudiyya* and the phrase *b<sup>δ</sup>š b<sup>δ</sup>w<sup>δ</sup>ra* = *bā<sup>δ</sup>ora*, both found in Apocryphal Pentateuch B (4Q377). After dealing with some aspects of 4Q377 and its relation to the biblical text, I deal with the linguistic pattern and meaning of these two rare words.

## **The Two Covenants, from Creation and through the Ages: An Interpretation of the 4Q158 Fragments**

Cana Werman

The underlying assumption of this paper is that 4Q158, previously identified by scholars as one composition, should actually be understood as two distinct compositions. The first consists of fragments 5–12, and contains the proto-Samaritan version of Exodus 19–22. The second consists of fragments 1–4 and 14 of 4Q158. The identification of a common denominator linking these latter fragments, which I have labeled 4Q158b, is the aim of this paper.

4Q158b expresses a particular exegetical understanding of the biblical covenants. Its author’s intentions and exegetical processes are best clarified in light of the book of Jubilees. According to Jubilees, two covenants were made by God at the creation of the world, the first with humanity and the second with the people of Israel. 4Q158b collects biblical passages (Genesis 31–32; Exodus 3–4; Exodus 24) in which the author discerns hints as to the commitment to these two covenants between the period of Abraham and the events at Sinai. The author rewrites these passages with the intent of revealing to the reader these covenantal references, only hinted at in the Bible.

## **4QCommentary on Genesis: Notes on New Readings**

**Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky and Esther Haber**

The four scrolls designated as 4QCommentary on Genesis (4Q252, 4Q253, 4Q254, 4Q254a) were edited and published by George Brooke in DJD 22. During our work for the Historical Dictionary Project of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, we re-examined these scrolls by consulting the new, high-quality images of the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library of the IAA. In the present paper we suggest new improved readings of many of the fragments of the 4QCommentary on Genesis scrolls, accompanied by short notes on their version and language in the light of other contemporary biblical and nonbiblical sources.

## **6QKings and the Historical-Literary Criticism of the Story of Elisha and the Siege of Samaria**

**Itamar Kislev**

The story of the siege of Samaria is the longest Elisha story (2 Kgs 6:24–7:20). A problematic passage appears at the end of the story (7:16–20) which highlights the fulfillment of Elisha's prophecy exactly as he had anticipated (7:1–2). This is, however, a stacked pericope, which includes a repetition of each detail two or three times. Scholars have tried to understand these superfluous repetitions in many ways; some have suggested that the passage was created in several stages, but there is no scholarly agreement on this issue. It seems that a hitherto neglected Qumranic document, together with some other philological considerations, can help us arrive at a solution to this puzzle, according to which the story originally ended in the middle of 7:17.

## Sectarian Divergences in Israel in the Light of Textual Corrections in the Hebrew Bible

Alexander Rofé

The purpose of this article is twofold: to contribute to the history of Jewish sects in the Second Temple period and to forward our understanding of the history of the biblical text in that period.

Textual corrections were introduced into biblical books by the various sects active during the Second Commonwealth. The Samaritans enhanced the sanctity of their temple on Mount Gerizim by tampering with the text of the Torah, in order to highlight the priority of that place (cf. their tenth commandment in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5). A similar step was taken in Isa 19:18 by the Zadokite priests of Leontopolis in Egypt, in order to legitimate their sanctuary. The Sadducees of Jerusalem added the word ארצה, “unto the earth” in 1 Sam 7:6 in order to invalidate the Pharisaic practice of water libation on the altar during the Sukkoth festival. Pharisaic interventions in the text of Proverbs (14:12), Psalms (49:12), and Qohelet (3:21) were noted long ago. To these I would add one more passage in Qohelet (5:5). The Essenes (=Qumranites) introduced their own tenets into Isaiah (8:11; 9:14; 53:11). The belief of the Zealots (=Josephus’s “Fourth Philosophy”) in the exclusive kingship of the Lord had an antecedent in the LXX version of the Pentateuch, which, from Genesis 49 to Deuteronomy 33, degrades all kings of Israel to the rank of *arkhon* (נשיא).

There are some indications that Jewish sectarian divergences had already appeared in the third century BCE. All in all, sectarian interventions in the biblical texts are limited in number. This indicates that the tenet of untouchable sacred books was usually accepted by the Jews as early as the Hasmonean times.

## **Sectarian Polemic or Interpretive Clarification? An Alternative Perspective on 1 Sam 7:6 in the LXX Version**

**D. Andrew Teeter**

This short note argues, in contrast to the position articulated in the preceding article by Alexander Rofé, that the variant reading of 1 Sam 7:6 LXX (וישפכו לפני ה' על הארץ) represents an assimilation of the wording of 1 Sam 7 to that in Deut 12. Its purpose is to clarify an ambiguous and potentially problematic passage by the logic of analogy. Given the basic obscurity of the ritual described in the context of 1 Sam 7 and the ambiguity of its verbal formulation, it seems that this variant represents a straightforward deductive clarification of a problematic formulation on the basis of a parallel passage, without necessarily reflecting any knowledge of a putative dispute between Pharisees and Sadducees regarding water libations offered during Sukkoth. It would therefore represent not an exceptional and rare sectarian variant, but a general interpretive variant fully characteristic of deliberate variation within scriptural manuscripts in the late Second Temple period.

## **Abraham in Second Temple Historical Summaries**

**Atar Livneh**

This paper examines the representation of Abraham in brief historical accounts written between the third century BCE and first century CE that did not find their way into the Hebrew canon. Although these texts vary in their date and provenance, their treatments of the Abraham cycle reflect similar tendencies. First, they are influenced by literary types that flourished or were adopted by Jewish communities during the Second Temple period—apocalypses and lists of examples, for instance. Second, while they follow earlier biblical historical models belonging to the “historical review” type, extrabiblical summaries blend these models with pericopae and literary types drawn from the long, authoritative story of Israel’s past in Genesis–2 Kings. While this phenomenon is already attested in late biblical summaries, the influence of Genesis is much

more manifest in Second Temple extrabiblical reviews. A substantial number of extrabiblical summaries thus recapitulate Abraham's narratives; place them at the beginning of the account or immediately following pericopae from Genesis 1–11; structure the unit about the patriarchs as a genealogy; or insert chronological data into their retellings of the patriarchal narratives—in larger numbers than their biblical precedents. While the biblical summaries never adduce chronological data or review the first generations of humanity, the selection of pericopae from the Abraham cycle in extrabiblical reviews is largely dependent upon biblical historical summaries. Themes such as Abraham's beginnings and the covenant between the pieces—referred to in Joshua 24, Psalm 105, and Nehemiah 9—thus form some of the most common Abrahamic narratives in the extrabiblical accounts. While no significant differences, with regard to most of the aspects examined in this paper, exist between the summaries penned by communities in various geographical locations, chronological data are a particularly characteristic feature of the summaries in the Qumran library, reflecting the sectarian community's intense interest in the temporal axis of history.

## **The Book of Tobit as a Court Tale**

**Devorah Dimant**

Discoveries made in the previous century suggest that the book of Tobit, previously known only in Greek and other translations, was originally written in Aramaic. This is indicated by the presence of five Aramaic copies of the book among the Qumran scrolls, in addition to one in Hebrew. The originality of the Aramaic version is further suggested by a number of literary contacts between this book and other Aramaic literature. Foremost is the book's reliance on the tale of the wise Ahiqar, fifth-century BCE Aramaic copies of which were discovered at Elephantine more than a century ago. Secondly, Tobit's use of the court tale model, popular in the ancient Jewish Aramaic literature, signals Tobit's backdrop in the Aramaic literary milieu. Court tales place Jewish wise/successful courtiers in the courts of Gentile monarchs, as exemplified by the biblical stories of Joseph, Esther, and Daniel. The court tale model used by Tobit belongs to the "conflict

tale” type, in which the Jewish protagonist is endangered because of his different religious practice. In the use of this model, Tobit resembles the Aramaic court tales of Daniel chapters 3 and 6.

## **The Praise of the Luminaries in the Similitudes of Enoch and its Parallels in the Qumran Scrolls**

**Arjen Bakker**

The Similitudes of Enoch is the only composition among the five books of Ethiopic Enoch that has been preserved in Ethiopic alone. The other four books of 1 Enoch are attested in Aramaic fragments from Qumran as well as in translations in Greek, Syriac, and Coptic. Despite the fact that the Similitudes were not found at Qumran, scholars have pointed to remarkable correspondences between the Similitudes and certain texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls. It has been suggested that these correspondences can illuminate the background of the Similitudes. From this perspective, the current article examines a few remarkable themes in the Similitudes that have striking parallels in Qumran texts.

The first section of the paper analyses cosmological passages from the first and third similitudes, with emphasis on two themes: (1) The differences between the sun, the moon, and the stars in the degree of their radiance corresponds to the differences between them in the degree of their glory; and (2) The luminaries continually praise God without ever resting, because their praise is their rest and their nourishment. The second section explores similar themes in the Qumran text, *Musar le-Mevin*. Two fragments (4Q418 55 and 69) associate the angels with the heavenly bodies. The angels differ from one another in glory according to their level of knowledge. Moreover, the angels continually chase after knowledge without ever becoming tired. The third section compares passages from the Similitudes of Enoch, *Musar le-Mevin*, and a third Qumran text: *Serekh ha-Yahad*. The Similitudes and the *Serekh* contain very similar phraseology with respect to the weighing and separating of spirits. The Similitudes describes the luminaries’ continuous praise, and *Musar le-Mevin* describes the angels’ continuous pursuit of knowledge. The formulations in both texts are based on an ancient interpretive tradition of Isa 40:26–31 that is already attested in Ben Sira.

The close correspondences between the Similitudes and these Qumran texts in terms of ideas and phraseology suggest that there was some kind of connection between the communities that produced them. It is not likely that the Similitudes were composed by members of the Yahad. But neither is it likely that the community behind the Similitudes and the communities behind the Dead Sea Scrolls were entirely separated from one another. It seems rather that there were some points of contact.

### **Legal Formulae in the Festivals in the Book of Jubilees and in Esther**

**Itai Kagan**

There are certain similarities between the legal formulae used to institute the festival of Purim in Esther 9 and those used to institute festivals in the Book of Jubilees and in 1 Maccabees. The Passover legislation in Jubilees 49:7–8 uses the same terms as Esther 9:27–28: “ולא יעבור” “and it shall not pass”; “כתב” “written”; “עשה” “to do”; “בכל שנה ושנה” “every year”; “בכל דור ודור” “for all generations”; “אין סוף” “no end.”

The establishment of the Festival of Weeks in Jubilees 6:17, the Festival of Booths in Jubilees 16:29, and the Festival of Unleavened Bread in Jubilees 18:19 all contain a shared formula. This formula appears also in Esther 9:19, Esther 9:21 and Esther 9:26–27. Another parallel is the constitution of Hanukkah in 1 Maccabees 4:59; of Nikanor Day (13th of Adar) in 1 Maccabees 7:49; and of the Hakra day (23rd of Iyyar) in 1 Maccabees 13:52. The common phrases are: “על כן” “therefore”; “קיים” “established/ordained”; “להיות עושים בכל שנה ושנה” “to celebrate every year”; “בשמחה” “with joy.”

The use of shared terminology in these three books has two possible explanations. The first is that Jubilees and 1 Maccabees drew inspiration from Esther 9, and used it as a model for establishing festivals. The second (preferable) explanation is that all three sources reflect technical phraseology commonly used in the Second Temple period to establish festivals. We know of many festivals established during this period, and one may suppose that they had etiological stories much like those in the books under discussion. The second explanation suggested here proposes that these lost stories



would also have used the shared phraseology found in the three sources discussed. Thus, there is no need to posit a direct relationship between Esther, 1 Maccabees, and Jubilees, since they all drew from a common stock of phrases.

## **The Community–Temple Identification in Qumran and the New Testament, their Differences and Relationships**

**Eyal Regev**

In this article I will compare the use of the symbolism of the community as Temple in two Qumran texts (the Community Rule [1QS] and 4QFlorilegium) to that found in the New Testament (in Paul's Epistles, Ephesians, and 1 Peter). I will reassess the relationships that these expressions create between the community's cultic imagery or metaphors and the Jerusalem Temple to determine whether the widespread assumption that the community truly replaced the Temple is correct.

The Community Rule's metaphors are sophisticated, invoking not only temple terminology (although the Temple itself is never explicitly mentioned), but also the priestly or sacrificial functions of atonement. I propose that the expression "the Temple of Man" (*miqdash adam*) of 4QFlorilegium, wherein the Torah practices are offered up, as similar to the cultic metaphor in the Community Rule.

For Paul, such cultic metaphors are more narrowly drawn, without reference to specific the cultic functions such as atonement. In fact, the community as Temple metaphor is part of a wider system in Paul's letters, which is secondary to his rhetorical and functional needs. Thus, it is difficult to see a literary or ideological connection between Paul and Qumran.

However, there are also strong similarities between the Community Rule, Ephesians, and especially 1 Peter. All utilize the stone imagery for the community (following Isa 28:16), and 1 Peter includes cultic functions somewhat similar to those of the Community Rule. Hence, it is possible that the authors of Ephesians and 1 Peter were influenced in some manner by Qumranic ideas or writings.

## First and Second Tithes in the Temple Scroll and in the Book of Jubilees According to Early Karaite Discourse

Yoram Erder

The most important Karaite sages, such as Yefet ben 'Eli and Ya'qūb al-Qirqisānī, although they knew the Qumran literature and related literature such as the Book of Jubilees, refrained from adopting laws taken from them. However, as the principle of pluralism reigned in ancient Karaite commentaries on the Bible, these same sages did not hesitate to introduce material from the minority of sages who did tend to adopt laws from ancient Jewish sectarian literature. Karaite sources can therefore sometimes help to decipher sectarian controversies from the Second Temple Period. Such is the case concerning the laws of the first and second tithes.

Concerning the first tithe, the minority among the Karaite sages, basing themselves on Gen 14:20; 28:22, claimed that this law had first been observed by Abraham and Jacob. From the tithes given by those patriarchs, they deduced that the first tithe should be given to the Levites from everything that earth produces, including its minerals. The Book of Jubilees, faithful to the principle that most commandments preceded the revelation of the Torah at Sinai, also claims that Abraham and Jacob were the first to set aside the first tithe; and according to Jubilees 32:2, this tithe encompassed everything the earth produces.

According to the Temple Scroll, it seems that the Bible mentions only two tithes. 11QT<sup>a</sup> 43:2–17 deals with the laws of the second tithe. By studying the laws of the Karaites, who also argued for only two tithes, one may shed light on the laws concerning the second tithe in the Temple Scroll.

1. In Karaite law, the holiness of the second tithe is derived from the text of the *viduy ma'aser* (Deut 26:13–15), and not Lev 27:30, which was considered to refer to the first tithe.
2. Karaite law specifies that one is to set aside for the second tithe only grain, wine, and oil (Deut 14:23; compare Temple Scroll 43:1-10).
3. The second tithe should be eaten only on holy days, with joy, according to Deut 14:26. The word ארונה (11QT<sup>a</sup> 43:16) should thus be interpreted as “sorrow.” The passage means that one is not allowed to eat the second tithe in sorrow.

4. In Karaite discourse there are traces of references to the law of burning the surplus of the second tithe (see 11QT<sup>a</sup> 43:11).

## **Shabbat Laws in Qumran: Between Biblical Language and Legal Traditions**

**Yair Furstenberg**

Review essay: Alex Jassen, *Scripture and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*,  
Cambridge, 2014

Despite the centrality of Sabbath observance to Jewish practice in antiquity, Scripture provides only the scantiest instructions, which appear mainly in the prophets (Isaiah 58; Jeremiah 17). In his recent book, Jassen seeks to trace the literary roots of some details of Qumran Shabbat laws to scriptural formulations, thus uncovering both the exegetical methods of Qumran authors and the canonical status of the prophets in their view. The literary approach adopted in this book locates Qumran legal formulations within the narrow framework of “rewritten bible”; that is, as clearly distinct from the rabbinic midrashic treatment of the biblical material. In contrast to Jassen’s approach, this review essay suggests that the various sources on the laws of the Sabbath in Qumran should be situated within a wider tradition of legal development, which incorporates, besides the commitment to biblical exegesis, additional practices and conventions shared with other groups. I argue that Qumran law cannot be read against the backdrop of Scripture alone, but must rather be interpreted as an integral part of Second Temple legal and ideological discourse.

*English abstracts edited by Ruth A. Clements*