

## English Abstracts

### Study with the Fleshly Spirit: A Rereading of 4Q417 1

Jonathan Ben-Dov

The textual unit 4Q417 1 1–18 is preserved on one of the largest surviving fragments of the composition *Musar La-Mevin* (4QInstruction). This unit is part of the prologue section of the entire composition and is sometimes considered its primary introduction, or at least one potential opening. The concluding lines of this unit draw a contrast between humans who join forces with the angels (called here עַם רוּחַ “the spiritual nation”) and those who own a רוּחַ בָּשָׂר “a fleshly spirit.” The contrast has often been understood as a dichotomy between two kinds of human beings, which are ontologically distinct. Parallels to this dichotomy were pointed out in the writings of Philo of Alexandria and in Paul’s epistles.

Using new digital canvasses for 4Q416 and 4Q417, the present article suggests that the programmatic units in 4Q417 1 and 4Q416 1 were both contained in *Musar La-Mevin*, with 4Q416 preceding. Text from a previous turn of the scroll is stuck to the verso of 4Q417 1, which therefore could not have been the beginning of *Musar La-Mevin*. The article suggests several new readings, textual reconstructions, and new interpretations of key terms in this unit. I suggest a reading of this textual unit as an optimistic call for the addressee to observe, decipher and follow the rules of history and cosmology. The capacity to understand the *raz nihyeh* is inherent in the fashioning of humankind and is rooted in human cognition; the world was initially constructed with this aim in mind. The two categories of humankind mentioned in lines 14–18 are not ontologically distinct but are rather two stages in the initiation of a *mevin*, as previously suggested by Rey and Bakker. The unit should thus be read as a treatise on education and adolescence, and many phrases in it are explained accordingly. Finally, the parallels with Pauline rhetoric are reinterpreted based on this new reading.

**Priestly Dues, Torah Commandments, and *Raz Nihyeh*:  
New Joins and Readings in Instruction**

Shlomi Efrati

In this paper I offer new reconstructions of two passages from the Qumran wisdom composition Instruction (also known as *Musar La-Mevin*): 1Q26 1+2 (par. 4Q423 3+4+4a+10) and 4Q423 5+15, and investigate their implications for several key themes in the composition. I compare the instructions concerning the rights and status of priests in 1Q26 1+2 with the “priestly” passage 4Q418 81, and discuss the identity and status of the addressee in both sections. I also offer a new interpretation of the mention of Korah in 4Q423 5+15, based on a comparison with both Ben Sira and early rabbinic sources, which connect Korah’s rebellion with the divine affirmation of priestly dues. In both passages the Torah commandments and narratives are linked to the *raz nihyeh*, “the mystery of that which comes into existence,” an opaque term which is central to Instruction. In the last part of the article, I examine this link in comparison to the concept of mysteries in writings of the Qumran community, and argue that, while both Instruction and the community writings suggest that God’s mysteries can be revealed through (the study of) the Torah, in Instruction the mystery revealed is the “mystery of existence” itself—an idea which seems to go beyond what is found in other writings from Qumran.

**LAB’s Usage of a “Complex Cluster of Scriptural Passages”  
in Rewriting 1 Sam 2:27–36**

Atar Livneh

In her analysis of the *pesharim* in the Damascus Document, Liora Goldman coins the term “complex cluster of Scriptural passages” to denote the reworking of a primary biblical text via secondary texts that share thematic or linguistic association. These draw additional scriptural passages in their wake to create an elaborate structure consisting of a number of sources. This paper exemplifies the use of this device in a “Rewritten Bible” text—

LAB 53:8–10. The passage reworks the prophecy of the “man of God” to Eli in 1 Sam 2:27–36, and draws on a number of disparate biblical verses in the process. Invoking Deut 18:5 and Numbers 17 (which also treat the election of the priestly family), it frames the blossoming of Aaron’s rod in the latter in the context of the Genesis account of the miraculous growth of fruit trees in the course of a single day. Identifying the priestly family of 1 Samuel 2 with Aaron’s rod, it further interweaves Ps 105:26–27, harmonizing the reference to Aaron’s election and Moses’ mission in the psalm with the depiction of Moses in Deut 34:11–12. It then retells the punishment of Eli’s house, as foretold by the man of God, in light of the description of the fulfillment of the prophecy in 1 Sam 4:17–18 and Ps 78:64, associating these passages with the transgression of Eli’s sons and the prohibition against taking a mother bird from a nest along with her young. By tying these passages together via the theme of parents and children dying at the same time, it hereby also sets the destiny of Eli’s house within a covenantal framework.

**The Levirate in Jubilees 41 in light of Benjamin  
al-Nahāhawndī’s Interpretation of the Story of Judah  
and Tamar (Genesis 38)**

Yoram Erder

Benjamin al-Nahāhawndī was considered by the early Karaites as one of the precursors of their movement, and therefore they learnt his legal interpretations, but with considerable criticism. The difference in outlook between Benjamin and the Karaites is demonstrated clearly in their respective interpretations of the levirate laws. The prevailing Karaite *halakhah* is that the designated levirate brother (Deut 25:5) is not to be understood as a brother by birth, but rather as a member of the larger family unit or tribe; this is deduced in light of the law that forbids one to uncover the nakedness of a brother’s wife (Lev 18:16). Benjamin, on the other hand, believed that the levirate duty should be performed by the brother by birth, but only in the event that the widowed sister-in-law was a betrothed virgin. If this was not the case, the commandment which

forbids uncovering the nakedness of a brother's wife would be violated, and thus the levirate duty should not be performed.

In dealing with the levirate law, the story of Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) should be considered. Judah ordered his son Onan to perform levirate marriage with Tamar, his sister-in-law, following the (childless) death of his brother Er. After Onan's death, Judah prevented his youngest son, Shelah, from performing his levirate duty. Most Karaites argued that this story cannot indicate that a brother must perform levirate marriage with his sister-in-law, since the levirate commandment, like the prohibition against uncovering the nakedness of the sister-in-law, was given only at Mount Sinai. Benjamin, however, considered the story as evidence that the two laws mentioned above were already in force during the life of Judah; he emphasized that the two brothers, Onan and Shelah, were obligated to perform levirate marriage because Tamar, according to the story told in Genesis, remained a virgin.

It is well known that according to the Book of Jubilees, many commandments were given before the revelation at Mount Sinai. The author included the levirate commandment among them. In his rewritten story of Judah and Tamar, he stressed, more strongly than in Genesis, Tamar's virginity after her marriage to Er and Onan.

Many scholars have tried to decipher the levirate law the author of Jubilees had in mind when he rewrote the story of Judah and Tamar. My conclusion is that, like Benjamin after him, he believed that the levirate duty should be performed by a birth-brother on the condition that the sister-in-law was a virgin. His rewritten story was meant to prove that Tamar, who gave birth to Judah's descendants Peretz and Zerach, was never impregnated by any Canaanite seed.

The Karaites claimed that Benjamin was influenced by the "cave sect," an ancient sect that had disappeared from the stage of history, and was named by this name because its writings were found in caves. My previous research has taught me the closeness between Benjamin's legal interpretations and those found in the Qumran scrolls and the Book of Jubilees. The case before us demonstrates another instructive example of Benjamin's proximity to the legal exegesis of the Book of Jubilees.

### **Why Are There No מִצְרַיִם in the Bible?**

Elisha Qimron and Chanan Ariel

The gentilic מִצְרַיִם (without the definite article ה) does not occur in the Bible. In places where it is required by the context or the syntax, the vocalized form מִצְרַיִם is used instead. Fortunately, 4QExod<sup>m</sup> occasionally reads מצריים “the Egyptians” instead of the MT מִצְרַיִם. This is surely the required form in these cases, while the Hebrew pronunciation traditions of the Bible do not reflect the form intended in the consonantal text.

### **“The Way of his Heart” (CD 1:11): A Fixed Term in the Literature of the Yaḥad**

Devorah Dimant

The term “in the way of his heart” (בדרך לבו) appears only once in the Damascus Document but it figures in an important passage, describing the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness and how he guided the first covenanters in the way of God. The locution also occurs in *Hodayot* col. 12 and in one copy of *Barkhi Nafshi* (4Q434). In each of them the term is elaborated in detail and is presented as an emblem of the particular way and practice of the Yaḥad.

### **The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of 1 Maccabees**

Nathan Evron

The common view among scholars of 1 Maccabees is that the Greek version we have is a translation of a lost Hebrew original. This paper presents several examples of reconstructions of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the book, based on phrases documented in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus, it is proposed that the phrase καὶ ἐτάχυναν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς πόλεμον (1 Macc

2:35) is a translation of *וימהרו עליהם מלחמה* (cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 13:19); *ἀβουλεύτως* (1 Macc 5:67) is a translation of *אשר לא בעצה* (cf., e.g., 1QS 7:11); *τὸ κάλλος τῶν γυναικῶν* (1 Macc 1:26) of *זיו הנשים*; *καὶ ἀντελάβοντο τοῦ νόμου* (1 Macc 2:48) of *ויעזרו את התורה* (cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:36–37); and *ζητοῦντες δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίμα* (1 Macc 2:29) of *דורשי צדקה ומשפט* (cf. 4Q298 3–4 ii 5). These examples illustrate how the Hebrew documented in the Dead Sea Scrolls may add linguistic data from the period of 1 Maccabees' composition, which will provide new suggestions for reconstruction or confirm previous hypotheses.