

# MEGHILLOT

Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls

XV

2020–2021

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 is published with the assistance of

The Perry Foundation for Biblical Research,  
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

*and*

The Paula and David Ben-Gurion Fund for Jewish Studies  
established by the Federmann Family, Mandel Institute of Jewish Studies  
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

\*\*\*

Faculty of Humanities, University of Haifa  
The George and Florence Wise Chair for Judaism in Antiquity,  
University of Haifa

\*\*\*



Copyediting by Israel Ronen

ISBN 978-965-536-333-3

ISSN 2309-3501

©

Copyright by the Bialik Institute, Jerusalem, The University of Haifa,  
and The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2020

Computerization: The Academy of the Hebrew Language

Printed in Israel

<http://megillot.haifa.ac.il>

<http://orion.msc.huji.ac.il>

<http://www.bialik-publishing.co.il>

## Contents

Foreword		v
<i>Texts and Editions</i>		
Jonathan Ben-Dov	An Early Halakhic Midrash in the Fragments of 4Q249 <i>Midrash Moshe</i>	3
Asaf Gayer	New Readings and Joins in the Wisdom Composition <i>Instruction</i>	21
Eibert Tigchelaar	A Cave 4 <i>Damascus Document</i> Fragment Corresponding to CD 7:7–13 (4Q273a/4QD <sup>i</sup> )	45
Eibert Tigchelaar	New Identifications of Fragments of <i>4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C</i>	51
Itamar Kislev	The Text of the Opening Verses of the Book of Exodus	61
Moshe Lavee	A New Copy of Medieval Hebrew Tobit	81
Elisha Qimron and Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky	Two New Readings in the <i>Damascus Document</i>	97
<i>Studies in Language and Literature</i>		
Esther Eshel	“And They Asked for Themselves the Book and the Wisdom and the Truth” (1Q20 19:25): Knowledge and its Transmission in the <i>Genesis Apocryphon</i> and Related Jewish Texts	107
Liora Goldman	“To Interpret all the Words of his Servants the Prophets” (1QpHab 2:8–9): The Qumran <i>Pesher</i> Reconsidered	123

Atar Livneh	The Evolution of Early Lists of Examples: A Comparative Analysis of <i>m. Ta'an. 2:4</i> , <i>4 Ezra 7:106–111</i> , and <i>Apos. Con. 7.37</i>	147
Noam Mizrahi	The Chiefs of Wondrous Garments: The Thirteenth <i>Song of the Sabbath</i> <i>Sacrifice</i> Reconsidered	173
Itai Kagan	“A Rightful Plant Forever”: The Evolution of a Phrase in Second Temple Literature	203
Menahem Kister	Studies in the Vocabulary of the Dead Sea Scrolls	249
Reinhard G. Kratz	The Composition of Psalm 151	263
<i>Review Essays</i>		
Albert Baumgarten	Secrecy and Secret Groups in Second Temple Judaism M.E. Stone, <i>Secret Groups in Ancient Judaism</i> , New York 2018	275
Serge Ruzer	Nascent Christianity, Second Temple Judaism, the Jerusalem Temple and the Temple of the End of Days: Following a Recent Discussion E. Regev, <i>The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred</i> , New Haven 2019	285
Christian Stadel	A New Grammar of Qumran Hebrew E. Qimron, <i>A Grammar of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> , Jerusalem 2018	303
List of Abbreviations		309
English Abstracts		VII

## English Abstracts

### **An Early Halakhic Midrash in the Fragments of 4Q249 *Midrash Moshe***

**Jonathan Ben-Dov**

This article presents a reconstruction and commentary of the first column of 4Q249, a fragmentary papyrus scroll in cryptic script whose title has been preserved on the verso of the first column as *Midrash/Sefer Moshe* (The word *sefer* that had been written first was later deleted by a second hand and replaced with *midrash*). This edition offers improvements on an earlier edition by Stephen Pfann in DJD 35. By rechecking the papyrus fibers and the material configuration of the fragments, I was able to approve Pfann's suggestion that fragments 1, 2, 12, 3, 4 belong to column 1 of 4Q249. Fragments 9a and 9b do not materially fit, however, and cannot be included in column 1. The present edition offers new readings and textual reconstructions.

The column deals with the laws of leprosy (צִרְעָתָא). It focuses on leprosy of the house (Leviticus 14), the only treatment of this phenomenon extant in Qumran laws. Passages from elsewhere in Leviticus 11–14 are intertwined in the discussion in a midrashic way. It is suggested that *Midrash Moshe* commented on various parts of the Book of Leviticus, including the nonlegal sections, such as chapter 26.

The fragmentary phrase מִשְׁפַּט אֶהָרִי that occurs twice in the text suggests that the author was indulging a midrashic technique of creating an analogy (הִיקָשׁ) between two similar laws: the house infected by leprosy and the house in which a corpse is found. More specifically, the question was whether the content of the infected house should be considered impure, and the scroll defines various categories for that content, apparently based on the analogy with the case of the house with a corpse. This connection was fundamental in Jewish laws of impurity, both in second Temple times and in rabbinic halakhah. The analogy made in 4Q249 is reminiscent of the tannaitic debate in *m. Nega'im* 13:12.

## **New Readings and Joins in the Wisdom Composition *Instruction***

Asaf Gayer

This article presents new joins and readings in two distinct copies of *Instruction*. Material and textual considerations support the new joins, and are presented at length to the reader. They are accompanied by new editions of the joined fragments, along with notes on readings. Limited commentary remarks are presented in an appendix.

Two of the new joins pertain to 4Q415, copy a of *Instruction*. The first, 4Q415 1 i-ii + 2 i-ii, disproves a former join of these fragments, suggested by Strugnell. Rather than positioning the fragments side by side, I argue that the two fragments should be placed one above the other. An additional join is suggested with regard to fragments 4Q415 9 + 10. Although the two joins do not provide significant new readings, the new configurations provide the foundations for a better material reconstruction of this copy.

I also suggest joining fragments 4Q418 55 + 47 + 57 + 211 + 217. Fragment 4Q418 55 is one of the substantial fragments of *Instruction*. Discussed by a great number of scholars, the fragment presents the angels as pedagogical role models for humankind. The new joins enable an improved analysis of the fragment's literary structure, which in turn sheds new light on the rhetorical move employed in it.

### **A Cave 4 Damascus Document Fragment Corresponding to CD 7:7–13 (4Q273a/4QD<sup>i</sup>)**

Eibert Tigchelaar

One of the Qumran Cave 4 unidentified fragments, PAM 44.102 frag. 66, preserves part of the text of the *Damascus Document*, corresponding to CD 7:7–13. The fragment displays one certain variant compared to the Cairo Genizah manuscript, namely in the quotation of Isaiah 7:17. The fragment reads למיִּוּם with Isa 7:17 (both MT and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), against CD 7:12 מיִּוּם. The script of the fragment is clearly different from all the other

Qumran *Damascus Document* manuscripts. Hence, the fragment probably is the sole survivor of a ninth Cave 4 *Damascus Document* manuscript, to which one may give the number 4Q273a and the name 4QD<sup>i</sup>.

### **New Identifications of Fragments of 4Q*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C***

**Eibert Tigchelaar**

Building on the foundational work of John Strugnell and Devorah Dimant on the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* (4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q387a, 4Q388a, 4Q389), the material reconstructions of Kipp Davis, and Elisha Qimron's identifications of fragments, one may identify more fragments that contribute to the ongoing reconstruction of the texts of this fragmentary work. The new identifications include (a) the textual and material identification of unidentified fragments (PAM 43.663 frag. 37; PAM 43.667 frag. 21; PAM 43.680 frag. 59) that had not yet been assigned to any of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* manuscripts; (b) the textual identification of one other unidentified fragment, 4Q282f, as overlapping with the text of *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*, but apparently not belonging materially to any of the hitherto five published manuscripts; (c) the textual identification of 4Q387a frags. 3 and 4 as overlapping with respectively 4Q389 frags. 2 and 5. These new identifications add to the textual basis of the *Apocryphon* and require us to review the codicological data. Qimron's earlier identification of the overlap of 4Q387a frag. 5 with 4Q385a frag. 1a–b ii, and the new identifications of overlaps of 4Q387a frags. 3 and 4, confirm Strugnell's assessment that the 4Q387a fragments belong to the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*, but there are no valid grounds to separate 4Q387a from 4Q387. On the other hand, 4Q282f provides evidence of yet another manuscript of the same composition, so that one may now distinguish the following five *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* manuscripts: 4Q385a, 4Q387+4Q387a, 4Q388a, 4Q389, and 4Q282f.

## **The Text of the Opening Verses of the Book of Exodus**

**Itamar Kislev**

The first five verses of the Book of Exodus enumerate the names of Jacob's sons and the sum total of the group that descended to Egypt. This passage, which is an abstract of the list of the descendants of Jacob who came to Egypt in Gen 46:8–27, has six textual witnesses. In addition to the three complete witnesses – the Masoretic text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint – the passage has been partially preserved in three fragmentary scrolls from Qumran: 4QpaleoGen–Exod<sup>l</sup> (4Q11), 4QGen–Exod<sup>a</sup> (4Q1), and 4QExod<sup>b</sup> (4Q13). These six textual witnesses display quite a few variants, including the number of people who descended to Egypt (70 vs. 75). In this article I discuss the variants, trace the evolution of the different texts, and present a reconstruction of the original version of these verses, with special attention to the contribution of 4QExod<sup>b</sup>.

## **A New Copy of Medieval Hebrew Tobit**

**Moshe Lavee**

This article provides an edition and apparatus criticus for the manuscript T-S NS 151.4, a representative of the textual branch of Tobit published in Constantinople in 1519 (קושטא רע"ט). This branch is dubbed H4 in the polyglot of Tobit by Weeks, Gathercole and Stuckenbruck. The edition is introduced by means of a detailed (yet still tentative) survey of the medieval Hebrew and Aramaic texts and reworkings of Tobit, beyond those collected in the polyglot. The medieval reworked translations of Tobit stem from the Greek and Latin texts, and do not convey direct testimony concerning the original text of the book. The article first provides a survey of early manuscripts and Genizah fragments attesting to the textual branch printed in Constantinople in 1516 (קושטא רע"ז; polyglot H3), the most popular and widely circulated Hebrew text of Tobit. Based on a survey of variants and other textual features I draw a stemma for that textual branch. A survey of the textual branch of Constantinople 1519 follows. One of the manuscripts of this branch (T-S A 45.29) was copied by Rabbi Joseph



Rosh ha-Seder, a rabbinic authority in Egypt at the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The page published here (T-S NS 151.4) belongs to an additional copy of the same textual branch. An apparatus annotating the differences between the Genizah manuscript, Ms Oxford Opp. Add. Qu. 65 and the printed edition of this textual branch is provided. While the Genizah manuscript was copied in the late fifteenth or possibly early sixteenth century, philological evidence suggest that its *Vorlage* preceded that of the copy made by Rabbi Joseph.

## Two New Readings in the *Damascus Document*

Elisha Qimron and Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky

The Genizah version of the *Damascus Document* (CD 9:8–12) reads:

8 על השבועה אשר  
9 אמר לא תושיעך ירך לך איש אשר ישביע על פני השדה  
10 אשר לא לפנים השפטים או מאמרם הושיע ידו לו וכל האוכר  
11 ולא נודע מי גנבו ממאד המחנה אשר גנב בו ישביע בעליו  
12 בשבועת האלה והשומע אם יודע הוא ולא יגיד ואשם

However, in the parallel text from Qumran (4Q267 9 i 4–7) we suggest two somewhat different readings and reconstructions:

1. [איש אשר] וְיִוָּשִׁיעַ לְוֹ עַל פְּנֵי הַשְּׂדֵה. (4Q267 9 i 4 = CD 8:9)
2. [יש]מִיעַ בְּעוֹלָיו [את שבועת האלה]. (4Q267 9 i ?? = CD 8:11–12)

Indeed, in the first case, the verb *יושיע* fits better the preceding collocation *לא תושיעך*; in the second, the verb *ישמיע* fits better the following participle *והשומע*.

On the basis of these readings, the two laws discussed here may be understood as follows:

1. According to our interpretation, Abigail's words in 1 Sam 25:26 were conceived of as a prophecy. The words *על השבועה* refer to Abigail's oath in this verse and the words *לא תושיעך ירך לך*, which we understand to mean, "Do not take the law into your own hands," allude to *והושיע ירך לך* in 1 Sam 25:26. According to our interpretation, the text states that whoever takes the law into one's own hands in a remote place (*על פני השדה*) without permission of the court is acting lawlessly.

2. If anything is missing from the property of (a member of) a community (מאד המחנה) and the thief is unknown (cf. Lev 5:1, Judg 17:2, and Prov 29:24), the owner of the stolen property is authorized to proclaim (ישמיע) a curse on whoever knows about the thief and does not say who it is.

**“And They Asked for Themselves the Book  
and the Wisdom and the Truth” (1Q20 19:25):  
Knowledge and its Transmission in the  
*Genesis Apocryphon* and Related Jewish Texts**

Esther Eshel

Authors of several Jewish texts dating from the third century BCE portray Enoch and Abraham as cultural heroes. The present article examines knowledge and its transmission in the *Genesis Apocryphon* in relation to Enoch, Noah, and Abraham. Throughout this text, the term רז is used with respect to positive and negative secret knowledge and its transmission. These insights are compared with similar references in Second Temple period Jewish texts such as Pseudo-Eupolemus, *Jubilees* and Josephus. By correlating these shared conceptions, I trace some parallels to Hellenistic conceptions of cultural heroes and suggest some possible lines of development across time and cultures. A close look at column 1 and at column 19 line 26 of the *Genesis Apocryphon* in the course of this comparison suggests new readings and interpretations.

**“To Interpret all the Words of his Servants the Prophets”  
(1QpHab 2:8–9): The Qumran *Pesher* Reconsidered**

Liora Goldman

This article offers a new perspective on two literary units from the Qumran *pesher* literature – 1QpHab 2:1–10 and CD 19:21–26 – which deal with controversies about the essence and reception of *pesher*. The purpose of the article is twofold: to examine the perception of the *pesher*ists themselves concerning the essence of *pesher*, and to re-examine the *pesher* techniques

and the classifications of the types of *peshar* as discussed in scholarly research. A careful analysis of two *peshar* units – 1QpHab 2:1–10 (part of a “continuous *peshar*”) and the literary unit of CD 19:21–26 (an “isolated *peshar*”) – and the allusions to scriptures that are interwoven into them, reveals an interpretative method that concerns the very idea of *peshar*, which is similar to that of the thematic *pesharim*.

In 1QpHab 2:1–10, the allusions to scripture that are intertwined into the *peshar* interpretation of Hab 1:5 (mainly Amos 3:7; Deut 18:18–19; and Jer 31:30) clarify the role of the prophet in maintaining the covenant between the people and God, and in warning against what is to come. These allusions are related to the role of the Teacher of Righteousness as a creator of the *pesharim* and to the role of the *pesharim* in understanding the history of Israel as well as the community’s own reality. This small thematic *peshar*, embedded into the continuous *peshar* on Habakkuk, suggests that we should allow for more flexibility in the current classification of the types of *pesharim*.

The *peshar* unit of CD 19:21–26 includes two textual focal points that are anchored in scripture. The first one is an explicit *peshar*, interpreting Deut 32:33 along with allusions to additional phrases from Deut 32:28–29. The second is a *peshar* about the Builders of the Wall and Whitewashers of the Wall, who follow the Preacher of Lies (an implicit *peshar* interpreting Ezek 13:10 and Mic 2:11). The link between these two textual centers is achieved through an allusion to Isa 44:18, where phrases common to both Deut 32:28–29 and Ezek 13:10 can be found. This *peshar* unit revolves around the themes of understanding prophecy and the importance of the method of *peshar* itself. The *peshar* exposes controversy about the meaning and significance of the events mentioned in the prophecies. It suggests that opponents of the Qumran community who do not pay heed to the *peshar* cannot understand their own reality and thus will be defeated by the “chief of the kings of Greece.”

A close examination of these units reveals the complexity and versatility of the *peshar* method, where either explicit *pesharim* within a continuous *peshar*, or isolated *pesharim* within a non-*peshar* literary framework, are interpreted by means of allusions to additional scriptures. These allusions are essential to formulating the idea of the function of *peshar*, and are by no means mere literary ornaments. In other words, the allusions and their implicit *peshar* interpretations are an essential part of the construction of the *peshar*, no less than the explicit *peshar* itself.

**The Evolution of Early Lists of Examples: A Comparative Analysis of *m. Ta'an. 2:4*, *4 Ezra 7:106–111*, and *Apos. Con. 7.37***

**Atar Livneh**

*Mishnah Ta'an. 2:4*, *4 Ezra 7:106–111*, and *Apos. Con. 7.37* all constitute *exempla* that demonstrate the relation between prayer and salvation by adducing biblical figures who prayed and were answered by God. In addition to the general theme, the three lists also share specific details – such as the specific exemplars themselves. While the affinities between *m. Ta'an. 2:4* and *Apos. Con. 7.37*, on the one hand, and between *m. Ta'an. 2:4* and *4 Ezra 7:106–111*, on the other, have been noted and commented upon, this paper discusses all three texts together in light of other contemporaneous Jewish texts. Shedding light on some of the literary features of *m. Ta'an. 2:4*, this literary analysis also reveals that *Apos. Con. 7.37* interweaves specific features that occur in the liturgy of *m. Ta'an. 2:4* and in *4 Ezra 7:106–111* – texts which in my view follow the same model. The details in *Apos. Con. 7.37* that are without parallel in either *m. Ta'an. 2:4* or *4 Ezra 7:106–111* appear to have been drawn from other ancient Jewish lists of examples.

**The Chiefs of Wondrous Garments:  
The Thirteenth Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice Reconsidered**

**Noam Mizrahi**

The liturgical composition *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* originally consisted of thirteen songs. This study focuses on the concluding song, offering a new interpretation of its best-preserved section, which survives as an almost complete paragraph (4Q405 23 ii 18–23). I argue that this paragraph can be read as a self-contained poetic unit. Thematically, it concerns the high priestly garments viewed by the speaker in the inner sanctum of the heavenly shrine. Terminologically, the passage makes sophisticated use of biblical priestly phraseology, adapting it to its own vision of the garments as animate, spiritual, and illuminating beings. I give attention to the literary makeup of the passage, to its interpretive and poetic adaptation

of the scriptural prooftexts, to its theological presuppositions, and to the historical and cultural signification of the symbol of the high priestly garments within the context of the late Second Temple period.

### **“A Rightful Plant Forever”: The Evolution of a Phrase in Second Temple Literature**

**Itai Kagan**

This article examines the Aramaic phrase נצבת קשט לעלם and its Hebrew equivalent מטעת אמת לעולם in Second Temple literature, usually translated as “eternal plant of righteousness” or the like. The phrase and its variants are attested in a range of texts, albeit with differing meanings and connotations. Like many phrases and idioms, it was used creatively in literary sources, accruing layers of meaning that can only be appreciated when the basic sense and the full history of the term are understood.

I argue that the expression is not a biblical allusion (to Isa 60:21, 61:3), but a linguistic phrase with wider circulation. According to Akkadian, Phoenician and (biblical and postbiblical) Hebrew sources, the meaning of the collocation is “rightful offspring.” The word “plant” is a term for “descendent(s),” like the more common “seed,” and the words “true” or “righteous” are used in a legal sense denoting the legitimacy of the descendant. Likewise, the term “forever” is used in common formulae wishing for the eternity of a lineage, especially in royal contexts; thus, the basic meaning of the full phrase is “a long-lasting line of heirs.”

In Second Temple literature, this phrase is used mostly in connection with the patriarchs’ blessings of progeny, especially in the narratives of Noah and Abraham. In some contexts, the phrase is used creatively, by reinterpretation of its components according to their semantic range and by conflation with similar phrases. Especially productive was the ethical and religious sense of קשט and אמת, instead of or in addition to the legal sense, “rightful offspring.” Some sources conflate earlier traditions or expand them, while infusing the phrase with religious and ideological significance, such as the singling out of Israel as the sole rightful and righteous heirs of the patriarchs, or the reapplication of the term in an eschatological setting. The starkest development is found in the sectarian

documents from Qumran, which incorporate the phrase in elaborate picturesque metaphors of the sect's special place in a sinful world.

The bulk of this article contains a close reading of the phrase's appearances in Second Temple sources, with special attention to semantic changes, expansions, and mergers with other phrases or biblical allusions. The main sources dealt with are: *1 En* 10:3; 10:16; 65:12; 67:3; 84:6; 93:2, 5, 10; *2 En*. 22:19 (=70:10); 23:49 (=71:37); *Genesis Apocryphon* 6:1; 14:13; *Aramaic Levi Document* 3:14; *Jubilees* 1:16; (6:13); 7:34; 16:17, 26; 21:24; 22:11 (24, 27); 25:3 (12, 18); 36:3; CD 1:7; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14:18; 16:7, 11; 4Q161 1–6 9 (*Pesher on Isaiah* 10:22); 1QS 8:5; 11:8.

## Studies in the Vocabulary of the Dead Sea Scrolls

Menahem Kister

1. אַסָּף/אָפֶס. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the word אַסָּף means both “threshold” and “vestibule.” The word באַפְסִי (5Q16 1+4Q525 15) is interpreted in the present article as a metathesis of באַסְפִּי, “in its vestibules.” The readings אַסְפִּי and אַפְסִי in the *Mekhilta* are discussed in relation to the midrashic interpretations of the word מַחֲסֶפֶס (Exod 16:14). This section deals with the dynamics of rabbinic parallels.

2. בָּא בִּי. The verb בָּא בִּי (4Q491 11 12–13) is interpreted as “similar to” (דְּמָה) in light of a similar semantic shift of יָצָא בִּי and other verbs of movement.

3(a). גְּבוּלוֹת. Words denoting “boundary” may mean also “law, statute” in several languages. The latter meaning is the clue to the correct interpretation of this word in 4Q266 11 12 as well as in other passages in the scrolls. The Hebrew usage sheds light on *Biblical Antiquities* 15:6, 51:3, and possibly helps to interpret a rabbinic passage.

3(b). הִקִּים. This verb in 4Q266 11 14 was frequently mistranslated. The meaning “to approve [the curses] by saying ‘amen’” is suggested here, in light of *b. Shevu'ot* 36a.

4. דוּק. This mysterious astronomical term (4Q321, 4Q321a) for a phase of the moon finds its striking counterpart in a poem by the *paytan* El'azar birbi Qillir (seventh century CE) describing the phases of the moon; there it means the waning part of the moon, derived from the root

*d-q-q*. Probably this is also the etymology of the term at Qumran. The surprising continuity of this Hebrew term throughout antiquity may have further implications for the continuity of language and content in Hebrew texts.

## **The Composition of Psalm 151**

**Reinhard G. Kratz**

Among the five apocryphal, so-called Syriac Psalms, Psalm 151 (Syriac I) is a unique case, since it is preserved not only in the Syriac tradition but also in the Septuagint and other ancient versions as well as in the Psalms Scroll, 11Q5 28:3–14. This paper concentrates on the question of the relationship between the shorter Greek version of the Septuagint (on which the Syriac version is dependent) and the longer Hebrew version from Qumran. Both versions are a sort of midrash on 1 Sam 16–17. The Septuagint version, however, is not only shorter but consists of one single poem whereas the Qumran version is divided into two separate pieces with two individual superscriptions. There is a discussion as to whether the Septuagint or the Qumran version is original. James A. Sanders, followed by Dalia Amara, postulated that the Septuagint version makes no sense and, therefore, is an abbreviation of the original Hebrew version attested in Qumran. Menahem Haran, to the contrary, argued that the Septuagint version is the original text and was supplemented and modified in the Qumran version. He, however, did not explain the Greek text of the Septuagint (or its Hebrew *Vorlage*) in detail. This gap was filled by Michael Segal. In this paper I will follow Haran and Segal and would like to add another argument for the priority of the Septuagint version in relation to the later Qumran version which, as far as I can see, has not yet been noticed. The Qumran version shows clearly many signs of secondary supplementation. Closer inspection reveals that most of these supplementations were added in order to adjust the poem to the biblical account in 1 Sam 16–17. This, I think is also a clear evidence for the secondary character of the Qumran version of Psalm 151.

## Secrecy and Secret Groups in Second Temple Judaism

Albert Baumgarten

*Review essay:* Michael Stone, *Secret Groups in Ancient Judaism*,  
New York 2018

This article is a review of Michael Stone's *Secret Groups in Ancient Judaism*. It summarizes Stone's argument that the ancient Jewish "Essene" group (that is, "allied groups exhibiting great resemblances" known from the (1) Qumran texts, (2) Josephus and other authors, and (3) archaeological data) functioned as a hierarchical group based on the shared possession of secret knowledge. Stone argues that the "Essene" group presents us with a unique opportunity among ancient secret cults in that we have its internal documents. In this, it differs from the followers of the Mysteries of Eleusis or the cult of Mithra, for which there are no extensive internal documents, and for which the secrets were so well kept among the initiates that they remain unknown despite years of research based on much new information.

Referring to the work of Georg Simmel (1858–1918), Stone explains that a group claiming to possess secret knowledge is likely to be organized as a hierarchy, in which that knowledge is graded, with the utmost secrets reserved for the heads of the hierarchy but revealed in stages as the initiates move up the hierarchical ladder. Stone concedes that the process of "Essene" initiation, as set forth in Josephus, does not focus on knowledge but on access to the purities of the group; but he cites *War* 2.141–142, in which the new member swears to carefully preserve the books of the sect and the names of the angels, as evidence that this new member now has access to knowledge and sources that he did not have before. Stone also finds clearer evidence of a knowledge-based hierarchy in Qumran texts such as 1QS column 9 and 4Q298, the "The Maskil's Address to All Sons of Dawn," not by chance written in a secret script in order to guard its special knowledge.

As to the details of that secret knowledge, Stone concedes that he is only able to partially lift the cloud. Some uncertainty remains. This knowledge probably included the "secret" legal teachings revealed exclusively to the Qumran group, as outlined by Shemesh and Werman (A. Shemesh and



C. Werman, "Hidden Things and their Revelation," *RQ* 18 [1998]: 416). Another possible source of this secret knowledge would be personal experiences, such as those recounted in the *Hodayot*.

The second part of this review essay takes its cue from Stone's comment in a footnote, that "Hierarchical seniority is also the foundation of legal provisions for conduct of members in gatherings and in their relationships with one another, *as is well known*." Taking my departure from this comment, I explore interpersonal relationships in a hierarchy, with one example based on Josephus' comments that there are four grades of Essenes; if a senior is touched by a junior, that senior must bathe as if touched by a non-Jew (*War* 2.150). The hierarchy here is reinforced in daily contact, in which status is stated and confirmed by purity regulations.

Stone's emphasis on the hierarchical organization of the "Essenes" contrasts with the egalitarian aspects that have been stressed by other scholars. One is entitled to wonder how these two modes of organization coexisted without creating friction or schism. Here, Gerald Mars's study of the hidden hierarchies in the Israeli kibbutzim of the 1980s can illuminate the ancient evidence (G. Mars, "Hidden Hierarchies in Israeli Kibbutzim," in J. G. Flanagan and S. Rayner [eds.], *Rules, Decisions and Inequality in Egalitarian Societies*, Aldershot 1988, 98–112).

For example, Josephus' comments on the egalitarian dress of Essenes (*War* 2.140), echoed by Philo's remarks (*Omn. Prob.* 86) about the commitment of a new Essene not to lord it over his fellows in dress if ever he should become a leader of the group, emphasize the interchangeable roles in their order. This is much like the kibbutz, where the inevitable elite status of some members is hidden when the kibbutz secretary takes a turn clearing tables or washing dishes. Admittedly, the previous dishwasher has about as much chance of becoming kibbutz secretary as the new member has of leading the "Essenes." However, the emphasis on this possibility, reinforced in the ancient example by common dress, serves to minimize the potential distinctions between the "Essene" elite and lower orders, even if this distinction is regularly reinforced in cases of physical contact.

This book argues convincingly for a window of insight into the "Essenes" as a hierarchical group based on the possession of secret knowledge. It offers an opportunity for further investigation of the "Essenes" from a social scientific perspective. It is thus a significant achievement for its author.

**Nascent Christianity, Second Temple Judaism,  
the Jerusalem Temple and the Temple of the End of Days:  
Following a Recent Discussion**

**Serge Ruzer**

*Review essay: Eyal Regev, The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing  
the Sacred, New Haven 2019*

Eyal Regev's new book reassesses some perceptions, still dominant in scholarly discourse, about earliest Christian attitudes toward the Temple. According to these perceptions, the belief in Jesus atoning death caused nascent Christianity as a whole to reject the value of the sacrificial cult centered in Jerusalem. Regev bases his reassessment on two methodological strategies. First, he distinguishes attitudes attested in the New Testament: participation in Temple worship; transferal of sacrificial imagery – without denying the importance of the traditional cult – to the Messiah's death and/or to the experience of his followers; criticism of the deficiencies in the performance of the cult; and finally, definite rejection of the cult. Second, he strives to reconstruct the particular historical contexts of various strata of the earliest Christian tradition; this allows Regev to comprehend the criticism as directed at concrete aspects of mishandling the Temple cult and not against the institution itself. In light of tendencies in other Second Temple Jewish sources, e.g., those attested in the Dead Seas Scrolls, Regev demonstrates that from the historical Jesus to Paul to the compilers of the Gospels, it is the first three modes of conversation with the Temple issue that are actually present. In other words, even when Jesus death is perceived as a complementing or more effective path to atonement, this does not presuppose the annulment of traditional sacrifices. Moreover, the application of sacrificial imagery to the crucifixion not only provides Jesus followers with the elucidation of his death's atoning function, but also helps to maintain their integral connection to the Temple as the foundational aspect of Judaism. Only in the later Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of Revelation does Regev discern – as in some other post-Destruction Jewish trends – the readiness to abandon traditional Temple-centered piety.

Though I identify isolated problematic points in Regev's argumentation, I find quite convincing his criticism of the uniform scholarly portrait

of earliest Christianity as parting ways with Jerusalem Temple piety, as well as his diagnosis that later Christian notions unduly informed this portrait. I suggest, however, that more attention should be paid to the complementing issue of attitudes toward the eschatological Temple and its function within end-of-days redemption scenarios. This aspect, also featured in late Second Temple sources outside the New Testament, definitely deserves an in-depth treatment in relation to the explicitly messianic movement of Jesus followers.

## **A New Grammar of Qumran Hebrew**

**Christian Stadel**

*Review essay: Elisha Qimron, A Grammar of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jerusalem 2018*

Ever since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, one line of inquiry into these unique historical sources has been linguistic. While trying to accurately describe the “new” Hebrew dialect, scholars have disagreed on the exact nature of Qumran Hebrew and its relationship to the language of the Bible and tannaitic writings. In his *Grammar of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Elisha Qimron – the eminent scholar of that language variety – presents his view of the language of the scrolls along with the most detailed description (yet) of its orthographic practices, phonology and morphology, as well as selected topics in syntax. Qimron essentially accords Qumran Hebrew the status of *primus inter pares*. *Primus*, because of the antiquity of the source texts (which unlike other attestations of Hebrew were not mediated by a chain of scribes for almost one millennium) and the size of the corpus. And *inter pares*, because Qimron readily acknowledges the importance of the linguistic information contained in the other traditions of Hebrew, to which he constantly refers for comparison. The volume brims with innovative philological discussions of Qumran Hebrew (and Biblical Hebrew) forms, and will serve both Hebraists and scholars who study the scrolls from a literary angle. The grammar provides an important counterpoint to Qimron’s three-volume edition of the Scrolls.