

CONTENTS

	Page
E. Y. KUTSCHER: The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: a Preliminary Study	1
YIGAL YADIN: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews .	36
N. AVIGAD: The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents	56
JACOB LICHT: An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits in DSD .	88
M. H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN: Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents	101
M. H. SEGAL: The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of its Composition	138
CHAIM RABIN: The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew	144
SHEMARYAHU TALMON: The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert	162
Z. BEN-HAYYIM: Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Special Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls	200
DAVID FLUSSER: The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity . . .	215
Index of Quotations	267

EDITORS' PREFACE

The present volume of studies by members of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem appears ten years after the acquisition of part of the complete scrolls from Cave I by the late Professor E. L. Sukenik for this University, and thus marks the tenth anniversary of a new and important field of research.

The Hebrew University has no special department devoted to research on the Dead Sea Scrolls. The contributors to this volume are connected with the departments of Bible, Archaeology, Hebrew Philology, General Linguistics, and Comparative Religion. The studies thus illustrate the contribution these disciplines have to make to Scrolls research, as well as the contribution this research can make to the corresponding fields of studies. Some of the articles were originally delivered as papers at the Second World Congress of Jewish Studies, held at the Hebrew University Campus in July 1957, at which a session was set aside for the Scrolls.

The opinions expressed are those held by the individual contributors, and sometimes contradict each other. Nevertheless we believe that as a whole they are characteristic of the approach of what might perhaps be called the Jerusalem School in Scrolls research, which here for the first time appears before its learned colleagues as a body.

In order to speed up the printing of this volume, the editors have departed from the practice of arranging articles according to the names of authors or by subjects, and have printed the various contributions in the order in which they received them. The index of quotations was compiled by Mr. Baruch Kanael, M.A.

The editors wish to thank Professor Benjamin Mazar, President and Rector of the Hebrew University, for his unfailing encouragement, Professors H. J. Polotsky and N. Rotenstreich, Deans of the Faculty of Humanities during the period of preparation of this volume, Professor A. Fuks, Chairman of the Editorial Committee of the *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, and Messrs. G. Liebes, Chairman, and H. Toren, Secretary of the Magnes Press, for help given in connection with their work.

Special appreciation is due to the owners and workers of the Central Press, Jerusalem, for carrying out their difficult task so successfully.

Jerusalem, March 1958.

C. RABIN

Y. YADIN

The Language of the “Genesis Apocryphon” *)

A preliminary study

I. THE SET OF THE LANGUAGE

§I. *The linguistic background*

It would be difficult indeed to overestimate the value of the Aramaic Scroll for research into the Aramaic language, for ‘Reichs-aramäisch’ (= R) which includes Biblical Aramaic (= B.A.), Targum, and later Western Aramaic (= W.A.). In all these fields, the scroll may help to solve problems that have vexed scholars for generations.

In order to set the find in its proper perspective, it will be well to outline the situation concerning the Aramaic material coming from Syria-Palestine and the adjacent territories from about 1000 B.C.E. until the rise of the (later) Western Aramaic dialects, which include Galilaean Aramaic (= G.A.), Samaritan Aramaic (= S.A.) and Christian Aramaic (= CH. A.) of Palestine. All of these reflect the linguistic situation of about the middle of the first millennium C.E.

We may say without hesitation that the Aramaic material which can confidently be located in this territory before the rise of Western Aramaic is very scant indeed. As far as Palestine is concerned, it is practically non-existent.

What we do have is the following¹: Aramaic inscriptions from Northern Syria, going back chiefly to the 8th—9th centuries B.C.E., and the Elephantine papyri, edited by Cowley and Kraeling. The latter, while very important in themselves, naturally give us but limited information on the Aramaic written (and spoken?) in Palestine. The Driver documents² recently edited come from the territory of the later Eastern Aramaic.

*) A *Genesis Apocryphon* by N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, Jerusalem, 1956. I wish to thank Dr. N. Avigad and Dr. Y. Yadin for the opportunity to study their transliteration (and translation) of the scroll prior to publication. I also wish to express my thanks to Dr. G. Sarfatti, and to Miss Gila (Helen) Hochstein for their valuable technical assistance.

1. Cf. to the following F. Rosenthal: *Die aramaistische Forschung* etc. Leiden, 1939, p. 7 ff.; A. Dupont-Sommer: *Les Araméens*, Paris, 1949 pp. 79 ff.

2. To be dealt with in my article ‘Aramaic Dialects and the Problem of Biblical Aramaic’, to be published in the *JAOS*.

The Nabataean inscriptions, dating mainly from the 1st century B.C.E. to the beginning of the 2nd century C.E., do not belong to Palestine proper. Besides, it still has to be established how far this language represents R. and how far it reflects the influence of the (later) Western Aramaic on R. (cf. below § 14, 5). Then again, the Arabic element is to be reckoned with, since the Nabataeans were, at least originally, an Arabic-speaking people.³

The same reservations apply even more to Palmyrene (1st century B.C.E. — 3rd century C.E.) where there are unmistakable traces of Eastern Aramaic. A further very important point to be discussed in connection with Nabataean and Palmyrene will be taken up later (§ 14).

B.A. has been one of the most debated Biblical problems for more than sixty years. There are two questions to be answered: 1) Time of origin; 2) Place of origin.

1) As to the time of origin, the estimates based on linguistic evidence vary widely.⁴ But what concerns us here is the second question: 2) Where did it originate? Was it written in the East, the territory of the (later) Eastern Aramaic, viz. Syriac, Babylonian Talmudic and Mandaic, or in the West? Or, being part of 'Reichsaramäisch' that was (or at least was intended to be) uniform throughout the entire Persian empire, it therefore does not reflect any dialectal traits, as maintained by Baumgartner?⁵ It is my belief that B.A. shows indications of eastern origin.⁶ Be that as it may, Biblical Aramaic cannot be used as a source for the Aramaic of Palestine until this question has been solved.

As for the Targums of the Onkelos type (= T.O.), here once again we are up against the double question: 1) Time of origin; 2) Place of origin. It is true that Targums are of very early origin.⁷ But we are by no means able, so far, to fix the date of our T.O. as known to us, and to state how much earlier it is than the Talmudic period (200—500 C.E.).⁸

3. Cf. Rosenthal, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 1), p. 89 ff.

4. Cf. the excellent account given on the controversy by Rosenthal, *ib.*, p. 60 ff.

5. *ZAW.*, 1927, p. 81 ff., especially p. 133.

6. Cf. my article mentioned in note 2.

7. Cf. A. Berliner: *Targum Onkelos*, Zweiter Teil, Berlin, 1884, pp. 81 ff.; P. E. Kahle: *The Cairo Geniza*, London, 1947, pp. 120—121.

8. I am therefore unable to agree with the opinion of Rosenthal *op. cit.*

As to 2), Th. Nöldeke and G. Dalman believe it to be of western origin; but P. E. Kahle argues for eastern origin (cf. below §8). The Palestinian Targums (Pseudo-Jonathan and Yerushalmi) are late. It should be noted that the texts, with the exception of those edited by Kahle⁹, are corrupt, and have to be used very cautiously.¹⁰

So what remains in this respect is pitifully little: a few very short inscriptions in Jerusalem, a few Aramaic words in the New Testament and Josephus, the Aramaic bill of sale from 134 C.E.¹¹, the 'Ta'anith Scroll' (1st cent. C.E.)¹² and the few Aramaic words and sentences to be found in Tannaitic literature.¹³ These, however, have to be used with care, since their text is not yet established.¹⁴

In this virtual vacuum of Aramaic texts in Palestine before the rise of Middle Aramaic (about 500 C.E.), a comparatively extensive text has now emerged which should at least provide the answer to the question: What did the Aramaic written (and spoken?) in Palestine at a certain period (cf. below §14) preceding Middle Aramaic, look like? What is more, this text may solve the problem of the origin of T.O. (cf. below §8).

§2. *The language of the Scroll and Middle Aramaic (= M.A.)*

The first question to be dealt with is this: Is the language of the scroll 'Reichsaramäisch' in general, or Biblical Aramaic in particular? Our answer must be in the negative. There are unmistakable traits which clearly set in apart from B.A. These are the following:

(supra, n. 1) p. 105: "dies Targum seit seiner Entstehung, die wohl schon in vorchristlicher Zeit anzusetzen ist, seine Sprachform nicht mehr gewandelt habe".

9. P. E. Kahle: *Masoreten des Westens*, II. Stuttgart, 1930, pp. 1–62.

10. The fragments edited by Kahle are dated by him to 700–900 C.E (op. cit. pp. 2*–3*). They certainly reflect the language spoken a few hundred years earlier. But the exact date cannot be established.

11. *RB*, 61, 1954, p. 182 ff.; cf. *BASOR* No. 136, 19, pp. 17–19. The Nabataean document published in the same issue of *RB* can, of course, be taken into consideration only as evidence for Nabataean.

12. Critical edition by H. Lichtenstein, *HUCA* 8–9, (1931–32) pp. 257–351, cf. p. 264. There exists no reliable manuscript giving the whole text. Cf. also G. Dalman: *Grammatik des jüd. pal. Aramäisch*, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1905, pp. 8–9.

13. G. Dalman, *ib.*, pp. 9–10.

14. Other material from outside Palestine will be cited below.

1) In B.A. the demonstrative pronoun sing. masc. is דְּנָה (R. יִנְה). In the scroll it is nearly always דָּן = M.A. (about 15 instances), while דְּנָא appears three times only (II, 2, 17; XX, 28?).

2) In B.A. the prefix of the causative conjugation perfect, imperative and infinitive is practically always ה, e.g. הַנִּמְפֵּק (there are four exceptions). The same applies to a lesser extent to the reflexive-passive conjugations.¹⁵ In the scroll it is always, without exception, א (e.g. אֶכְלִיאַת XIX, 16; אֹדִית XXI, 3 etc.; אַתְּבַהֵלַת II, 3 etc., about 25 instances), a feature that it shares again with M.A.

3) The particle הֵן 'if' of B.A. appears twice as אָן (XXII, 21, 22) = M.A. and twice as הֵן (II, 5; XX, 19) = B.A.

4) Forms like תִּמְן XXI, 1, 2, 3, etc.;¹⁶ = תִּמָּה in B.A.; כִּמְן XXI, 14 twice (cf. below § 7) = כִּמָּה in B.A. (also כִּמָּה, כִּמָּא occurs, e.g. XX, 2, 4 etc.); אַחֹי XXI, 34 = אַחֹהִי* in B.A.; מְרִיתוֹן XXII, 4 = מְרִינְתָהוֹן* in B.A.; בְּעוֹן XIX, 15 = בְּעוּ in B.A. (cf. אֶתְוֹן XIX, 26); תְּנִיאַנִי (cf. below § 10) = תְּנִינֹת in B.A., can be mentioned as further instances.

5) The spelling of certain words also betrays a M.A. background, viz. שְׁנִי II, 11; XIX, 27; XX, 8, 31 etc. (but שְׁנִיאִין XX, 33, 34; שְׁנִיאַ XX, 7 is feminine, probably so XX, 31) = שְׁנִיאַ in B.A.; מְרִי II, 9, 13, 24; XX, 12 etc. = מְרָאִי in B.A. (Kethib). There also occur *plene* spellings like רְאִישָׁה XX, 3 = רְאִישָׁה in B.A.; a number of instances of *plene* spelling with ו, e.g. קוֹשֵׁט II, 7, 10, 18; אִינֶס XX, 11; חוֹקֶף XX 14, etc.; a number of instances of *plene* spelling with א, e.g. וְאֶכְלִיאַת XIX, 16; הוֹאֵת XXII, 25; מְשִׁרִיאַתִי XIX, 1; תְּנִיאַנִי XXI, 1; לוֹאֲתִי XXI, 5, 7; etc.

6) The order of words in the sentence is different from that of B.A. (cf. below II, § 4).

These points may suffice to prove that the language of the scroll is indeed different from 'Reichsaramäisch' in general and Biblical Aramaic in particular. Further points will follow below (§ 8, 9, 10).

But if the language is not identical with B.A., neither is it M.A., since there are a number of traits which it shares with B.A.

15. Cf. ZAW, 1927, pp. 106, 108.

16. To be sure, תִּמְן is already found at Elephantine, cf. P. Leander: *Laut- und Formenlehre des Ägyptisch-Aramäischen*, Göteborg 1928, § 61a.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF QUMRAN HEBREW.

I

Much has been written about the ways in which the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls differs from Biblical Hebrew (BH) as we know it from our Massoretic Hebrew Bible. As far as is known to me, the question has never been asked why the non-Biblical Scrolls are written in BH at all. In attempting to throw some light on this problem, the present article will deal with what we might call the internal features of their language only as far as seems necessary, and is concerned primarily with its external aspects, i.e. its meaning for the society which used it and the general linguistic situation in which it was embedded.

The study of this aspect is not dependent upon the exact dating of the composition of the Scrolls or the identification of the group from which they emanated. If we except the extreme views of J. Brand, who places them in the first exile, and of Prof. Zeitlin and Dr. Weis, who consider them to be medieval, all datings lie between the limits 190 B.C.E. — 100 C.E., which are, of course, also those fixed by the radio-carbon tests. As for the sect, all these views agree that it was not identical with Rabbinic Judaism and on the other hand shares certain features with the latter which place the two in opposition to other Jewish groups of the time and strongly suggest some period of common development. Most views of the identity of the sect see in the "interpreters of smooth things", the sect's chief opponents, either Rabbinic Judaism or its mother group, the Pharisees.

We may say, therefore, that by common consent the non-Biblical Scrolls were composed at a time when Mishnaic Hebrew (MH) was being used as a literary idiom by some part of the Jewish community of Palestine, and that this part included the chief opponents of our sect. The synchronism is evident with regard to the later datings, but even the Maccabean dating would make the Scrolls simultaneous with the first scholars mentioned in Aboth i and with the early *balakboth* adduced by F. Baer¹ as having been formulated in the Maccabean age. We must ask, therefore, what caused the two contemporaneous groups to adopt such essentially different vehicles for the expression of their ideas.

1. "היסודות ההיסטוריים של ההלכה", *Zion* 17 (5712), 1-55.

In the middle ages it was quite normal amongst Jews to employ different types of Hebrew, or even different languages, for different literary genres. Quite apart from the fact that we have no right to assume such habits for the end of the Second Temple period, the hypothesis of division by genres is also inapplicable in itself. The *halakhah* in the Scrolls uses typologically the same language as the non-halakhic material, completely different from that of Pharisaic-Rabbinic halakhah; while the earliest sayings reported in Talmudic literature are of "aggadic" character and, like all Rabbinic aggadah, use MH, not the Hebrew of the Scrolls. We are therefore concerned with two groups which used different types of Hebrew for *all* their literary purposes. Apparent exceptions will be discussed in the further course of our argument.

II

The problem exists even if MH was only a literary idiom, and the spoken language of the period Aramaic, as was believed in the 19th century and is still widely accepted in scholarly circles. It gains in depth, however, through the recognition that MH was spoken in Judaea during the last centuries of the Second Temple period. This assumption, which has been gaining ground in recent years², is based upon the following cumulative considerations: a) MH contains constructions and forms not derivable from BH or Aramaic, some even demonstrably older than BH³; b) if MH were an artificial combination of BH and Aramaic, we should expect it to be unstable — as such mixtures generally are — but in fact it is no less stable than BH; c) there is a distinct MH influence in some late Biblical books (Jonah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, some Psalms) and in Ben Sira⁴, which is difficult to explain except by assuming that MH was the spoken vernacular of the authors of these works⁵; d) traces of MH influence can be dis-

2. Cf. H. Birkeland, *The Language of Jesus* (Avh. Norske Vid.-Ak., II. Hist-Filos. Kl., 1954, No. 1), Oslo 1954. The first to work out the theory in detail was M. H. Segal, "Mišnaic Hebrew and its Relation to Biblical Hebrew and to Aramaic", *JQR* 20 (1909-10), 647-737.

3. E.g. the fem. demonstrative pron. *zo* (BH *zo-th*), the 3rd sg. fem. perf. of verbs tert. inf. *bayath* (BH *bayethab* = **hayat-at*); *mašbezeth* "grindstone" — Tell Amarna *mašbeldu* = **mašhaztu* (Tur-Sinai, *Ha-Lashon weha-Sefer* I, 2nd edn., Jerus. 1954, p. 336); *nemušoth* "those who hang back" — Tell Amarna (113, 34, etc.) *yinamušu*.

4. Cf. D. Strauss, *Sprachliche Studien in den hebräischen Sirachfragmenten*, Zürich 1900; for later literature see Ackroyd, *VT* 3 (1953) 118, note 3.

5. See M. Z. Segal, *Leshonenu* 7 (7696), 100-120.

covered in the Greek renderings of the LXX and in the Greek text of some Pseudepigrapha; e) both Christian Palestinian Aramaic and, to a lesser extent, Samaritan Aramaic contain borrowings from MH which cannot—as in the case of Galilean Jewish Aramaic—be accounted for by the acquaintance of their speakers with MH literature; f) the use of MH in the Bar Kosba letters from Murabbaʿat.

Indeed, the Scrolls themselves provide further support for the existence of a MH colloquial in the ranks of the group who composed the Scrolls. This falls under three heads:

g) The Copper Scroll⁶, which according to the preliminary announcement of May 1956 is written in “colloquial Mishnaic Hebrew”. I would suggest that the departure from the type of language used elsewhere is due to the fact that that scroll contains verbatim reports of eye-witnesses. Whatever the explanation, it is clear that the scribes of the sect both understood and knew how to write MH.

h) The possibility that in the Scrolls MH is actually alluded to, as “a halting language” (DST IV, 16), “an uncircumcised language” (ib. II, 18), and “a tongue of blasphemies” (CDC V, 11–12).⁷ The counter-argument, that these terms are mere metaphors to characterize the wrongness and insolence of the opponents’ teaching, is weakened by the appearance next to it, in both DST passages, of “another tongue”, as well as by the fact, stressed again and again, that the false teachers know how to disguise their falsehoods as true halakhah (“righteousness”, CDC IV, 17), thus are not open anti-nomians and blasphemers.

i) The frequent appearance of involuntary Mishnaisms in the language of the Scrolls. The instances adduced in the following paragraphs, taken mainly from CDC, could be multiplied.

1. Words and meanings of words: *be-pherush* (CDC II, 13), *msr Qal* (III, 3), *ḥwb* Qal (ib. 10), *šlm* Ni. (? IV, 8), *ḥurban* (V, 20),

6. For the reasons for writing that scroll, cf. perhaps B. T. Bekh. 50a: ‘They sought to hide away (*lignoz*) all silver and gold in the world on account of the silver and gold of Jerusalem’.

7. Cf. my *Qumran Studies* (Oxford 1957), p. 68. M. Zucker, *Tarbiš* 27 (1957–8), 73, states that the Karaites “rejected not only the contents of Mishnah and Gemara, but also their language”. This would constitute an interesting further link between them and the Qumran Sect; however it seems to me that Z.’s source, Saadiah’s statement in *כתאב אלסבעין לפט׳ה* (ed. N. Allony, *Goldziher Memorial Volume II* (1956), p. 15 of offprint) only means that the Karaites did not *know* MH, not that they rejected it as a language.