

# English Abstracts

## *Dibre Hamme'orot and the Apocalypse of Weeks*

Hanan Eshel

The *Apocalypse of Weeks*, preserved in the *Epistle of Enoch* (1 Enoch 90–105), contains a vision that chronicles world history by dividing it into time units called “weeks”. In the Ethiopic manuscripts of *Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Weeks* appears in two separate parts: one part (93:3–9) describes the seven weeks from the creation of the world until the end of days, and the other (91:12–15) describes the last three weeks of the eschatological period. Despite the fact that they were found joined in a Qumran document (4Q212 = En<sup>g</sup>ar), scholarly consensus holds that the vision of the seven weeks, which describes actual historical periods, should be distinguished from the vision of the last three weeks, which deals with metahistory.

A text found at Qumran shows close affinity to the historical section of the *Apocalypse of Weeks*. This text, called *Dibre Hamme'orot* (4Q504–6), of which three copies were found at Qumran, contains prayers for each day of the week. In 1992 Esther Chazon (*RQ* 15, pp. 447–455) showed that the content of the different prayers for the successive days of the week reflects a chronological historical sequence. The complete parallelism between the historical events listed in *Dibre Hamme'orot* and the historical divisions recorded in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* leads to the conclusion that the author of the former was familiar with the latter and adopted its historical sequence as the framework for its prayers.

## **Qumran and the Essenes: Six Categories of Purity and Impurity**

**Magen Broshi**

The author identifies the obsessive observance of their peculiar purity laws as the most important element in Essenism. These laws, compounded by a belief in double predestination, created a broad gap between the Essenes and their Jewish brethren, to say nothing of the rest of the world. As compared to the purity laws observed by practically every human society, and certainly by normative Judaism (i.e., pharisaic, rabbinic), the Essene laws were extremely stringent, absolute, and supererogatory. Several dozen such laws, all of which are more stringent than the similar rabbinic ones, can be enumerated. By way of example, Essene law places draconic limitations on the permissible means of saving life on the Sabbath: no ropes or ladders could be used.

The definitions of purity and impurity presented here are broader than the ones current in Dead Sea Scrolls research. The author submits that the Essenes regarded any breach of their halakha as causing defilement. Various purity laws adhered to by the Essenes are reviewed here, grouped according to six categories: bed, table, body, space, time, and means of purification.

## **Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in Spirit: The Peshar of Isa. 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community***

**Devorah Dimant**

Ongoing studies and recently published scrolls have confirmed two assumptions dating from the beginning of Scrolls research: firstly, that the ascetic communal group depicted by the *Rule of the Community* (1QS) and the *Damascus Document* was an Essene community of the type described by Philo and Josephus and, secondly, that the site of Qumran was settled by members of this community, to whom the scrolls found in the caves nearby belonged. However, one feature of the accepted picture

that has not been reexamined in light of the new data is the history of the Qumran community as reconstructed fifty years ago. A linchpin of this reconstruction, based, in the main, on the peshet of Isa. 40:3 found in the *Rule of the Community* 8:12–16, is the notion that the leader of this group, the Teacher of Righteousness, left Jerusalem and settled with his followers in exile in the desert: “And when these have become a community in Israel in compliance with these arrangements they are to be segregated from within the dwelling of men of sin to go to the desert in order to prepare there His path. As it is written (Isa 40:3): ‘In the desert prepare the way of the Lord, straighten in the steppe a roadway for our God’. This is the study of the Torah which He commanded by the hand of Moses to do, according to everything which has been revealed from time to time”. It is usually argued that the author of the peshet understood the biblical verse to prescribe a life of Torah study in a real desert, and that Qumran constituted such a place.

The analysis offered by the present article shows that the entire verse, and not just certain of its words, was equated with the activity of Torah study. This is clear from the correct text – confirmed by 1QS and the parallel text from a cave 4 copy (4Q258 6:6–8) – which reads *הואה מדרש התורה* instead of the usual *היאה מדרש התורה*. The syntactical analysis of the corrected text shows that the *Rule* understood the verse as a figurative directive for communal life centered around the study of the Torah, conducted not in a real desert but in a figurative one. The “desert” is most likely the segregation of the community from the majority of Israel.

## **The *Book of Jubilees* and the Qumran Community**

**Cana Werman**

The first part of this paper, which treats the question of the relationship between *Jubilees* and the Qumran community, is a consideration of the date of *Jubilees*' composition. The view taken here is that the book was composed at a time when the Qumran community was already established, arguing for the late second century BCE as a more likely date of composition than the early or mid-second century BCE. A close examination of a central chapter in *Jubilees*, chapter 23,

which constitutes the main part of the paper, demonstrates that it indeed includes a Qumranic layer. At the core of chapter 23 stands an early, independent composition describing four periods in the deterioration of humanity, due to the sins of fornication and impurity. Several verses in the chapter, however, seem to be an interpolation. Verses 16 and 19–20 describe a clash between young men and elders on calendrical and other halakhic issues disputed by the Qumranites and the Pharisees. Verses 21–23 focus on the sins of the people “who escaped” and their punishment, using terms and accusations known from Qumranic anti-Hasmonean polemical writings. Both the presence of matters of Qumran-Pharisee controversy and of close parallels to Qumranic anti-Hasmonean writings led to the conclusion that this chapter underwent redaction at Qumran.

***Inclusio: On the Final Section of the Damascus Document  
and Its Literary Significance***

**Paul Mandel**

The conclusion of the *Damascus Document*, as found in Qumran fragments 4Q266–4Q270, includes a passage that summarizes the previous section of laws (“this is the list of laws...”), and also refers to events “visited” by God upon the people and to the migrations of the members of the sect. Said to be written in “the latest teaching of the Torah” (מדרש התורה האחרון), previous constructions of this passage understood “the laws” as having been written “in accordance with the latest [or final] interpretation of the Torah”.

A new rendering of this passage (containing a slightly different reading) suggests that it is comprised of two separate sentences: the first serves as a conclusion to the second part of the *Damascus Document*, namely, the part containing the “laws”, and the second relates chiasmatically to the first section of the document, the “Admonition”. In its survey of the ancient history of Israel, the Admonition places emphasis on the backsliding of previous generations from the true commands of God and on the granting of an enlightened revelation to the leaders of the elect “sons of light” who enter the “new covenant”. The proposed reading, substantiated by a detailed analysis of the terms found in the passage, supports a view of the *Damascus Document* as being intended for new

proselytes to the sect. By providing the theoretical, historical basis for the sect's allegation that it possesses the true, newly revealed understanding of God's commandments and intentions, the historical survey is particularly germane to the claims made by the sect in its address to the proselytes. In his concluding sentence (which seems to be modeled after a passage in 2 Chron. 24:23–27 that mentions the taking of booty to Damascus), the author of the *Damascus Document* states that the source of his historical account is itself based on divinely inspired exegesis of scriptural prophetic texts. He names as his source a work entitled **מדרש התורה האחרון** (“the contemporary teaching of the Torah”), evidently a known written work: perhaps a *peshet*.

## Improving the Editions of the Dead Sea Scrolls (2)

Elisha Qimron

The author edits afresh six passages from several manuscripts of the *War Rule* and suggests new readings and interpretations. Thus, for example, in 1QM<sup>a</sup> (4Q491) 1–2 7 he reads **ואנשי החרש [וה]מ[צ]רף יפקודום** (instead of **ואנשי החרש [וה]מ[צ]רף ופקודים** in other editions), translated as follows: “The organizing people shall sift the warriors”. In 4QSM (=4Q285) 4:8 he reads: **[מימיו] עליהם ונעכרו עליהם**, translated as follows: “(God) will raise the waves of the sea against them (i.e., the fleeing Kittim) and the waters of the sea will be stormy”. The verb **עכר** ‘to stir up water’ is known from mishnaic Hebrew.

## Traces of Sectarian Halakhah in Tannaitic Literature

Aharon Shemesh

The Midrash (*Sifre Numbers* 112) depicts King Manasseh as “one who discloses faces in the Torah (**מגלה פנים בתורה**)”, who “sits and offers contemptuous expositions before God, saying, Did He have nothing to write in the Torah but ‘and Lotan’s sister was Timna’ [Gen. 36:22?!]” The article argues that the statement attributed to Manasseh is but a segment

of a fuller Sadducean-sectarian biblical exposition, intentionally veiled for that reason. It suggests that the aim of the Sadducean midrash alluded to in *Sifre* was to support the Sadducean stance in their dispute with the rabbis regarding the laws of inheritance, as recorded in several talmudic sources. Grounded in the generally accepted assumption that the halakha of the Qumran scrolls and the Sadducean halakha are essentially the same, it appears that King Manasseh stands for a Sadducean-sectarian sage in this midrash. It is further suggested that the phrase מגלה פנים בתורה be understood as a rejoinder to the Scrolls' claim that their biblical interpretations were divinely inspired and uncovered divine mysteries (גילוי נסתרות).

## **What Else Did King Manasseh of Judea Discover in the Torah?**

**Hananel Mack**

Both the tannaitic midrash *Sifre Numbers* (112) and the Babylonian Talmud (*Sanh.* 99b) relate how the evil king of Judea, Manasseh, used to proclaim “contemptuous commentaries” about Timna, Lotan’s sister (Gen. 32:12, 22), and about the tale of the mandrakes (Gen. 30:14). In his contribution to this volume, Aaron Shemesh submits that this rabbinic aggadah presents the evil king Manasseh as a Sadducean commentator and that the exegetical comments about Timna must be viewed as halakhic criticism of the pharisaic stance and, particularly, as evidence in support of the Sadducean interpretation of certain issues in family law.

I would like to suggest that Manasseh’s commentary on the mandrakes as reported in the Talmud must similarly be considered a sectarian aggadic commentary. In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Issachar tells the story of his conception and birth as a result of the matriarchs’ quarrel over the mandrakes. As told there, the description of the events in this “testimony” is remarkably repellent and ridicules Issachar himself. Rabbinic aggadic literature from the tannaitic period on portrays the tribe of Issachar as Torah scholars; thus, the aim of Manasseh’s factional commentary is to dispute the origins and scholarship of the pharisaic-

tannaitic Torah scholars. Based on Chronicles, the descendants of the tribe of Issachar were considered particularly knowledgeable in calendrical calculations: “Of the Issacharites, men who knew how to interpret the signs of the times, to determine how Israel should act... and all their kinsmen followed them” (1 Chron. 12:33). Calendrical calculations were a central disputed point during the Second Temple period; therefore, by defaming the tribe of Issachar the talmudic story served the purposes of the opposition party to the pharisaic scholars and their decrees, including their calendar.

### **The Language of Qumran: Between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (A Study in Morphology)**

**Moshe Bar-Asher**

The article investigates an item in the morphology of classical Hebrew (Hebrew Bible, *Sirach* and Qumran, and mishnaic Hebrew): the 3<sup>rd</sup> masc. and fem. pl. pronominal suffixes of nouns ending in *-oth*, found in both a short suffixed pronominal form (שמותן, אבותם) and a long suffixed pronominal form (שמותיהן, אבותיהם). Examination of the distribution of these forms revealed the following:

a. The short pronoun predominates in the early books of the Hebrew Bible, whereas the long pronoun predominates in the late books. In mishnaic Hebrew the long pronoun is used almost exclusively. (Note that, in Chronicles, which is closely linked to the books of the First Temple period, the short pronoun is still widely current. In tannaitic Hebrew, forms of the short pronoun not attested in the Bible, for example, מזונותן, מעשרותן, גגותן [biblical גגותיהם], may still be found.)

b. In *Sirach* the short pronoun predominates and in Qumran texts as well it is much more frequent than the long pronoun. These findings contrast with the ones culled from the late biblical books of the Second Temple period and from tannaitic Hebrew.

In my opinion, the overall data from these Hebrew texts indicate that two parallel types of language are involved: the first is a language type in which the long pronoun predominates and the short one is abandoned, reflected in the late biblical books and in tannaitic Hebrew (does this type perhaps reflect spoken language?). Nonetheless, it also draws on the

second type to an extent. In the second language type, which is more conservative, the short pronoun predominates. This type is reflected by *Sirach* and by the Qumran texts (does it perhaps reflect the conservative character of a written language represented by literature?), but also draws on the first type.

### **Linguistic Innovations in the Hebrew of the Hellenistic Period: Qumran and the Septuagint**

**Jan Joosten**

The potential relevance of the Septuagint for the study of Qumran Hebrew was realized early on by experts such as Edward Yechezkel Kutscher and Chaim Rabin. Attentive study of the Septuagint allows at least a partial retracing of the Hebrew known by the Greek translators, assumed for chronological reasons to be close to the Hebrew of the Qumran writers. Where a linguistic usage known from the Scrolls can be shown to underlie a Septuagint passage, Qumran Hebrew is freed from the threat of isolation that hangs over it. The present paper discusses two items for which it can be claimed with some assurance that Qumran and the Septuagint illuminate each other: (a) זן = 'this'; and (b) עלילה = '(false) cause, excuse'.

### **Notes on the Language of the Qumran Scrolls**

**Matthew Morgenstern**

This article discusses the linguistic basis of several enigmatic forms in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In particular, it attempts to demonstrate how the polyvalence of certain Hebrew forms allows for multiple interpretations, each of which may be linguistically justified.

The following examples are considered: (1) the meanings of Hebrew בלע and its interpretation as 'attack, rebuke' in *Peshet Habakkuk* (1QpHab) 5:8–11; (2) the confusion of the roots אשם and שם following the elision of an *aleph* in Qumran Hebrew. The pseudo-corrective



spellings נאכר and נמאס are explained by reference to this phenomenon; (3) the alternative interpretations of the form קרקר and their significance for the variant readings of Num. 24:17; and (4) the eschatological interpretation of שילה in Gen. 49:10 in the light of contemporary orthographic practices.

## The Language of the Aramaic Documents from Qumran

Steven E. Fassberg

Even if the Aramaic documents found in the Qumran caves were not written or copied at Khirbet Qumran, several of these texts share a feature that distinguishes them from all other Middle Aramaic corpora: the 2 m.s. pronominal suffix *-kh*. This phenomenon suggests a common origin for those texts in which the suffix is attested, be it Khirbet Qumran or elsewhere.

Some five decades after the initial publication of the longest of the Aramaic documents, 1QapGen, and a few years after the publication of several additional columns from it, the language of the *Genesis Apocryphon* seems to reveal, as believed by E. Y. Kutscher, isolated examples of features that are salient in later Palestinian Aramaic: final nasalization on adverbs and proper nouns (and perfect verbs?), the G infinitive with *o*-vowel (*mqṭwl*), and the 3 m.s. pronominal suffix on dual/plural nouns (*-wy*). Other documents also show rare examples of features that are common in Late Western Aramaic: the G imperfect with *o*-vowel (*yqṭwl*), forms of the derived stems with prefixed *m*- and suffixed *-h*, and final nasalization on the adverbs *kmn* and *tmn*. All these phenomena point to a Palestinian Aramaic that is in transition from an older, classical form to that of Late Western Aramaic.

**Addenda to 4Q462****Devorah Dimant**

In *Meghillot* 1 a fresh edition of 4Q462 (4QNarrative) was published with detailed comments and discussion. The present note offers a slightly different supplement for line 8 in order to create a syntactically smoother phrase. Another alteration is suggested for line 4, where the future 3<sup>rd</sup> per. sing. **יֵאמֶרְךָ** replaces the first edition's **יֵאמֶרְנִי** in order to provide a better link with the following line, which speaks of Israel. Finally **לְיִשְׂרָאֵל** in line 5 is connected with Isa. 52:2–3. Thus, Isaiah 52 constitutes the background not only of the second section of the text (4Q462 1 13–19) but also of the first part, which deals with Egypt (4Q462 1 1–12).

*English summaries edited by Dena Ordan*