Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls

PROCEEDINGS OF

THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

OF THE ORION CENTER, 19-23 JANUARY, 2000

EDITED BY

ESTHER G. CHAZON

WITH THE COLLABORATION OF

RUTH A. CLEMENTS & AVITAL PINNICK

BRILL STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH

LITURGICAL PERSPECTIVES: PRAYER AND POETRY IN LIGHT OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH

EDITED BY

F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

P.W. FLINT

VOLUME XLVIII

LITURGICAL PERSPECTIVES: PRAYER AND POETRY IN LIGHT OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

PROCEEDINGS OF
THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
OF THE ORION CENTER
FOR THE STUDY OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS
AND ASSOCIATED LITERATURE,
19-23 JANUARY, 2000

EDITED BY

ESTHER G. CHAZON

WITH THE COLLABORATION OF
RUTH CLEMENTS & AVITAL PINNICK

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2003

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature.
International Symposium (5th : 2000)
Liturgical perspectives : prayer and poetry in light of the Dead Sea scrolls ; proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature / edited by Esther G. Chazon with the collaboration of Ruth Clements & Avital Pinnick.
p. cm. – (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah, ISSN 0169-9962 ; v. 48)
Includes index.
ISBN 90-04-12162-5 (hc. : alk. paper)
1. Dead Sea scrolls—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—Congresses. 2. Judaism—Liturgy—Congresses. 3. Jewish religious poetry, Hebrew—West Bank—Qumran Site—History and criticism—Congresses. I. Chazon, Esther G. II. Clements, Ruth. III. Pinnick, Avital. IV. Title. V. Series.

BM487.O75 2000
296.1'55–dc21

2003042229

ISSN 0169-9962
ISBN 90 04 12162 5

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This volume is based on the papers delivered at the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature held at the Hebrew University on January 19–23, 2000. The inspiration for the symposium topic, "Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," was the publication of two new volumes of poetical and liturgical texts from Qumran in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series (DJD 11 and 29). The corpus of more than 300 prayers and psalms from Qumran, now fully accessible in DJD, is a tremendous boon particularly because, until the Scrolls' discovery, we had preciously few texts of Jewish prayers that predated the first medieval Jewish prayer books.

True to the aims of the Orion Center and its symposia, the articles in this volume examine the latest Scrolls publications and view the prayers from Qumran in the broader context not only of Second Temple Judaism but also of the earlier, biblical and later, rabbinic periods. Adele Berlin offers a sensitive interpretation of two Qumran laments (4Q179 and 4Q501) against the background of biblical and postbiblical lament literature, paying careful attention to the artful conflation and recontextualization of biblical verses in the composition of these two "poems of alienation." Moshe Bernstein considers the intriguing juxtaposition of poetry and prose in the recently published full edition of *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*[a,b,c]; in so doing, he makes important observations about "generic identification in the Dead Sea Scrolls and related corpora." Eileen Schuller explores the place of poetical works in public communal worship, breaking new ground by bringing broad considerations and factors (e.g., the use of biblical psalms outside the Temple, concurrent religious and social developments) to bear on this important issue.

Other areas of religious experience and practice, related to mysticism and magic, are treated respectively by Esther Chazon and Esther Eshel. Esther Chazon isolates three modes of joint human-angelic prayer that correspond to three types of religious experience, and addresses the question of their correlation to different social realities or religious outlooks. In her study of apotropaic prayers from

the Second Temple period, Esther Eshel classifies them into two groups, one of prayers composed by the Qumran Community and the other of prayers circulating more broadly; she differentiates these defensive prayers from the incantations found at Qumran, which were probably not of Qumranic origin. One of the texts discussed by Chazon, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, is the topic of Hanan Eshel's contribution to this volume, in which he proposes the identification of yet another fragment of this influential liturgy.

Hartmut Stegemann presents the fruits of over 40 years of his research on the *Hodayot* (*Thanksgiving Hymns*) in his article with appended charts, showing the number of psalms and sections of psalms in *1QHodayot*[a]. His definitive reconstruction of the 1QH[a] manuscript is outlined in his *Appendix 1*. Stegemann's identification of the formal differences between the psalms of the Teacher and those of the Community allows him to arrive at the important conclusion that 1QH[a] ix 1–xvii 36 comprises "a special collection of 'Teacher's Psalms.'"

The rest of this volume, just over half of the articles, focuses on connections between prayers from the Second Temple period and the traditional Jewish liturgy as formulated after the Temple's destruction in 70 ce. Richard Sarason sets out to distinguish what, thanks to Qumran, can now be known with certainty about "the existence and diffusion of regular, communal prayer among Jews before and after 70 ce," over against what remains uncertain, showing also that there was "a larger common background." Bilhah Nitzan brings together the now ample evidence from both sectarian and non-sectarian scrolls for prayers for peace, comparing these with the Priestly Blessing and its use in the Temple service and in the later synagogue liturgy. Early roots of the Rosh Hashanah liturgy and of the Yom Kippur litany, "Our God in Heaven," are traced back to the second Temple period by Torleif Elgvin and Moshe Weinfeld, respectively, based on parallels with the Dead Sea Scrolls (*4QInstruction* for Rosh Hashanah and *11QPsalms*[a] for Yom Kippur). David Levine uncovers "remnants of a Temple prayer for fast-days" in early rabbinic traditions (*m. Tamid* 2:4–5), noting its compatibility in form and content with other prayers from the Second Temple period. Joseph Tabory distinguishes between the non-Temple *maʿamad* liturgy and the "sacrificial" *maʿamad* representing *all* Israel at the Temple (already attested in the War Scroll), arguing that the former was the earlier institution founded when the Seleucids polluted the Temple. As such

it was, like Qumran prayer itself, "one of the earliest, if not the earliest, attempts to replace the sacrificial service of the Temple with a liturgical service." In what was the concluding paper of the symposium, Stefan Reif surveys the history of Jewish liturgical research from its inception through the most recent studies on Qumran prayer, focusing on the question of whether the Qumran corpus enables us to recover the "pristine version" of standard Jewish liturgical texts, as the earliest liturgists had claimed could be done, or whether it affirms the more recent skeptical view of such reconstructions. He concludes that while in the Second Temple period, some Jewish groups prayed regularly with fixed texts bearing similarities to rabbinic prayer, "there was no standard set of common compositions widely employed by Jewry."

The symposium and this volume of proceedings have been generously funded by the Orion Foundation, the Sir Zelman Cowen Universities Fund, and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The articles have undergone academic review by the editor of this volume. Eileen Schuller graciously agreed to review my own paper and that of Hartmut Stegemann. The linguistic and copy editing was begun by Dr. Avital Pinnick, the former Orion Chief-of-Publications, and has been brought to completion by her successor, Dr. Ruth Clements, with the help of research assistant Shelly Zilberfarb; Dr. Pinnick also prepared the indices for the volume. On behalf of myself personally as well as the Orion Center, I wish to thank the contributors to this volume and all those who support the Center's work and academic life.

Esther G. Chazon
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
September, 2002 Tishrei 5763

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
ATDan	Acta Theologica Danica
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DJDJ	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JSQ	*Jewish Studies Quarterly*

JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
OTL	Old Testament Library
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*
RB	*Revue Biblique*
REJ	*Revue des Études Juives*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
STDJ	Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

This page intentionally left blank

QUMRAN LAMENTS AND THE STUDY OF LAMENT LITERATURE*

Adele Berlin
University of Maryland

Among the Dead Sea Scrolls are four copies of the biblical book of Lamentations (3Q3, 4Q111, 5Q6, and 5Q7) and several compositions that draw on or bear a resemblance to Lamentations: 4Q179, 4Q282 (formerly 4Q241), 4Q439, 4Q445, 4Q453, and 4Q501. These Lamentations-like texts have received little attention, even in recent studies of Qumran poetry and prayer, and they merit consideration under both these topics. Until the eve of this symposium, only 4Q179 and 4Q501 had been published,[1] and it is these two texts that I will examine in the hope of understanding more about their nature and their meaning. Are they indeed laments? What are their compositional techniques? What use do they make of scriptural references? What is their place in Qumran religious expression?

4Q179

It is obvious that this composition has drawn heavily on the book of Lamentations and on prophetic writings. Earlier commentators

---

* This article is dedicated to the memory of Susan Segal, a woman of חכמה and חסד, who was tragically taken from her husband and seven children. Her son Michael Segal, a young scholar of the Second Temple period, assisted in arranging the conference at which this paper was read.

[1] For 4Q179 see J. M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJDJ 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 75–77, pl. XXVI, and J. Strugnell, "Notes sur le no. 179 des 'Discoveries . . .,'" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 250–52. 4Q179 is scheduled for republication. For 4Q501 see M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 79–80, pl. XXVIII. Translations are in F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), and M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996). 4Q282 now appears in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (ed. S. J. Pfann et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 216–27; 4Q439, 4Q445, and 4Q453 appear in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. G. Chazon et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).

assumed that it was a poem, as will I, although this is hard to prove because no line has been completely preserved. The impression that it is a poem stems largely from the biblical poetic texts of which it is constituted. Maurya Horgan raised the possibility that it is actually several poems, on the model of the five chapters in the book of Lamentations, and noted that it is uncertain which of the two large fragments comes first.[2] It is true that the second fragment quotes Lam 1:1 and that the first is based on later parts of Lamentations, but the composition invokes only selected parts of Lamentations, in an order of its own making. It seems reasonable to assume that we are dealing with one poem, but the text is so poorly preserved that we have little sense of its coherence.

Fragment 1, the large two-column fragment, opens with a confession of guilt, but not in the typical formulaic language of penitential prayers: ". . . all our sins and it is not in the power of our hands for we did not heed." These sins presumably led to the catastrophe described immediately afterwards, the destruction of Jerusalem by fire and ravaging—this description forms the bulk of the extant text. The description moves from inside to outside. It begins with the lack of sacrificial odor on the altar and progresses to the holy courts (of the Temple), the squares (fit only for animals), the desolate citadels, and the absence of entering pilgrims. The culmination is "our נחלה" (referring to the Temple precinct, the city, or perhaps even the entire country), which has become a desert. The column ends with another reference to sins and transgressions, perhaps forming an *inclusio* with the beginning of the column.

The second column of the first fragment invokes Lamentations more often, especially Lamentations 4. Its themes are woe, defilement, and the dire straits of those who once lived in luxury.

The second large fragment develops the metaphor of the abandoned woman of Lam 1:1 by calling on similar images in Isa 54:6. It breaks off with a reworking of Lam 1:2 in which Jerusalem is weeping for her children.

The style is overtly biblicizing, as are many poems and prayers in Qumran and beyond. Despite the fact that the poem is laced

---

[2] M. P. Horgan, "A Lament over Jerusalem (4Q179)," *JSS* 18 (1973): 228. This text was also studied by Hartmut Pabst, "Eine Sammlung von Klagen in den Qumranfunden (4Q179)," in *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; Paris: Ducolot; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978), 137–49.

with biblical allusions, to such an extent that it is composed largely of a pastiche of biblical phrases, no biblical verse is quoted in its entirety. Moreover, the biblical allusions are obvious but are not exact quotations. There is a distinct tendency to add words to biblical expressions or to combine biblical citations. The composition displays some interesting features in this regard, not unlike other Qumran texts but not exactly like them either. The ways in which scripture is used in the Bible itself, at Qumran, and in rabbinic exegesis has become the subject of much fruitful research, and I would like to relate my analysis to that enterprise.

In making additions to and combinations of biblical phrases, the author of 4Q179 employed the exegetical techniques of his period. But 4Q179 is not, I think, an exegetical piece per se, as that term is usually meant. To put it in reductionist terms, it is a poem, not a *pesher*. It is an example of what Devorah Dimant has called "anthological style, which makes use of biblical allusions, reminiscences, and semi-citations as a literary feature." Dimant distinguishes this from "the anthological style with exegetical purpose."[3] The distinction is useful but not absolute. For one thing, the allusions and citations may unintentionally reveal the interpretations of the poet's community, or may call upon those interpretations in a more conscious way. Secondly, the juxtaposition of verses from different parts of the Bible often creates a new interpretive effect, whether or not that was the author's purpose. An allusion makes the reader see the quoted verse in a new light, as well as in its original context. We cannot, therefore, easily decide whether a composition has an exegetical purpose. It may be better to put the question of exegetical purpose on a continuum, from texts that are formally exegetical, like the *pesharim*, to those that are overtly but not formally exegetical, like the rewriting of parts of the Bible, to those that employ biblical verses, and by definition the meaning that adheres to those verses, as a means rather than as an end. Prayers and hymns, it seems to me, are in this last category. They use scriptural citations for many purposes: to embellish their literary art, to invoke the authority of tradition, and, through subtle exegetical techniques, to drive home their message. Their use

[3] D. Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M. Stone; CRINT 2:2; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 504.

of scripture is somewhat comparable to that of later *piyyutim* and medieval Hebrew poetry, but it often goes far beyond them. It is difficult to ascertain the significance of the way a scriptural verse is cited, or the connection between that verse and another; but it is worth attempting to discern these nuances because they may hold the key to the meaning of the poem.

In a recent paper,[4] Paul Mandel drew some parallels between Qumran and rabbinic exegesis. Among the "styles of presentation" shared by both, he noted two that are of interest to my discussion. One is the citation and interpretation of scripture woven into non-exegetical contexts (his examples were the *Damascus Document* and 4QMMT). The second is scripture cited (almost) verbatim, with the interpretation arising from juxtaposition of verses or through explicit (minor) changes (exemplified by *4QReworked Pentateuch* = 4Q364–367). These two "styles of presentation," especially the second one, describe in a general way the main compositional techniques that I find in 4Q179. I was also taken by Mandel's recognition of the fact that the juxtaposition of verses creates an interpretive nexus, and I will develop in greater detail how this works. But Mandel's examples do not include poems or prayers because, I suppose, the rabbinic material contains so few of them.

The use of the Bible in prayer is the subject of several recent studies. Rodney Werline shows how penitential prayers incorporate and change biblical themes and phraseology.[5] Judith Newman identifies three modes of interpretation in prayers: the telling of history in Nehemiah 9, the use of typology in Judith 9, and the use of *exempla* in 3 Maccabees 2.[6] Esther Chazon, in her study, "Scripture and Prayer in the 'Words of the Luminaries,'" isolates four strategies for employing biblical material to compose new prayers: modelling, *florilegium*, pastiche, and free composition.[7] Daniel Falk's article, "Biblical Adaptation in 4Q392 *Works of God* and 4Q393 *Communal Confession*," shows how a prayer can be composed of a biblical base text and

---

[4] P. Mandel, "Midrashic Exegesis and Its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Boston, November 1999).

[5] R. Werline, *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (Early Judaism and its Literature 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

[6] J. Newman, *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (Early Judaism and its Literature 14; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999).

[7] E. Chazon, "Scripture and Prayer in the *Words of the Luminaries*," in *Scripture and Prayer* (ed. J. Kugel; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, forthcoming).

modified by other biblical texts and/or by extrabiblical traditions.[8] These studies build on their predecessors to further refine the study of scriptural influences on Second Temple writings, and they also contribute nuanced and insightful readings of their texts. They provide suggestive models of how modern readers may interpret ancient prayers, and how they may uncover traces of ancient exegesis or exegetical practices in prayers.

Let us look at some of the compositional techniques in 4Q179. I call them compositional techniques because they form the ways in which the poem is constructed. I do not think the poet set out to interpret verses from Lamentations. I think he wanted to write a poem, express an idea. He did so by quoting many biblical phrases. To the extent that the phrases get explained or reinterpreted in the poem, it is because the poet is working with known biblical themes and models that he uses creatively for his own ends. To echo my refrain, this is a poem, not a *pesher*. What I find interesting is that in the case of 4Q179 and 4Q501, the compositional techniques correspond to exegetical techniques.

My 'control' for these techniques is not rabbinic exegesis, but what has come to be known as inner biblical exegesis, and I use Michael Fishbane's *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* as my guide.[9] 4Q179 exemplifies three exegetical techniques identified by Fishbane.

(1) The addition of an annotation unmarked by any deictic element.[10] A biblical example is Deut 22:11, לא תלבש שעטנז צמר ופישתים יחדו, where the words "wool and flax together" explain the meaning of שעטנז. We find a similar explanation, without an indication that it is an explanation, in 4Q179 2 4, [איכה ישבה] העיר [הנ]דול[ה ירוש]לים, which is an expansion of Lam 1:1: איכה ישבה בדד העיר.

(2) The substitution of a more common term for a less common one.[11] An alternative analysis of my previous example is that הגדולה ירושלים replaces the more difficult רבתי עם of Lam 1:1.[12] A clearer

---

[8] D. K. Falk, "Biblical Adaptation in 4Q392 *Works of God* and 4Q393 *Communal Confession*," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 126–46.

[9] M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).

[10] Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 58–65.

[11] Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 56–57.

[12] There may be a telescoping in our text of the phrases רבתי עם and רבתי בנוים in Lam 1:1 but further comment must await the republication of the text.

case of substitution is in 4Q179 2 5: שרתי כל לאומים, in which the biblical term מדינות was replaced by the more common לאומים.[13] It is possible that חבקו אשפתות (Lam 4:5) replaces אשפתות מדור ביתו (4Q179 1 ii 9).

(3) Blending or conflation of biblical phrases.[14] The classic example is 2 Chr 35:13: ויבשלו הפסח באש, which conflates Exod 12:9: אל תאכלו ממנו נא ובשל מבשל במים כי אם־צלי־אש and Deut 16:7: ובשלת ואכלת.

1. 4Q179 1 ii 11 reads המסלאים [ב]פז וכתם. This is a conflation of Lam 4:2: המסלאים בפז and Job 28:16: לא תסלה בכתם אופיר.
2. 4Q179 1 ii 14 is ומשי תכלת ורוקמה, a combination of Ezek 16:13: ש]ש ומשי ורקמה and Ezek 27:24: בנלומי תכלת ורקמה.
3. 4Q179 1 i 5 has היה לשרפת אש וחפכה, which appears to combine Isa 64:10: עריכם שרפות אש . . . היה לשרפת אש and Isa 1:7: ושממה כמהפכת זרים.
4. 4Q179 2 6 reads [כ]אשה ער[י]ריה כעצובה וכעזובת . . . כל ארמנותיה. The allusion to Isa 54:6, כאשה עזובה ועצובת רוח, is clear but there may also be an allusion to Isa 23:13: עוררו ארמנותיה. (The root ערה/ערר plays on the ideas of childlessness, nakedness, and degradation.)
5. We can see this conflation in action from the physical evidence in 4Q179 1 i 14, where the original text read לאנוש למכאובנו, echoing Jer 30:15: אנוש מכאבך. The text was corrected by the insertion of תי and the deleting of אוב, so that it now reads לאנוש מכתינו, conforming to Mic 1:9: אנושה מכותיה.
6. It is possible that הגדולה ירושלים, which I earlier suggested was an unmarked addition or a substitution, could be analyzed as a conflation of verses. Compare Jonah 1:1: נינוה העיר הגדולה and Gen 10:12: הוא העיר הגדולה, referring to Calah.

The type of conflation clearly at work in examples 1 and 2 can be formulated as AB + AC = ABC. That is, two biblical phrases that share a common term are joined into a hybrid phrase containing the shared term plus the distinctive terms from both original phrases. Conflation is often used to smooth away differences in the conflated

[13] לאומים occurs with גוים in Gen 25:23; Isa 34:1; 43:4, 9; Pss 2:1; 44:3, 15; 105:44; 149:7. מדינות is a later word found, to be sure, in 1 Kgs 20:14–19 but more frequently in Esther and Nehemiah. It occurs with גוים in Ezek 19:8.

[14] Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 135–37.

texts, as is the case in 2 Chr 35:13. A similar type of harmonization is accomplished in the rabbinic tradition, in reference to the Sabbath commandment, which opens with the word שמור in Exod 20:7 and זכור in Deut 5:11. The *Mekhilta of R. Ishmael* (*Bahodesh* 7) explains that these two phrases were one utterance, two words spoken and heard as one word (זכור ושמור שניהם בדבור אחד נאמרו).[15] This does not create a new text that is a conflation of two earlier texts; it is, rather, a conflation through interpretation. It literally makes one thing out of two things. Its effect is similar to 2 Chr 35:13 in that it erases the dissonance between the two citations. This piece of interpretation finds its way into the *Lekha Dodi* prayer, שמור וזכור בדבור אחד, a nice example of halakhic exegesis imported into a literary, non-exegetical context.

A modern example of a conflated text is the NRSV translation of Gen 1:1: "In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth." As the note in the NRSV indicates, this is a conflation of *When God began to create* and *In the beginning God created*. The first alternative is preferable, according to scholarly opinion, but English-speaking Christian Bible readers are so wedded to the KJV's *In the beginning* that it seemed too jarring to open the Bible with any other words. The conflation lets the translators have their cake and eat it, too.

The conflation of biblical verses is the most dominant and most important technique I have observed in 4Q179 and 4Q501, but harmonization is not the reason for its use. Rather, it seems to be doing the opposite: it sets up a dissonance between the common understanding of a verse and the new understanding that the poet is advocating.

Let us look more closely at one conflation, 4Q179 1 ii 13–14: וכתם טוב עדים נושא{ם} חלבו[ש . . .] ומשי תכלת ורוקמה. This phrase follows a passage that describes those reared in scarlet (Lam 4:5) and uses other terms from Lamentations 4. At first blush, the allusions from Ezek 16:13, to jewelry and to silk, purple, and multicolored clothing, merely enhance Lamentations' image of the luxury that has turned to poverty. But in fact the reference to Ezekiel is devastating, because this is a portrait of Jerusalem, the girl whom God

[15] The *Mekhilta* goes on to give other cases of verses that were uttered as one utterance. These verses appear to be contradictory, until the *Mekhilta* harmonizes them in this manner. This is a legal exegetical technique, not a literary one, but it works in the same way as does our text. See J. Lauterbach, ed., *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* (3 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1949), 2:252.

dressed in finery, and who then used her finery to attract lovers with whom she prostituted herself. The Ezekiel reference undercuts the Lamentations reference and turns sympathy into a critique of the Jerusalemites. Those fancy dressers had turned away from God while things were still good.

The word תכלת does not occur in Ezek 16:13, but is found in Ezek 27:24 in association with רקמה. In fact, there is a tradition of interpreting רקמה as "purple," the color of תכלת. But in our text I do not think that תכלת is just an explanatory addition, for then I would expect it to follow רוקמה, not precede it. I see here a conflation of Ezek 16:13 and 27:24—the latter is a description of the haughty Tyre, with all her imported finery, whose imminent demise Ezekiel is lamenting. This adds yet another negative image to the picture.

I note in passing that *Lamentations Rabbah* also uses Ezekiel 16 in association with Lamentations, but in a different context. Commenting on the word בדד in Lam 1:1, *Lamentations Rabbah* says:

> It is like a king who had a son. Whenever he did as his father wished, he dressed him in fine wool, and whenever he got angry at him he dressed him in rags. So, when Israel did as God wished, he dressed them in fine garments, as in "I dressed you in רקמה (Ezek 16:10). R. Simai says [that רקמה means] "purple" [פורפירא] and Aquila translated "embroidered" [אפיקוליטון]. And since they angered him, he dressed them in garments of loneliness (בדדים).[16]

There may be an underlying common exegetical tradition of explaining garments in Lamentations by referring to Ezekiel 16, but if so, it is applied quite differently in these two cases.

4Q179 is too fragmentary for a close reading of individual lines, but we can see that along with the verbal conflation there is a corresponding tendency to conflate the imagery. Whereas Lam 1:1 speaks of a widowed woman dwelling alone and then goes on to portray a faithless woman, 4Q179 2, calling on descriptions of destroyed cities from Isa 54:1–6 and perhaps Zeph 2:4, speaks of a woman abandoned, barren, and bitter. 4Q179 1 i introduces prophetic imagery of Jerusalem as a wasteland, a habitat for wild animals, a theme absent from Lamentations except for 5:18.

The dominant imagery is the absence of people and cultic ritual, desolation, and abandonment. There is a heavy emphasis on the

---

[16] The text is problematic. See S. Buber, *Midrash Ekhah Rabbah* (Vilna: Romm, 5659/1899; rprt. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967), 42. Translation is my own.

city's destruction and its aftermath, but no mention of a foreign enemy or of the exile of the people (common themes in Lamentations and other biblical laments and in Second Temple penitential prayers). Jerusalem's suffering is highlighted; the imagery of a desert wasteland gives the impression that the city has been long abandoned. This is somewhat strange if the composition dates from a time when Jerusalem was a thriving city. It is one thing to claim, as many Second Temple penitential prayers do, that even though the Jews have returned to Judah they are still spiritually in exile. It is quite another to dwell on the image of Jerusalem in ruins. This negative portrait is intensified by the reference to the absence of the odor of sacrifice on the altar (וניחוח אין בו במז[בח]) and the implied criticism of the city's elite, who wore the clothing of Jerusalem the prostitute.

All of this begins to add up to a peculiarly Qumranic view of Jerusalem. The poet may be conveying a picture of the condition of Jerusalem of his own time, which he couched in the language of the destruction of 586 BCE. To the Qumran community, the Temple was a place of impurity, unfit for sacrifice, and whatever sacrificing was done there would not be pleasing to God. It may not be going too far to say that for the Qumranites the Temple was, in a cultic sense, still in ruins. The prophecy of Jer 33:10–11 had not yet been fulfilled, for as our poem says [קו]ל שמ[ח]ה לוא נשמ{ש}עה בה (4Q179 1 i 13). It remains for the eschaton to usher in the rebuilding of the Temple. Meanwhile, we have this poem, a depressing glimpse of the destroyed city, and two antidotes, in *4QTanḥumim* (4Q176) and the *Apostrophe to Zion* (11QPs^{a} 22), which invoke biblical passages of comfort and the hope for the future rebuilding of Jerusalem.

My foregoing comments raise questions about what type of text 4Q179 is and where it was composed. I will address the issue of genre now, and defer the question of place of origin until after an analysis of 4Q501.

4Q179 is known by titles like *4QApocryphal Lament* (its official listing), "fragments of 'Klage-Dichtungen'," [17] "A Lament over Jerusalem" (Horgan), but these titles really tell us little except that the piece draws heavily on the book of Lamentations. Is it a lament for Jerusalem in the same sense as the book of Lamentations, or in the

[17] J. Maier, "Zu Kult und Liturgie der Qumrangemeinde," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 543–86; see p. 578.

sense of later *qinot* for Tisha b'Av? That is, is it a work written to commemorate the destruction of Jerusalem? My interpretation of the poem suggests that it is at least as much a complaint about the present state of Jerusalem as a dirge commemorating the events of 586 BCE. There may be additional arguments to support this view.

Why was the work composed? Horgan suggested that it was written to commemorate a contemporary historical occasion—the attacks on Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes IV in 169/8 and 168/7 BCE that are mentioned in 1 Macc 1:16–40 (where there is a comparable lament). Her opinion is echoed by Wise, Abegg, and Cook.[18] Horgan prefers this suggestion to seeing the poem as a lament over the destruction of the First Temple at a time when the Second Temple was standing. However, in light of the fact that the theme of the exile is so prevalent in prayers of the Second Temple period,[19] and that a text like ours can easily be related to the theme of exile, there is no need to seek a post-586 threat to Jerusalem to account for a Jerusalem lament. We know from Zech 7:5 and 8:19 that Jews commemorated the destruction of Jerusalem with fasts and lamenting (ספוד). Schiffman, following this line of thought, notes that the Jews in the Second Temple period continued to mourn over the destruction of the First Temple, and suggests that 4Q179 "is such a text, adapting the biblical Lamentations with exegetical expansions." He suggests that it "may represent the general sorrow of the Jewish people for the loss of the ancient glories of First Temple times."[20]

This may be so, but there are very few remnants of Jerusalem laments from the Second Temple period outside of the Bible. We do not know what the lamenting mentioned in Zech 7:5 involved. Only one copy of our text has been found and to my knowledge there are no others at Qumran that resemble it. While there are many Second Temple penitential prayers with the theme of sin-exile-return, they do not include Jerusalem laments like this. The closest things to it are the few short passages in 1 Macc 1:25–28, 37–40; 2:7–13; 3:44–45, 50–53. These are associated with a new instance

---

[18] Horgan, "Lament over Jerusalem," 222; Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 237.

[19] See M. Knibb, "Exile in the Damascus Document," *JSOT* 25 (1983): 99–117; M. Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *Heythrop Journal* 17 (1976): 253–72; and Werline, *Penitential Prayer*.

[20] L. H. Schiffman, "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Centrality of Jerusalem* (ed. M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 74.

of Temple destruction, not a commemoration of the First Temple. Moreover, they are not actually laments uttered by the people. The passages in 1 Maccabees 1 are poetic descriptions in lament-like language. The passage in 2:7–13 is spoken by Mattathias and is accompanied by gestures of mourning; it is most like the individual and communal laments of the Bible in times of trouble, and it does not commemorate the First Temple. The passages in 1 Maccabees 3 serve similar functions, as poetic descriptions and as the people's prayer for help and compassion in their trouble. The lament for Jerusalem, in and of itself, seems to have diminished in the post-exilic period, and to have been absorbed into penitential prayer. The mourning over Jerusalem that continued after the return and the rebuilding of the Temple is not mourning per se, but an aspect of penitential prayer. And the aspect that is stressed in penitential prayer is the state of exile that the Jews consider themselves to be in, not the description of the destroyed Temple.

Laments are generally associated with times of public mourning, ad hoc or fixed occasions that also entailed fasting. A lament for Jerusalem might have been recited on fast days like those mentioned in Zech 8:19. But despite the ascetic nature of the Qumran sect, there is no evidence that public fasting played a role in their religious observances. Communal fast days, as Noah Hacham has recently shown, are unknown there except for Yom Kippur.[21] If there were no public fasts, that eliminates an obvious occasion for the recitation

[21] N. Hacham, "Communal Fasts in the Judean Desert Scrolls," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27–31 January, 1999* (ed. D. Goodblatt, A. Pinnick, and D. R. Schwartz; STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill: 2001), 127–45. Hacham suggests that the Qumran community replaced the physical aspects of repentance that fasting entails with other, more spiritual, means, just as they had replaced sacrifice with prayer. There may be a more pragmatic reason for the absence of the fixed days of public fasting at Qumran, at least those days that were observed elsewhere during this period, by analogy with the reasons for the absence of Purim. R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), has argued that Purim was not celebrated at Qumran for calendrical reasons, since Purim would always fall on the Sabbath in the Qumran calendar. Although the exact dates of the fasts mentioned in Zech 8:19 are uncertain, if we adopt the rabbinic dates for these fasts, we note that 9 Av likewise always falls on the Sabbath at Qumran, and the other fast days occur on Fridays. This would certainly be problematic and may have prevented the observance of these fast days altogether. Or it may simply have been that the Qumran community did not adopt post-Torah festivals and fasts at all, except for their own special days (another possible reason for the absence of Purim at Qumran).

of a lament over Jerusalem. Of course, such a lament might have been recited at another time, on either a fixed or an ad hoc occasion. What this occasion might be, though, is difficult to imagine. 4Q179 has so far not been identified with any of the formal daily, weekly, or festival liturgies, and the Qumran calendar does not offer any suggestive possibilities.

For these reasons, I am reluctant to conclude that 4Q179 is a poem written primarily to commemorate the historical destruction of Jerusalem. I prefer to see it as a hymn or penitential prayer (there is a clear admission of sin), of which there are many examples from this period, rather than a Jerusalem lament, for which there are few examples. It joins a number of other such prayers whose *Sitz im Leben* at Qumran is not currently known.

4Q501

This composition can be considered a companion piece to 4Q179 in that it, too, relies heavily on Lamentations and other biblical phraseology. But it is not a lament over Jerusalem. It makes no reference to the city or the Temple. The exile motif is much less explicit, although it can be read out of the allusions to Lamentations 5. The poem is, rather, a supplication or petition, similar in some ways to penitential prayers of the Second Temple period, but lacking a confession of sins and a reference to God's former acts of deliverance. It is close in tone and structure to the communal laments of the Bible. The speaker portrays his community as beleaguered by those who speak false words. The community feels itself to be wandering, broken, isolated, and dispossessed. God is bidden to avenge the community against its enemies.

Communal laments in the Bible have been well-studied by form critics, and their most common structural elements have been identified.[22] 4Q501 shares with biblical communal laments the following elements, at least in part: invocation, request for deliverance, lament proper, request to curse the enemy. The invocation is incomplete because God's name is not mentioned; but he is addressed in

[22] See P. W. Ferris, *The Genre of Communal Lament in the Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 92–103, especially p. 93. Of the twenty-five laments that Ferris diagrams, all but one contain an invocation, all have the lament proper, and twenty-three ask for deliverance from and/or revenge on the enemy.

the second person. The request for deliverance is expressed through the words, ". . . do not give our inheritance to strangers." The lament proper typically speaks of both physical danger and mental anguish, and this is true in our case, as well. The speaker describes a wandering, bent and broken people, attacked by the false words of the enemy. This is followed by the plea that God take revenge on the enemy.

The theme of "lying words," or the enemy who uses his tongue to do harm, is known from the ancient Near East in general and the Bible in particular.[23] The language and imagery of the poem is general enough for us to conclude that it was not composed at Qumran, and its similarity to 4Q509, which is also not specifically Qumranic, seems to confirm that conclusion.[24] But it is also true that the theme of attack by false words or a lying tongue (לשון שקרמה, לשון גדופיהמה) fits well with the mentality of the Qumran community, who viewed their own interpretations as true and the interpretations of others as false. Similar sentiments about being saved from evil tongues and words are found in 1QH[a] 13:24, 15:11–13, and 16:35–38.[25] At the least, the composition may have had special meaning for the Qumran community, whether or not it originated there.

The chapter from Lamentations most evident in this text is Lamentations 5, itself a prayer of supplication, the hallmark of which is זכור, the invocation to God to remember.[26] Allusions to Lamentations 5 are לבני נכר . . . לזרים נחלתנו (l. 1, cf. Lam 5:2); זכור (l. 1) and הביטה וראה חרפת (l. 5, cf. Lam 5:1); עורנו וזלעופות אחזונו [נכמר] (5:10). In this last example I see another conflation, similar to those in 4Q179. Here the line combines Lam 5:10: עורנו כתנור נכמרו מפני זלעפות רעב, "our skin is burning like an oven from the heat of the famine" and Ps 119:53: זלעפה אחזתני מרשעים עזבי תורתך, "Heat (agitation) has seized me from the wicked, who have abandoned your Torah." The conflation, "our skin is burning and we are seized by heat by the

---

[23] For example, the Babylonian poem *Ludlul bel nemeqi* I.68, 90–95 (*ANET*, 596–597); Psalms 52; 109:2; 120:2–3.

[24] B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 353–54; D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 209–11.

[25] Column and line numbers are given according to the reconstruction of H. Stegemann (see *Appendix 1* to his article in this volume pp. 224–26).

[26] See Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 90–107. זכור is also often part of the invocation in communal laments.

tongue of the insolent," is a key to the meaning of the poem. It recontextualizes the Lamentations verse in terms of the Psalm 119 verse. "We are physically devastated," says the poem, "like the Jerusalemites in Lamentations, not by famine but by the wicked people who have abandoned the Torah." The poet clarifies the nature of their wickedness by adding the explanatory words מלפני לשון נדו פיהמה, "from before their insolent tongue." Insolent words are the cause of the harm. The poet's problem comes not from famine but from Jewish opponents.

Bilhah Nitzan has noted the allusions to Ezek 34:4 and 16 in the words שבורים ואין חובש, תועים ואין משיב (l. 3), but she did not comment on the context of these words.[27] Ezekiel is prophesying against the "shepherds," the political leaders of Judah, who failed to provide proper protection for their "sheep" and whom God will call to account. Ezekiel presents a vision of restoration to the exiles, a vision in which the old leaders will be replaced either by God or by his duly appointed Davidic representative.[28] It is not hard to see our poet equating his community with the sheep, awaiting restoration and the replacement of the "shepherds" of their own day. 4Q501 is not simply a moving dirge by mourners recalling a past exile, nor is it a poem about oppressed people in physical danger. It is not even the standard "We are still in exile" line of the penitential prayers. It is a vindictive attack against the group that the speaker's community sees as its opponents in the matter of "words"—that is, teachings and interpretations. The opponents are the "Babylonians" from whom the poet seeks to be rescued; they are also the "shepherds," the failed Judean kings against whom God will bring judgment.

I find additional support for this view in the influence from Psalm 109 on this poem, especially in the first line. Our text reads: אל תתן לזרים נחלתנו ויניענו לבני נכר, "Do not give our inheritance to strangers and our produce to foreigners." It sounds pretty close to Lam 5:2, which reads נחלתנו נהפכה לזרים בתינו לנכרים, but the last part of the line, ויניענו לבני נכר, resembles Ps 109:11 ויבזו זרים יניעו, "May strangers plunder his produce." Once again we find a conflation, this time around the idea of strangers taking one's possessions. In Lamentations, the Babylonians are taking the land of Judah; in Ps 109:11, the strangers are those who will rightfully dispossess the

[27] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 354.
[28] See M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 705–709.

person who speaks deceit and falsehood. Again, Lamentations has been recontextualized to make the enemy those who speak falsely. By quoting Ps 109:11, our poet is saying, "Don't let my produce be plundered"—that is, "Don't let happen to me what will happen to those who speak falsely."

There is more of Psalm 109's influence in our poem. 4Q501 4 reads: סבבונו חילכיא עמכה בלשון שקרמה, echoing לשון שקר and סבבוני in Ps 109:2–3. In fact, the overall contents of Psalm 109, an individual lament by a person suffering from his opponent's false words, resembles the theme of our text. In line 4, the opponents are called חילכיא עמכה, a term found in Ps 10:8, 10, and 14 (another psalm lamenting the power of the wicked over the weak), where it refers to the weak who are set upon by the wicked. However, as Menahem Kister has noted, in Qumran texts the word חילכים refers to the Pharisees.[29] The term is similarly used in our poem in this opposite sense—not, as in Psalm 10, for the oppressed, but rather for the oppressors. These "weak of your people," like the "foreigners/strangers" mentioned earlier in the poem, are Jews of a different interpretive persuasion. Lamentations 5 is here recontextualized by being combined with Ezekiel 34 and Psalm 109 (and perhaps Psalm 10), and is thereby transformed from a supplicatory prayer to end the shame and loss of the Babylonian exiles into a prayer for the end of the current religious suffering felt by the speaker. Or conversely, we may say that a standard theme in communal laments about unspecified speakers of false words has been placed into the setting of the destruction of Jerusalem and loaded with Jeremian (Lamentations) and Ezekielian allusions to the exile and the future restoration. While this piece may not look particularly Qumranic on the surface, I can't think of a better place for it to have found a home.

My interpretations of 4Q179 and 4Q501 have found these texts to be in concert with the Qumran religious worldview, with respect to the community's perception of the contemporary Jerusalem establishment and the war of opposing words or interpretations. This raises the question of whether these texts were composed at Qumran, and of how one decides the locus of origin of a text. I will not

---

[29] M. Kister, "עיונים במגילת מקצת מעשי התורה ועולמו: לשון ולוח," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 317–71, p. 331 and n. 65.

rehearse all the criteria, which have been nicely summarized and critiqued by Falk[30] and are also considered by Newman.[31] The default position has been that if a text does not contain terminology or ideology distinctive to Qumran, it originated outside of Qumran. Thus 4Q179 and 4Q501, which on the surface do not manifest distinctive traits, have both been declared "outsiders."[32] Esther Chazon has recently complicated the discussion, making it yet more difficult to ascribe Qumranic origin, by noting that even some of the ostensibly distinctive ideas found in the core Qumran documents may have been shared by other Jewish groups, such as those that produced *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*.[33] Qumran was not alone in some of its peculiar ideas, so even the presence of these ideas in a Qumran text is not absolute proof of Qumran origin. Conversely, the absence of such terms or ideas does not prove that the document originated elsewhere, for Qumran, after all, shared many beliefs with other Jewish groups. As Newman notes, some Qumran-composed prayers may have been "orthodox," in the sense that they lack references to the community's distinctive beliefs. "Prayers," says Newman, "need not be 'sectarian' to have originated in a 'sectarian' group."[34] Conclusive proof of an outside origin, according to Chazon, would be the presence of ideas that are *incompatible* with those held by the Qumran community.[35] But if such ideas were to be found in Qumran documents, one would then ask why those documents had been preserved at Qumran.

I can't cut this Gordian knot, so I will reframe the question. Ask not where the text came from; ask why it was preserved at Qumran. My assumption is that these texts, wherever they originated, were not preserved by accident, but because they had some significance for the community. How might they have been understood at Qumran?

---

[30] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 9–16.

[31] Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 234–40.

[32] On 4Q179, see Horgan, "Lament over Jerusalem," 223; Schiffman, "Jerusalem," 74. Since 4Q501 is similar to 4Q509, and since the latter is considered non-Qumranic in origin, it follows that 4Q501 would be considered the same.

[33] E. Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications," *DSD* 1 (1994): 271–73. See also C. A. Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman; Biblical and Judaic Studies 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 67–187.

[34] Newman, *Praying by the Book*, 235–36.

[35] Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran," 272.

Why did the community find them meaningful? That is what my interpretation tries to show. These texts, neutral on their surface, can be read in a way that reveals an agenda that suits the religious outlook of Qumran. While we may not know when or how these works were used, we can have a better sense of why they were used. Both texts are constructed on the scaffold of the book of Lamentations, not because they are lamenting the destruction of 586, but because by so doing they equate their own condition with what had become the stock model of suffering and divine rejection. These are not poems of mourning, they are poems of alienation.

Let me end by recapping my own interpretive strategy. I have based my readings largely on analyzing the effect of biblical allusions and conflations, which our poet employed as part of his formal structure much as later poets use rhyme or alliteration. I have taken seriously which words are chosen and the biblical contexts from which they come. In poetry, as in midrash, allusive words do not lose their contexts or their connotations. Like all poems, these Qumran texts speak in metaphors—metaphors created through the transference that goes on in the allusions and conflations: "the words of the insolent burn me like the heat of the famine of the destruction"; "the Jerusalem elite were dressed in fine cloth like the whore that Jerusalem became." These allusions act somewhat like a vehicle and a tenor, to use the literary terminology, pulling meaning from one context and inserting it into another. While their purpose was not primarily exegetical in a formal sense, they create new meaning through the juxtaposition of old interpretations. It's not a *pesher*, it's poetry.[36]

[36] Postscript: At the conference where I read this paper, Prof. Avi Hurvitz brought to my attention an article he had written some years ago entitled, "לתיאורם של בגדי אהרון ובניו ב'מגילת מלחמת בני-אור' ז 9–10," in *Meḥqarim ba-Mikra uva-mizraḥ ha-qadmon: mugashim l-Shmuel Levenshtam, be-melot lo shiv'im shanah* (ed. Y. Avishur and Y. Blau; Jerusalem: Rubenstein, 1978), 139–44. Hurvitz notes the use of biblical terms and phrases along with their later Second Temple counterparts, that is, the combining of archaic and contemporary terms. But it seems to me that the same phenomenon of conflation that I have been discussing is at work in his examples. Further comment must await future study. It seems probable, though, that the technique of conflation of biblical texts identified in this paper will turn up in other Qumran texts and that this paper will be helpful in interpreting those texts.

This page intentionally left blank

POETRY AND PROSE IN 4Q371–373 *NARRATIVE AND POETIC COMPOSITION*[a,b,c1]

Moshe J. Bernstein
Yeshiva University

Among the most difficult and unavoidable issues that Eileen Schuller and I had to face in the preparation of three fragmentary manuscripts, 4Q371–373, for publication in the DJD series, were the dual tasks of naming the text and of trying to determine its genre. The three manuscripts had at an earlier juncture been named *Apocryphon of Joseph*[a,b,c], based on the contents of 4Q372 fragment 1 (the largest fragment of 4Q372). However, in a preliminary publication of that fragment, Professor Schuller had already noted that its text was not an extra-biblical story about the major figure of Genesis 37–50, and that the title *Apocryphon of Joseph* was therefore not really appropriate even for 4Q372 1, not to mention the other fragments which had nothing to do with any Joseph figure, whether hero or tribe.[2] But knowing what the text was not about did not aid us a great deal in determining what its genre was.

The issue of generic identification also stood as one of the major obstacles in our path to choosing a name for these texts. Aside from the apparently varied nature of the contents of the manuscripts, one of the major obstacles to any clear generic identification was the fact

---

[1] I take this opportunity to thank Professor Eileen Schuller for graciously sharing the cooperative effort of editing 4Q371–373 with me, and particularly for tolerating, as a veteran Qumran editor, some of the idiosyncrasies and exuberance of a first-time one. Although the texts that I am discussing in this essay are those produced under our joint editorship, I bear sole responsibility for the analysis which follows. Since the delivery of this paper, Professor Schuller and I have published the texts in question in DJD 28 (D. M. Gropp, ed., *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh*; E. Schuller et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* [Oxford: Clarendon, 2001], 151–204). The English translations of texts discussed in this paper utilize, but may differ from, the DJD translation. Dr. Shani Berrin and Dr. Esther Chazon read early and late drafts of this paper, respectively, and furnished perceptive and practical suggestions for its improvement.

[2] "4Q372 1 is not an exegetical reflection on Genesis but rather a text in which the figure of Joseph stands for the northern tribes" (E. M. Schuller, "4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph," *RevQ* 14 [1990]: 68).

that some of the manuscripts contain material that appears to be prose immediately juxtaposed with material that seems to be poetry.[3] As a result, the somewhat 'prosaic' and unenlightening title, *Narrative and Poetic Composition*[a,b,c], was ultimately selected for these texts.

In this paper, I shall examine briefly the nature and style of the apparently poetic material contained in these fragments, and then attempt to address the questions generated by the juxtapositions between the prose and the poetry as they relate to the typology of the manuscript and perhaps other Qumran works as well. (I must stress at this point that I do not think that there is anything specifically 'sectarian' about the work that would link or limit it to a Qumran provenance.) The Orion symposium theme and the order in the title of this presentation should underscore the fact that this paper is much more concerned with poetry than with prose.

My definition of poetry will not be overly nuanced; I cannot limit the term to only those texts whose language exhibits the parallelistic structure characteristic of biblical poetry, in part because these fragments do not offer us enough text to evaluate in that way.[4] More significantly, as Professor Schuller has already noted in one of her pre-official-publication treatments of 4Q372 1, this text possesses many of the changing features of the poetry of late biblical Hebrew which make it at times difficult to distinguish from prose: "longer cola, frequent use of tricola, envelope formula, frequency of the infinitive, and chiasmic construction."[5] Other touchstones which I

---

[3] D. A. Diewert begins the article "Poetry" in the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:679a, with the judicious statement, "Determining what is and is not poetry among the inscriptional finds of the Judean desert is not a straightforward task. There are no graphic arrangements of versification, and no colophonic indicators marking a certain text as poetry." Almost all of the limited work which has gone into the study of Qumran poetry has focused on the *Hodayot*, as can be seen from Diewert's brief bibliography, 681a.

[4] The treatment of biblical poetry, especially its parallelistic aspect, has grown in the past two decades. See, for example, M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1980); J. L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981); R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1985); A. Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985). Perhaps because of the paucity of integral texts in the original Hebrew (or Aramaic), there has not been much of an attempt to follow the history of parallelism in biblical Hebrew poetry into the post-biblical period. For a brief survey of the later poetic material, see S. Holm-Nielsen, "Religiöse Poesie des Spätjudentums," *ANRW* Part 2, *Principat*, 19.1:152–86.

[5] E. Schuller, "The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 67–79, p. 70.

shall use to identify poetry include direct addresses to God in prayer or praise (which I assume are usually poetic in nature), the use of phraseology deriving from biblical poetry, contents of a sapiential nature (which are most frequently composed in poetic style), and any other features which indicate that the text before us is not narrative, legal, or some other sort of prose.

We begin with the assumption that the assignment of all the fragments to the three texts is correct, that is to say, that we are dealing with three manuscripts which overlap with each other in some of their contents, although there is no passage which appears in all three of the manuscripts. We thus cannot know whether they are all copies of the same complete text or whether some may be excerpted, to take one extreme, or eclectic, to choose another; 4Q371 and 4Q373 may or may not share the generic pluriformity of 4Q372. Furthermore, we must add that it is very likely that our *Narrative and Poetic Composition*[a,b,c] has a long lost relative in 2Q22, published by Baillet under the title "Un apocryphe de David (?)."[6] One of its columns overlaps 4Q372 fragment 19 and 4Q373 fragment 1, and thus we should probably speak of four related manuscripts. The introduction of 2Q22 into the equation actually confronts us with yet another manuscript that seems to contain poetry and prose side by side.

The prose material alone in this group of manuscripts appears to be generically diverse. Some fragments recount a narrative of events from the near past or present, such as 4Q372 fragment 1, which apparently deals with Second Temple events, while others present material that derives from Israel's biblical history. Some pieces appear to comprise an autobiographical narrative of a victory by a biblical figure (probably either Moses or David) over a gigantic opponent (either Og or Goliath), while other passages that are formulated in the first person have no indication of speaker, and appear to allude to the biblical period from a later perspective. Other prose material is admonitory or hortatory; there are references to "telling of former things" and "jubilees" which might derive from historical contexts, various allusions to the military events of the desert wanderings, and isolated references to priestly garments and to unclean animals. There

[6] M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, eds., *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (DJDJ 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 81–82.

are also fragments about which we cannot say much beyond the fact that they do not seem to be poetic in language, even though their content is very unclear. These data alone can be seen to complicate any generic identification.

Confusing matters far more, however, is the presence of passages that are indubitably poetic, *side by side* with the various prose sections. Our inability to discern whatever connections might have existed among them is probably due to the fragmentary nature of the material more than anything else. Furthermore, the poetry in the large fragment that Professor Schuller published initially (4Q372 1) is perhaps atypical of the other poetry in this text; it contains, *as an integral part of the narrative*, and I cannot stress this too much, a poetic prayer addressed to God by 'Joseph,' probably the tribe or its representative. In its placement and function this passage resembles a number of texts in the Hebrew Bible as well as in works from the Second Temple period.[7] A poetic text that is appropriate to a speaker within a prose narrative does not surprise us at all, but in this group of manuscripts this passage is unique. From the standpoint of 'prayer' rather than that of 'poetry,' fragment 1 is probably the most important segment in these manuscripts, but my focus in this essay is on poetry, rather than prayer. In almost all cases, we are precluded by the absence of context from knowing whether the other poetic passages were of a similar nature, embedded in the prose around them. We shall return briefly to the nature of the poetry within the Joseph prayer toward the end of our discussion.

It is the presence in 4Q371–73 of poetic material that does *not* seem to be integrally related to the prose juxtaposed to it which raises a number of more serious questions about the nature of these texts. The boundaries between poetry and so-called 'elevated prose' or *Kunstprosa* are, of course, not always clear. It is not always easy to prove that a given passage in late or post-biblical Hebrew is prose

[7] Exodus 15, Judges 5, 2 Samuel 22, Jonah 2, and Hezekiah's prayer in Isa 38:9–20 are among the biblical examples, while Tobit 3, 8 and 13, Judith 16, the apocryphal Additions to Esther and others derive from late antiquity. There are two comparatively recent studies of this phenomenon in biblical and post-biblical literature: J. W. Watts, *Psalm and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative* (JSOTSup 139; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); and S. Weitzman, *Song and Story: The Literary History of a Convention in Ancient Israel* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997). Both of these authors include some post-biblical material in their discussions, but not, of course, fragmentary texts such as those we are examining.

or poetry, or something awkwardly in between, even when we have complete texts, and those under discussion are far from complete. The question of the lack of coherence or overt sequence in the text, however, would actually still exist if the material were all prose. The fact that some of it is poetry whose relationship with the prose is perplexing simply makes the problem of coherence stand out more clearly.

The best example of this pattern in our manuscript, I believe, is 4Q372 fragment 3. I first present the whole fragment as published in DJD 28, and later offer my rearrangement of lines 4–12 into something resembling poetic form, where I have taken more liberties in restoration within the text than are appropriate for DJD:

1] [◦◦ת השמי[ם] י[[
2] [ך ח֯כ֯מ֯ה ובינה הל◦[ ]◦מה עם כ֯[[
3] [ו֯ע ולבב להבין חק[יך]צדיקים [[
4] ל]השבית מהם[ ] *vac* אהללה יה֯[וה יע]ר֯ב עליו שיח֯י֯[[
5 [ו]לבב ללמד בינה פה֯[להג]י֯ד משפט כי דברי מנפת֯[ימת]ק֯ו֯ ומיין יערבו לש[וני [
6 אמת וכל אמרי פי צ[דק] לא ישחיתו מעדיהם ולא יו֯בד֯ו֯ מחלקותם כי כלם֯[[
7 יהוה פתח פי ומאתו [ד]ברי לשוני ודברו בי להגיד מ֯י◦[[
8 ר֯חמיו ולא יתן לגוי אחר חקיו ולא יעטרם לכל זר כ֯י֯[[
9 [ב]נ֯יהם אשר כרת עם יעקב להיות עמו עד עלמי ע֯ד֯[[
10 [י]ש֯ראל כלה להשמידו ביד גוים כל הנגעים בנחל[תו [
11] [◦◦◦◦ ו֯א֯ת דמם ידרוש מידם ראו מה עשה למדין א[[
12 אחד הוא זמרי בן סלו֯א וחמשת מלכי מדין נהרגו[[
13] [ל] [מ֯ק֯] [

The text begins with language that suggests a wisdom context: line 2, חכמה ובינה, "wisdom and understanding"; line 3, ולבב להבין חק]יך ומשפטיך ה[צדיקים, "and a heart to understand [your] righteous statutes [and judgments]."[8] Unfortunately, not enough of any line survives for us to be able to discern the parallelism or whatever else could denote the presence of poetry with more certainty.

Following a midline *vacat*, however, line 4 begins an unmistakably poetic segment with the words אהללה יה]וה, "let me praise the Lord." There does not seem to be anything in the surviving traces of the preceding lines to indicate that such a passage was about to begin, although it is not unlikely that line 3 in the previous section, which is too fragmentary to assert that it is poetry, could very well be

[8] We could also restore חק]יו ומשפטיו[, referring to God in the third person rather than the second.

restored with a first person speaker, along the lines of נתת לי אזנים לשמ]וע ולבב להבין חק[יך, "[You have given me ears to he]ar and a heart to understand [your] statutes."[9] That would make this section, too, hymnic in nature, and we should then have two poetic texts, or perhaps two parts of a single poetic text, following one another. It should be noted, further, that there are no unrestored second person references to God in the opening lines (1–4a), and that, in the poetic segment that follows, God is referred to in the third person.

The language and structure of lines 4–7 can readily be seen as poetic, with the parallelism still manifest. With somewhat aggressive restorations, we might read:[10]

A [4]אהללה יה[וה בחיי יע]רב עליו שיחי[
B [כי נתן לי] [5]לבב ללמד בינה פה[לה]ניד משפט
C כי דברי מנפת[ימ]תקו ומיין יערבו
D לש[וני תדבר] [6]אמת וכל אמרי פי צ[דק]
E לא ישחיתו מעדיהם ולא יובדו מחלקותם כי כלם[
F [7]יהוה פתח פי ומאתו [ד]ברי לשוני
G ודברו בי להניד מ֯[

A Let me praise the Lo[rd in my lifetime;[11] may] my meditation [be sw]eet to him
B [For he has given me] a heart to teach understanding, a mouth [to rel]ate judgment
C For my words [are sw]eeter than honeycomb and more pleasing than wine
D [My] to[ngue speaks] truth and all the words of my mouth are righ[teousness]
E Their testimonies will not corrupt, nor will their portions perish.[12] For all of them . . .
F The Lord opened my mouth, and from him are the [wo]rds of my tongue.
G And his word is in me to tell . . .

---

[9] Modeled after Deut 29:8, ולא נתן ה׳ לכם לב לדעת ועינים לראות ואזנים לשמע עד היום הזה, "the Lord has not given you a heart to understand, or eyes to see, or ears to hear until this day."

[10] For this and the following excerpt, I employ raised numerals for the manuscript lines and capital letters for my reconstructed lines of poetry.

[11] This portion of the reconstruction is based on a combination of Ps 146:2, אהללה ה׳ בחיי אזמרה לאלהי בעודי, and Ps 104:33–34, אשירה לה בחיי אזמרה לאלהי בעודי יערב עליו שיחי. Quite obviously, these could serve together to influence the post-biblical author's composition.

[12] Schuller and I reject the 'obvious' calendrical understanding of מעדיהם and מחלקותם because it simply does not fit the context. We understand the terms as located within a wisdom framework.

The only difference in this reading from the DJD version is the absence of a restored *vav* from לבב at the beginning of line 5 (poetic line B), and I believe that this is a justifiable reading on the basis of the manuscript. If instead of [לש[וני תדבר in D, we were to restore לש[ומע] "to the listener" or [לש[מוע, "to hear," then it should be attached to the end of line C ("more pleasing than wine to the listener/to hear"). I should then suggest something like [דברי] אמת וכל [אמרי פי צ[דק] ("[my words] are truth and all the sayings of my mouth are righ[teousness]") for line D, since there is probably no room at the end of line 5 for a subject + verb to govern אמת of line 6. The sapiential nature of the preceding lines is continued in a fashion which can only be described as poetic. The language of 4–7 is poetically repetitive, echoing biblical poetic language in the surviving text: אהללה ה׳ (Ps 146:2); יערב עליו שיחי (Ps 104:34); וכל אמרי פי צדק (Prov 8:8 ובצדק כל אמרי פי); it is tempting to complete the lacunae with further biblical language, as I have done somewhat generously.

Whereas the poetic nature of these lines is fairly obvious, that of those following is not quite as overt, although they might still be claimed to be 'poetic':

G [8]רחמיו
H ולא יתן לנוי אחר חקיו ולא יעטרם לכל זר
I כי[ברית [9]ב]ניהם
J אשר כרת עם יעקב להיות עמו עד עלמי עד[
K [כי לא יעשה את [10]י]שראל כלה להשמידו ביד גוים
L כל הננעים בנחל[תו יאבדו
M [11][ ]oooo ואת דמם ידרוש מידם
N ראו מה עשה למדין א[רצם אבדה . . .]
O [הרג פינחס מהם] [12]אחד הוא [12]זמרי בן סלוא
P וחמשת מלכי מדין נהרגו

. . . his mercies. He shall not give any other nation his statutes, nor will he adorn them upon any stranger. For . . . [covenant] . . . their [so]ns, which he cut with Jacob to be with him forever. [For he will not entirely] destroy Israel, by annihilating them by the hand of the nations. All who harm [his] inheritance [will perish] . . . and their blood will he demand from their hand. See what he did to Midian; [their] l[and is lost[13] . . . Phineas killed] one [of them], Zimri son of Salu, while five kings of Midian were slain.

[13] Or perhaps, [א[בד את ארצם, "he destroyed their land." The suggestion of how to read the last two lines as something resembling poetry is owed to Professor Menahem Kister, who proposed the readings at the time of the oral presentation of this paper.

The 'poetry,' identified by the apparent parallelism and by the psalmodic and sapiential language of lines 4–7, might be argued to continue in 8–11, although the subject matter shifts abruptly between lines 7 and 8 of the fragment from wisdom to the relationship between God and Israel. The figurative language in the metaphor of God adorning a nation with his laws is novel, perhaps anticipating the rabbinic notion of כתר תורה, "the crown of the Law."[14] This is poetic exegesis of Ps 147:19–20: מגיד דבריו ליעקב חקיו ומשפטיו לישראל לא עשה כן לכל גוי ומשפטים בל ידעום, "He relates his words to Jacob, his statutes and judgments to Israel; he has not done so for any nation, and judgments they have not known." The historical references to the covenant with Jacob and the promise of divine protection for Israel and destruction for its enemies still maintain some parallelistic structure. In fact, awareness of the poetic structure virtually assures that [י]שראל כלה] should be preceded by a negative. If we accept something like Professor Kister's suggestion (above, n. 13) for the last lines, even the example of God's protective action in the past is represented somewhat poetically.

What we have here, in sum, is a brief sapiential psalm (and I am not sure whether that term is appropriate for all of the text) emphasizing God's gifts, first that of intellect, given to the psalmist, and then that of the Law, given to Israel, followed abruptly by a hortatory demonstration of God's protection of Israel based on an example from Israelite history. Note that the exhortation ראו is plural, as if addressing an unidentified audience, although it is doubtful whether this implies a liturgical context. We might compare for the imperative, 4Q521 7+5 ii 1–2, ראו את כל א[שר עשה אדני האר]ץ וכל אשר בה, "See all th[at which the Lord has made, the eart]h and everything

[14] The rabbinic idiom כתר תורה usually refers to the crown achieved by the study of Torah; cf. *m. Avot* 4:13, *Avot de Rabbi Nathan* A41 B48 (with the remarks of M. Kister, *Studies in Avot de-Rabbi Nathan: Text, Redaction and Interpretation* [Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Department of Talmud/Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1998], 96 [Hebrew]); *Sifre* 119 (ספרי על ספר במדבר וספרי זוטא; ed. H. S. Horovitz; Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1966 [1917]), 144; and other parallels. There are, however, midrashim which mention crowns obtained by the Israelites upon their affirming, "we shall perform and we shall listen" (Exod 24:7), at the receiving of the Law at Sinai (cf. *b. Shab.* 88a; *Seder Eliyahu Zuta* 4; *Pesiqta Rabbati* 33). The descriptions of these rewards, although I am not aware of a reference to them as כתר תורה, seem more analogous to the passage before us in 4Q372 than the texts in *m. Avot* and *Avot de Rabbi Nathan*, especially in light of the apparent reference to covenant in line 9.

which is in it." Perhaps the whole ought to be described as a sort of didactic poem.

In the case of 4Q372 3, we have the rare advantage of almost complete lines which enable us to see some of the poetic parallelism. In most other passages in our manuscripts, however, we have no such luxury, and as a result our discussion and suggestions must remain even more tentative. Thus 4Q372 fragment 2 exhibits 'poetic' features, but less markedly than fragment 3. In the case of this text, though, not enough words survive to endeavor to lay it out in any kind of parallel structure, and our argument that the text is somewhat poetic must rest on other grounds. 4Q 372 2:

]◦ לׄבׄ[
] יהוה בׄשמים [
] בתהמות וׄבׄכל אבדׄוׄ[ן
המ[לׄמׄד ידו למלחמה הנוקםׄ[
הנו[תׄןׄ לו שכל להבין לבנות ◦]
לע[שׂות חמדו לעוד כרׄם]
לד[עת כי נתן לך עוז לגׄבׄ[ר
[ויתנםׄ ביד עמו במשׁׄפׄ[טים
ה[רׄ הבשן ש◦[ ] ואת כל ערי[
[◦מות ◦◦◦ ◦◦בׄנׄ◦תׄ לבש בׄ◦[
[המבטיח עמו על [ ]◦רׄת◦[
יש[רׄאל כי נשבר לפניו[
[ראשו באבן המז[ור
[לא נׄרׄ◦[ ]ל[

. . . the Lord in heaven . . . in the depths and every place of perdi[tion . . . [who tr]ains his hand for war; who avenges . . . [who gi]ves him perception to understand how to build (?) . . . [to] do his delight forever *krm*[15] [. . . to k]now[16] that he gave to you strength to prev[ail] . . . and he gave them into the hand of his people with judg[ments] . . . [Mou]nt Bashan . . . and all the cities of . . . he was clothed with . . . who makes his people trust in . . . [Is]rael, for he was shattered before him . . . his head with a stone of in[jury]. . . .

---

[15] The vocalization and translation of כרם here is as yet undetermined.

[16] The restoration לד[עת is not without problems; there is no mark of a letter before עת, although it is possible that the surface has peeled, leaving no trace. It is the similarity to Deut 8:18, וזכרת את ה׳ אלהיך כי הוא הנתן לך כח לעשות חיל, which makes the reading לדעת attractive. If we adopt an unrestored reading, the word remaining is עת, "time," and must represent the final word of the preceding sentence or clause.

Despite its fourteen partially surviving lines, barely a single complete sentence remains in this fragment. From a generic perspective, beginning with line 8 the text appears to be narrative and historical, referring perhaps to Israelite triumphs during the wilderness wanderings (the reference to Mt. Bashan would dovetail well with the allusions to the Midianites in fragment 3, and with the passages referring to the gigantic opponent in 4Q372–373 and 2Q22, if indeed they refer to Og and not to Goliath). The narrative employment of *vav*-consecutive in ויתנם, "and he handed them over," is certainly atypical of classical biblical poetry.

Several of the earlier lines, on the other hand, point in the possible direction of 'poetry,' or at least do not sound like any sort of prose to which we are accustomed. The sapiential language of הנו]תן לו שכל להבין, "who gives him intellect to understand," need not be poetic, per se, but it does recall the wisdom-like poetry which we examined earlier, and its allusion to God would be most suitable in a poetic context.[17] Descriptive phraseology like "the Lord in Heaven," followed by "in the depths and in all perdi[tion]," which taken together might stand for 'everywhere,' might be characterized as more typical of poetry than prose, and the rhythmic language of the successive participles describing God, ה]מלמד, הנוקם, הנו]תן, "who teaches, who takes vengeance, who gives," also points in that direction. If this tentative analysis is correct, we have something poetic juxtaposed with something of a clearly prosaic nature, highlighting the generic problem with which I began. The absence of any reference to speaker or addressee and the difficulty in ascertaining whether the suffixes in lines 4–6 are first or third person combine with the fragmentary nature of the passage to make it difficult to say anything more about it.

Since it is fairly clear that there is a triple overlap among 2Q22 i, 4Q372 19 and 4Q373, our initial premise is that they are copies of the same work. The overlapping text of 2Q22 i contains a first person, apparently prose, narrative by the hero of a battle between himself and a gigantic opponent, either Moses vs. Og or David vs. Goliath. In light of the overlap, it is appropriate (with only slight

[17] I would be more confident of suggesting this context if the reading were לי, "to me," rather than לו, but the distinction between *vav* and *yod* in this manuscript is sufficiently clear that the former reading is probably precluded.

hesitation) to introduce the non-overlapping column of 2Q22 into our discussion.[18] The second column of 2Q22 reads as follows:

1]שרים כי ידעת[י]ם
2 כי רחמיו על ישרא[ל
3a דבריו
3 הוא בכל דרכיו ולא[
4 יתנם למשפט וכל[

. . . For I (you?) know . . . that his mercies are upon Israel . . . is he in all of his ways (*supralinear*: "his words") and not . . . he will give them for judgment. . . .

Again the language does not appear to be prose, and is somewhat hymnic/poetic. The fragment appears to be some kind of prayer text in which the individual praying mentions God's mercy and constancy, perhaps stressing His protectiveness over Israel, along the lines of "He will not destroy Israel," which we saw in 4Q372 3. The third line was obviously preceded by an adjective, producing something like Ps 145:17: צדיק ה׳ בכל דרכיו; or, with the interlinear reading, like 11QPs[a] 17:2, the 'missing' *nun*-verse of Psalm 145, נאמן אלוהים בדבריו וחסיד בכול מעשיו. And yet this piece apparently stands only one column distant from the first person battle narration that 2Q22 has in common with 4Q372 and 4Q373. Once again, a narrative and a poem are juxtaposed, without any context to explain their proximity. It should be noted that יתנם למשפט also recalls ויתנם ביד עמו במשפטים of 4Q372 2, but that is not very much to build on.

Besides these texts, which appear to have some poetic style or language, there are several other, even more fragmentary, passages in 4Q372 that sound like they derive from poetic contexts, because of either their vocabulary or their style. Fragment 8 of 4Q372 exhibits language which might point to a poetic context, but its sketchy nature makes the evidence much more tenuous:

[18] Cf. E. Schuller, "A Preliminary Study of 4Q373 and Some Related (?) Fragments," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 2:515–30.

1]ה להניד[
2]ת וחרשים מש[מוע
3]לו אשר יושעו[
4 ל]א מבינים בלבבם [
5]עליהם לא ישמעו[
6 כ]י לא יבינו ולא ידׄ[עו
7 כ]סֶף וזהב למכש[ול
8]כל עובדיהם[

To tell . . . and the deaf from h[earing] . . . who will be saved . . . [no]t understanding in their heart . . . concerning them, they will not hear . . . [fo]r they do not understand and do not kn[ow] . . . [s]ilver and gold as a stumbling block . . . all who worship them

If we are not dealing with poetry here, we are certainly dealing with something very close to it, although the fragment is too poorly preserved to determine context. If we restore line 2 boldly ת[עורים מראו, "the blind from seeing and the deaf from hearing," the language would be reminiscent of Isaiah 6:9–10. Line 6, of course, recalls Ps 82:5, לא ידעו ולא יבינו, "they do not know and they do not understand," although the language is admittedly also found in a prose context in 4Q390 2 i 7, ולא ידעו ולא יבינו כי קצפתי עליהם במועלם ("they do not know, nor do they understand that I have become angry at them because of their faithlessness"). The passage concludes with a reference to idolatry. The whole passage may actually be elevated prose which employs poetic language as a model, but, regardless of whether it is prose or poetry, its contents remain unclear.

Even fragments consisting of only a few words can point to poetic contexts. Thus we find in 4Q372 14 language which implies direct address to God, אמתך . . . השמים ושמי ה[שמים, "your truth," followed by "the heavens and the heavens of h[eavens"; and in 4Q372 15 3 we have a phrase which can be restored, א[רננה בכל ימ[י, "[I] shall exult all [my] d[ays]."[19] In 4Q372 16 we read, ברוח[. . . עדׄ השׄ[מים נבורה[. . .]הרימות למעל[ה, "up to the he[avens . . .]with a powerful spirit . . . you have lifted up on high," once again apparently an address to God. It is difficult to imagine a context for any of these

[19] The verbal root רנן is attested in 4Q256 and 4Q427; the noun רננה is not attested in Qumran literature, according to the preliminary concordance. A first person plural restoration, נ[רננה is also possible and would require a different restoration for the final word of the line.

lines which implies praise of God that is not poetic/hymnic. 4Q371 6 3 and 5 contain, in the context of references to water, fire and flame, the words תשלח ידכ[ה, "may you send out you[r] hand," and אשר [תע]שה, "which [you will] do," both most easily understood as a prayer or other address to God. Finally, how can 372 24, הלליה הל[. . .]א לעולם, "praise the Lord . . . forever," not be poetry? The appearance of short *vacats* within the text (at 3 4, as we have seen, as well as 4 5 and 9 1) may also indicate subsections within the composition or the presence of separate psalmic works.

Before summarizing the results of this investigation, I return briefly to the substantial prayer in 4Q372 1 to which I alluded earlier. Professor Schuller devoted a 1992 article to this section of 4Q372 alone, and my treatment, of course, builds on her work. She categorized the structure of the prayer as exhibiting "many of the forms of the standard individual lament."[20] The best-preserved segment of the prayer is its opening, in which the individual praying invokes God, describes some divine attributes, and presents the complaint that his own land has been taken away from him. Introduced by "And he cried out [and aloud] he called to mighty God to save him from their hand, and he said" (15–16), the prayer itself begins (16–20):

A [16]אבי ואלהי אל תעזבני ביד הגוים
B [17]עשה אתה בי משפט למען לא יבדו ענוים ורשים
C ואין אתה צריך לכל נוי ועם [18]לכל עזרה
D אצב[ע ידך]נדולה וחזקה מכל אשר בתבל
E כי אתה בורר את האמת ואין בידך [19]כל חמס
F גם רחמיך רבים וחסדיך גדלים לכל דרשיך
G [וי]קחו]ארצי ממני ומכל אחי אשר [20]נלוו עמי
H עם אויב יושב עליה

A My father and my God, do not abandon me into the hands of the nations;
B Do justice for me, lest the afflicted and the poor perish.
C You have no need of any nation or people for any help.
D The fin[ger of your hand] is greater and stronger than anything in the world.
E For you select the truth, and there is not in your hand any violence.
F Also your mercies are abundant, and your kindnesses great for all who seek you.

[20] "The Psalm of 4Q372 1," 71.

G [They took] my land from me and from all my brothers who are joined with me.
H A hostile people is dwelling upon it. . . .

Once again, I have laid out the language of these virtually complete lines in a manner as close to poetry as I can. The poetic features are, as Schuller has noted, somewhat limited, although a line like, כי אתה בורר את האמת || ואין בידך כל חמס, "for you choose the truth, and there is no violence in your hands" (18–19) is an example, in her words, of "short, concise cola in the classical style,"[21] as is also, perhaps, רחמיך רבים וחסדיך גדלים לכל דרשיך (19). Despite the fact that the text is indubitably a prayer, poetic features are not particularly prominent in it.

The later, more fragmentary section (23–30) exhibits traits more easily recognizable as poetry: the apparent parallelism within [לעשות] רצון בראי ולזבח זבחי [תודה], "[to do] the will of my creator and to sacrifice sacrifices [of thanksgiving]" (23–24); and את אלהי ואגיד. . . חסדי[ו], "[I shall . . .] my God and relate [his] mercies" ([24–]25).[22] For a second time within this manuscript we find the employment of the language of praise and invocation: אׄהללך ה׳ אלהי ואבׄ[ר]כׄךׄ, "I shall praise you, Lord my God and I shall bl[ess you]" (26); although this language is clearly not at the beginning of a poem, it may mark a transition. וללמד לפשעים חקיך ולכל עזביך תוׄרׄ[תך], "to teach sinners your statutes, and to those who abandon you [your] La[w]" (27), would strike our ear as biblically poetic even if we did not recognize Ps 51:15, אלמדה פשעים דרכיך, "let me teach sinners your ways"; [השמים] והארץ וגם במעמקי תהום], "heaven] and earth and also in the abyss of the deep" (29–30), and הוד וׄ[הדר], "splendor and [glory]" (30), if correctly restored, both have a clearly biblical poetic tone and rhythm as well. The (at least) sixfold string of epithets for God in line 29 ([גדול קדוש גבור ואדיר נורא ונפלא) is an expansion of a biblical model.[23] Perhaps the syntactic difficulty of line 28 (ורע אשר לא להכיחי עדותיך ולהגיד דברי צדׄקׄ[ך) is to be blamed on the 'poetry.' The first person language with which the fragment concludes, ידעתׄ[י]

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] The alternative is to read חסדי[ך] and to translate "You are my God and I shall relate [your] mercies."

[23] The threefold biblical model is found in Deut 10:17 and Neh 9:32. As Schuller, "Psalm of 4Q372," 72–75, has already noted, rabbinic tradition (*b. Ber.* 33b) forbade the expansion of this threefold phrase in the first benediction of the Amidah.

וֹהתבוננתי, is once again of a sapiential nature. Perhaps it is due to the fragmentary nature of these lines, but their 'poetry' is not as evident as that of 4Q372 fragment 3, where the parallelism is much clearer.

Can we conclude anything from this brief survey of the 'poetic' material in these manuscripts? Probably very little beyond recognition and acknowledgment of the constraints under which we continue to operate, barring the discovery of new textual material. The overall nature of a group of fragmentary manuscripts such as these becomes more enigmatic when we focus on the features we have discussed today: they contain elements of prayer-lament, hymnic praise, wisdom psalm, wisdom psalm with historical model, and perhaps narrative praise as well. The issues which our fragments raise actually go beyond these texts alone and lead to further significant questions about the nature of generic definition and generic identification in the Dead Sea Scrolls and related corpora.

It is tempting to declare that our texts are eclectic, and that we are therefore not required to search for connections among their disparate pieces, but that is a solution of last resort, if it is any solution at all. The juxtaposition of prose and poetry in the fragments of this manuscript is more jarring than we should expect, even granted the generic flexibility that we sometimes see at Qumran. And, more significantly, we might not even have juxtaposed the pieces of 4Q372 fragment 3 if they had been on several pieces of leather, rather than one; this text alone should be sufficient to remind us that our inability to see connections within pieces of poetry, or between poetry and prose, can be due to our inability to see past the fragmentary pieces of text, to visualize the connections which originally may have existed among them, and to understand the way in which the ancient composer employed what to us are the different genres, prose and poetry, in his work. On the other hand, perhaps the text *is* excerpted or eclectic. Until we are fortunate enough to have some Bedouin shepherd boy find some more missing pieces, we shall just have to do our best with what we have, and that includes the occasional confession, which I am willing to make here, that the evidence just does not allow us to go any further than I have gone.

This page intentionally left blank

HUMAN AND ANGELIC PRAYER IN LIGHT OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Esther G. Chazon
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

This study will explore the intersection between human and angelic prayer, which takes place when human beings join the angels in praising God.[1] The Dead Sea Scrolls now offer nearly a score of previously unknown texts and testimonies reflecting joint human-angelic praise. With the final publication of some of the major works in the last two years—the Cave 4 *Hodayot* manuscripts, *Berakhot*, and *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*[2]—the time is ripe to take stock of the Scrolls' contribution to understanding this interesting religious phenomenon and its varied manifestations in different cultural, social, and historical matrices.

With this goal in mind, I set out to discern the diverse modes of joint human-angelic praise, and to pose the important question of a correlation between a particular mode and a particular religious outlook or social reality. The extant sources from the late biblical through the early medieval periods represent, in my estimation, three fundamental patterns of joint prayer, corresponding to three distinct types of religious experience:

A) Many voices: harmonizing with the universe;
B) Two choirs: praying like the angels;
C) One congregation: joining the angels.

---

[1] This research was supported by The Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 0322251). I wish to thank Eileen Schuller for reading a draft of this article, and for her helpful comments.

[2] E. Schuller, "Hodayot," *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. G. Chazon et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 69–232; B. Nitzan, "Berakhot," *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. E. Eshel et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 1–74; C. Newsom, "Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat," ibid., 173–401; F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar and A. S. van der Woude, "11QShirot ʿOlat HaShabbat," *Qumran Cave 11.II (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 259–304.

In isolating these categories, my principle criteria were liturgical function and the kind of religious experience engendered. Other aspects of phenomenology as well as content and literary form were factors in determining a text's function and in identifying different facets or subcategories of each main type.

Before examining each of the three categories outlined above, we should note the typology proposed by Bilhah Nitzan in her seminal article, "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgic Writings from Qumran."[3] As the title of her article indicates, Nitzan distinguishes between two types of human-angelic praise: a cosmological approach characterized by "an experience of harmony with the entire universe," and a mystical approach characterized by "an experience of mystic communion" between the human and angelic worshippers. While I basically accept this dichotomy, I perceive additional types, classify several texts differently, and usually refrain from applying the term 'mystical' to these ancient Jewish texts.[4]

A. *Many Voices: Harmonizing with the Universe*

In this pattern, all of God's creatures, including the angels, are invited by human worshippers to praise God. This category corresponds to the cosmological approach outlined by Nitzan. As Nitzan observes, "the praises invoked from all the cosmos express in harmony the . . . majesty of God, the creator of the whole universe."[5] The religious experience engendered by this pattern of joint praise is, then, that of singing in harmony with all God's creatures and being at one with them; in short, harmonizing with the universe. The harmony achieved is of a particular kind—it is one of multiple voices, each emanating from a separate and distinctive group of created entities, from the heavens above to those under the seas. In fact, what distinguishes this pattern of joint praise from the others is the human worshippers' distance from the angels. Here they do not emulate angelic praise, nor elevate themselves to angelic status, nor otherwise lay claim to a special association with the angels or their praise.

---

[3] B. Nitzan, "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgic Writings from Qumran," *JQR* 85 (1994): 163–83.

[4] On the latter point see E. R. Wolfson, "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran: A Response to Bilhah Nitzan," *JQR* 85 (1994): 185–202.

[5] "Harmonic and Mystical," 166.

The paradigmatic example of this pattern is Psalm 148, which invokes praise by all creatures, class by class, first in the heavens and then on earth, including creatures of the ocean depths. Psalm 148 may have served as a model for other hymns of this type, such as the Song of the Three Young Men in LXX Daniel 3:51–90 and the Sabbath prayer in the weekly liturgy of *Dibre Hame'orot* (4QDibHam^{a} 1–2 vii 4–12 and *verso* ll. 1–10). Like Psalm 148, these two songs are structured as a series of invocations to praise, using second person plural imperative verbs: הללו in Psalm 148, ברכו in the Song of the Three Young Men,[6] and הודו in *Dibre Hame'orot*.[7] In all three hymns, the list of invitees is divided into two main parts, those in heaven and those on earth, each part containing a general call to all in that particular realm, followed by invitations to specific creatures residing therein. The universality of this cosmic praise is emphasized through repetition of the word 'all' (כל). These three cosmological songs overlap considerably in their detailing of the specific invitees; for instance, the waters above and below the firmament, as well as the angels, are found in all three. Yet, each text has elements not found in either of the other two. Thus, Psalm 148 and LXX Daniel each list different groups of human beings, whereas *Dibre Hame'orot* emphasizes the depths of the earth, mentioning Abaddon and probably the Great Abyss (רבדה [תהום).

To illustrate these generic similarities as well as the special bent of our example from Qumran, I quote below the first section of the Sabbath prayer in *Dibre Hame'orot* and its closest parallels in the Song of the Three Young Men:

---

[6] The Septuagint has *eulogeite*, evidently translating ברכו. This is the primary verb in the song's long series of invocations, opening almost every verse. On the Aramaic version of this song in the *Chronicle of Jerahmeel*, and on the question of the song's original language (Hebrew or Aramaic), see J. J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia Series; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 199, 202 and the literature cited there.

[7] הודו is the first call to praise in the Sabbath prayer and one which may have been repeated in subsequent lines (note the prayer's title, which employs the same root, הודות שיר ביום השבת). With the exception of הרננו in line 11, none of the other imperative calls to praise have been preserved. Compare ירוממו in line 2 on the *verso* of this fragment, which contains the final lines of the Sabbath prayer and of the whole scroll. See my edition in E. G. Chazon, "A Liturgical Document from Qumran and its Implications: 'Words of the Luminaries' (4QDibHam)" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991), 298–314 (Hebrew); the text was previously published by M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 150–52. The translation is my own.

Give thanks [to the Lord forever,	All the works of the Lord, bless the Lord; Laud and highly exalt him forever.
Praise] His holy name continually.	
In the hea[vens]/ Pro[claim . . .][8]	Angels of the Lord, bless the Lord, laud . . .
All angels of the holy firmament,	Heavens, bless the Lord; laud . . .
And [all waters above] the heavens;	All the waters above the heaven, bless . . .
The earth and all its depths,	Let the earth bless the Lord, Let it laud . . .
[All the fountains of the] great [deep]	Rivers and springs, bless the Lord, laud . . .
and Abaddon,	Seas and rivers, bless the Lord; laud . . .
and the waters and all that is [in them].	Sea monsters and all that move in the waters, bless the Lord; laud. . . .
[Give thanks to the Lord] all his created ones continually, forever and ever.	
(4QDibHam[a] 1–2 vii 4–9)	(LXX Dan 3: 57–60, 74, 77–79)[9]

Finally, it is important to note that the title of the cosmological song in *Dibre Hame'orot*, "Thanksgiving Song on the Sabbath Day," clearly indicates its liturgical function as a prayer for recitation on the Sabbath. Like the prayers for the other days of the week in the same document, this Sabbath song would have been recited on a weekly basis. Furthermore, the plural language throughout *Dibre Hame'orot*—that is, the 'we' language in the weekday prayers and the second person plural calls to praise God in the Sabbath song—strongly suggest that this was a liturgy recited in a communal context. Similarly, a liturgical or cultic setting has been suggested as the original *Sitz im Leben* of the song incorporated into the Septuagint version of Daniel.[10] Both texts apparently predate the foundation of the Qumran community.[11]

---

[8] The most plausible reconstructions are בש[מים or בש[רו תהלתיו (cf. Isa 60:6, Ps 96:2). For the proposed schematic reconstruction of these lines, see Chazon, "Liturgical Document," 304–10 and, "On the Special Character of Sabbath Prayer: New Data from Qumran," *Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy* 15 (1992–93): 1–21.

[9] The translation is from Collins, *Daniel*, 196–97.

[10] Ibid., 207.

[11] E. G. Chazon, "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 3–17. For the date of the Song in LXX Daniel 3:51–91 see Collins, *Daniel*, 207.

B. *Two Choirs: Praying Like the Angels*

This pattern differs from the first in two respects: 1) human beings pray exclusively (or primarily) with the angels rather than with the whole universe; and 2) they offer praise which is similar to that of the angels in content or in form and language. The result is that the human worshippers not only pray *with* the angels but also come to pray *like* them. This type of joint praise would have engendered an experience of human-angelic liturgical communion and fostered a sense of a special association with the angels on high. Nevertheless, here the choirs remain separate, their voices are distinct; despite their similarities, human and angelic praise are not identical. In this case, the human worshippers never quite reach the level of their angelic counterparts.

Our first example of 'praying like the angels' is 4Q503 *Daily Prayers*, a text often overlooked in treatments of angelic liturgy. These blessings for every evening and morning of the month praise God both for sunrise and sunset, and for the daily changes in lunar light as the moon waxes and wanes during the course of the month.[12] A description of the worshippers' praise in conjunction with the heavenly hosts is an essential feature of each blessing. The most complete reference to joint human-angelic praise is found in the morning prayer for the sixth day of the month (frgs. 8–9 1–5): "[We] the sons of your covenant shall praise [. . .] with all troops of [light]" (אנו]בני בריתכה נהלל[. . .] עם כול דגלי [אור).[13] The construction "troops of [light]" evidently serves here as an epithet for the angels associated with the heavenly lights. Other blessings refer to the heavenly beings engaged in joint praise as "hosts of angels" (frg. 65), "those

[12] Each day's blessings (recited "in the evening" and "when the sun goes forth to shine on the earth") count the incremental changes in the fourteen portions ("lots") of lunar light and darkness on that day of the month. The system and terms are explained in J. M. Baumgarten, "4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 399–406. See further E. G. Chazon, "The Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; exec. ed. G. Marquis; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 217–25.

[13] The text was published by M. Baillet, "503 Prières Quotidiennes" (DJD 7.105–136). The English translation is my own.

who testify with us" (frgs. 11, 15, 65), and "those praising with us" (frgs. 38, 64).

The content of the joint praise is discernable in frg. 30: "[We] praise your name, God of lights, in that you have renewed [. . .] gates of light and with u[s] in praises of your glory" (מהל]לים שמכה [אל אור[י]ם אשר חדשתה . . . שערי אור ועמנ[ו] ברנות כבודכה . . .). These words, together with the astronomically charged angelic epithet "troops of light," demonstrate that the joint praise, like the rest of the blessing, extols God for the regular renewal of the heavenly lights. In this daily liturgy, then, the human blessings and the angelic praise are alike in content.

In our next two examples, the earthly congregation imitates angelic praise, and even echoes some of the angels' words. The sectarian covenant ceremony in *4QBerakhot* opens with blessings which praise God's attributes and describe the heavenly Temple, the divine chariot-throne, and various classes of angels. The section concludes with a well-preserved liturgical rubric which indicates that "the council of the community" is the group instructed to recite these covenant blessings (עצת היחד יומרו כולמה ביחד אמן אמן, 4QBer[a] 7 ii 1).

Joint praise is not explicitly mentioned in *4QBerakhot*, but it is implied by the juxtaposition of angelic praise with human praise. For instance, 4QBer[a] 7 i 2–7 first describes praise by human "elect ones [. . .] and all those who have [k]nowledge" and then immediately describes the praise by the "c]ouncil of *elim* (angels) of purification with all those who have eternal knowledge."[14] These analogous portrayals of elite human and angelic worshippers reflect one important aspect of the joint praise in *4QBerakhot*; that is, the correspondence between human and angelic praise in form, language, and manner of recitation. The following selections illustrate that the praises offered in each realm were formulated similarly as blessings to be recited together (ביחד) by all (כולמה) the worshippers belonging to that realm.[15]

In the earthly realm:

(1) ויבר]כוכה כול בריאות הבשר כולמה אשר ברא[תה

And] all the creatures of flesh, all those [You] created, [will ble]ss You. (4QBer[b] 3 2)

[14] The text and translation are from Nitzan, "Berakhot," DJD 11.25–26, but I have translated the epithet *elim* as 'angels.'

[15] Nitzan, "Harmonic and Mystical," 174–75.

(2) ויברכ]וכה ביח[ד כולמה אמן א[מן

and] all of them [will bless] You togeth[er]. Amen. A[men.

(4QBer^{b} 5 11)

In the heavenly realm:

(3) יברכו בי]חד כולמה את שם קודשכה

All [will bless toge]ther Your holy name. (4QBer^{a} 2 4)

(4) ולבר]ך את שם כבודכה בכול [קצי עו]למים

and to bles]s Your glorious name in all [ever]la[sting ages.

(4QBer^{a} 7 i 7)

These parallel phrases reveal two additional aspects of this liturgy's joint praise: 1) the angelic praise has special elements; and 2) these elements, which are not recited by the earthly beings, are blessings of God's holy and glorious name (שם קודשכה and שם כבודכה). The latter may allude to the angelic words in Isa 6:3 (the *trishagion*) and Ezek 3:12 (the blessing of God's glory). Such allusions would imply that the angels indeed recite these verses, but that the human congregation refrains from repeating them *verbatim*. In any event, whether or not *4QBerakhot* actually alludes to these two verses, it is clear that by referring *in*directly to the angelic blessings of God's holy and glorious name, the human worshippers are echoing this heavenly speech, taking what may be called a point/counterpoint approach.[16]

A similar approach is taken by the *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat* from Qumran and Masada. These songs for the first thirteen Sabbaths of the year are an earthly liturgy recited by human worshippers, who invite the angels to praise God and describe angelic worship in the heavenly Temple. Not only do the invitations to the angels and the description of their praise imply that the human congregation is joining them in prayer, but such joint praise is mentioned explicitly in one passage (4Q400 2 1–7): "to praise Your glory wondrously with

[16] On this approach see also E. G. Chazon, "Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran," *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 95–105. Note that in Nitzan's different classification ("Harmonic and Mystical"), she categorizes *4QBerakhot* as cosmological whereas she characterizes the *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat* (discussed below) as mystical.

the gods of knowledge (אלי דעה) and the praiseworthiness of Your kingship with the holiest of the h[oly ones] . . . how shall we be considered [among] them? . . . [What] is the offering of our tongues of dust (compared) with the knowledge of the g[ods (דעת אל[ים)?"[17]

The self-effacing remarks by the human worshippers in this passage uncover a qualitative distinction between angelic praise and human praise, which may provide a clue to the *Shirot*'s puzzling omission of the angels' words in general, and of Isa 6:3 and Ezek 3:12 in particular. Although these two verses are not quoted *verbatim* in this liturgy, some of the songs do allude to them. The beginnings of Songs 7 and 12 are good examples. Song 7's invocation to the holy angels to praise God for His holiness repeatedly employs the root קדש, 'holy,' thereby calling to mind the threefold angelic proclamation of God's holiness in Isa 6:3 (קדוש, קדוש, קדוש): "Let the holiest of the god-like beings magnify the King of glory who sanctifies by His holiness all His holy ones," (יקדילו קדושי אלוהים למלך הכבוד המקדיש בקודעו לכול קדושו, 4Q403 1 i 31).[18]

Song 12's use of Ezek 3:12 becomes apparent once we recognize its underlying interpretation of that verse. This interpretation associates the blessing of God's glory with the sound produced by the *ḥayyot*'s wings (Ezek 3:13, 1:19–24), perhaps by recourse to a "double reading" of *barukh* ('blessed') as *berom* ('lifting up') in Ezek 3:12.[19] It also identifies the angels pronouncing the blessing as the *cherubim* (cf. Ezek 10:5), and specifies the place of God's glory (ממקומו in Ezek 3:12) as "His glorious seat" (cf. Ezek 1:26–28):

יפול[ו] לפניו ה[כרו]בים ובו[ר]כו בהרומם . . . והמון רנה ברים כנפיהם קול[
דממ]ת אלוהים
תבנית כסא מרכבה מברכים . . . [והו]ד רקיע האור ירננו מִמתחת מושב כבודו

---

[17] The translation basically follows Newsom, "Shirot," DJD 11.187–88. The Hebrew text cited below is taken from this edition.

[18] The translation reflects the understanding of יקדילו as a phonetic misspelling of ינדילו and of בקודעו as a scribal error for בקודשו (see Newsom, "Shirot," 269–71). The emphasis is my own and highlights the three closely juxtaposed words derived from the root קדש ('holy') that call to mind the *trishagion* of Isa 6:3. On the last point compare A. M. Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult in Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (ed. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer; WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1991), 97–98; and D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 139–45.

[19] See C. A. Newsom, "Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot," *JJS* 38 (1987): 11–30.

> . . . the *cheru*[*bim*] fall before Him; and they bl[es]s as they lift themselves up. . . . and there is a tumult of jubilation at the lifting up of their wings, a sound of divine [stillnes]s. The image of the chariot throne do they bless . . . [And the splend]our of the luminous platform do they sing (which is) beneath His glorious seat. (4Q405 20 ii-21–22 7–10)[20]

The invitations to angelic praise, which allude to Isa 6:3 and Ezek 3:12, imply that the angels recite the *trishagion* and the blessing of God's glory recorded in these verses. The human worshippers who extend these invitations, however, merely describe and paraphrase the angels' words, without quoting them precisely. Thus, by echoing some but not all of the angels' words, these human beings pray like the angels to a certain, but not a full, extent. They approximate angelic praise while maintaining the proper distinction between the two choirs, the one human and the other angelic.

C. *One Congregation: Joining the Angels*

This mode of joint praise is characterized by the union with the angels attained by human worshippers. The distinction between human and angelic praise is dropped, the veil between the realms is removed, and the human worshippers conceive of themselves as actually present with the angels, apparently experiencing a sense of elevation to angelic heights. The meeting ground between the human worshippers and their angelic counterparts is in some cases a single, united congregation whereas in others it is the heavenly throne room. These two arenas are discussed separately below.

We encounter this mode of prayer quite frequently in the *Hodayot*. The 'I' speaker in these hymns expresses the conviction that both he personally and his entire community share a common lot and a common station with the holy ones in heaven. The activity of praising God together is singled out as the goal of the union with the angels, and is also the way this union is concretized. The word ביחד ('together,' 'in union') is used repeatedly for both the joint praise and the shared station, מעמד (compare 1Chr 23:28, 35:15, where this term refers to the Levites' duty and post in the Temple). One

[20] The emphasis is my own and indicates the words alluding to Ezek 3:12, including the double reading of ברוך ('blessed') and ברום ('at the lifting up').

illustration from a Hymn of the Community shall suffice to demonstrate the *Hodayot*'s approach:

> [13]For the sake of your glory you have purified man from transgression . . .
> [14]To become united [with] the sons of your truth
> And in the lot with your [15]holy ones . . .
> [16]So that he can take his stand in your presence
> With the perpetual host and the spirits [. . .]
> To be renewed with everything [17]that will exist
> And with the knowledgeable in a union of jubilation.

[13]ולמען כבודכה טהרתה אנוש מפשע . . .
[14]לחיחד [עם] בני אמתך ובנורל עם [15]קדושיכה . . .
[16]ולהתיצב במעמד לפניכה עם צבא עד ורוהו[ת . . .]
להתחדש עם כול [17]נהיה ועם ידעים ביחד רנה

(1QH[a] 19:13–17 = Sukenik 11:10–14).[21]

In his classic commentary on this passage and its parallel in another hymn (1QH[a] 11 = Sukenik 3:19–23), Jacob Licht suggested that the comparable phrase in the latter hymn, "to take (his) stand in a station with the host of holy ones" (להתיצב במעמד עם צבא קדושים), refers to a position around the divine throne as in *1En.* 60:2.[22] This interpretation may gain some support from the so-called *Self-Glorification Hymn*, which occurs in three *Hodayot* manuscripts, all representing the same recension of this hymn (1QH[a] 26:6–38, 4QH[a] 7 i–ii, and 4QH[e] 1–2 = 4Q471b).[23]

The 'I' speaker in the *Self-Glorification Hymn* boldly asks, "Who is like me among the heavenly beings?" (מי כמוני באלים; 4QH[a] 7 i 8+4QH[e] 1:4). He then declares that he is a beloved of the king (ידיד המלך) and a companion to the angels (רע לקדושים), with whom

---

[21] The text and translation basically follow F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1.188–89. For the reconstruction and renumbering of 1QH[a] and the corresponding column numbers in the old (Sukenik) edition consult Hartmut Stegemann's articles, "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot," *Fifty Years After*, 272–84, and in the present volume, "The Number of Psalms in *1QHodayot*[a] and Some of Their Sections." In the latter contribution, Stegemann also discusses the distinction between Hymns of the Community and Teacher Hymns as well as their distribution in the *Hodayot* manuscripts.

[22] Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957), 84, 163 (Hebrew).

[23] E. Eshel, "471b. 4QSelf-Glorification Hymn (= 4QH[a] frg. 1?)" (DJD 29.421–32), and Schuller, "Hodayot," 96–108 and 199–208 (note the bibliography listed on page 79 as "Previous discussion of frg. 7"). For the second recension of the *Hymn* see 4Q491 11 i.

he claims to be stationed (אני עמ אלים מעמד[י]; 4QH[a] 7 i 10–11+4QH[e] 1:6). This station with the angels who praise God, as well as the speaker's gifted speech and subsequent invocations to the 'beloved ones' (ידידים) to sing praise (4QH[a] 7 i 13–23), imply that the speaker, too, praises God, and that he does so together with the angels and on a par with them. This text leaves little doubt about the speaker's elevation to angelic status. Moreover, as Eileen Schuller has pointed out, "in the recension of this psalm that is found in the *Hodayot* manuscripts, the 'I' is to be understood in relationship to the 'I' voice we hear speaking in the other psalms, particularly the other Hymns of the Community."[24] These observations lead to the conclusion that the author(s) of some of the *Hodayot* claimed to be in the company of angels and to be reckoned as one of them.

Furthermore, if Schuller is correct that the 'beloved ones' called upon to praise the king, evidently by the 'beloved of the king,' are human beings rather than angels, then the speaker would appear to be making a similar claim for all members of his community.[25] Indeed, this section of the hymn depicts the 'beloved ones' as praising together with the eternal heavenly hosts, and even places these beloved ones in God's holy abode, according to Schuller's reconstruction of the text ([קודש] הללו במעון; 4QH[a] 7 i 14–15). In addition, like the angels alone in *4QBerakhot* and the *Shirot*, the 'beloved ones' appear to sanctify God's holy name (שו שמו[הקדי]) and display eternal qualities (4QH[a] 7 i 16–18). It is not impossible that the speaker, whether the Teacher of Righteousness or a similarly exalted leader of the *Yaḥad*, projected his own spiritual, perhaps even mystical, experience onto all members of his community or conversely, that the *Yaḥad* projected onto itself the Teacher's achievements and experiences.

Conclusion

This study has isolated three basic patterns of joint human-angelic prayer, corresponding to three types of religious experience and three different levels of association with the angels. They are: all created

---

[24] Schuller, "Hodayot," 102. Contrast Eshel, "Self-Glorification," 422–27, and the other views cited by both editors.

[25] Schuller, "Hodayot," 103. See the interesting perspective in D. Dimant, "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community," *Religion and Politics in The Ancient Near East* (ed. A. Berlin; Bethesda: Univ. Press of Maryland, 1996), 93–103.

beings harmonizing together; the human choir praying like the angels; humans and angels joined together in one choir of praise. We have seen that a single group, in this case the Qumran Community, engaged in various types and levels of joint praise on different occasions and for different purposes.

The full publication of *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*[26] fifteen years ago gave rise to an interesting theory linking the whole phenomenon of joint human-angelic praise with a particular religious outlook and social context. Specifically, this text's striking similarities with the *Hekhalot* literature, and their shared interests in such matters as the heavenly Temple and the angelic priesthood led Itamar Gruenwald, Rachel Elior, and other scholars to propose a common priestly origin and a historical trajectory from the Qumran Community and its precursors to the *merkabah* mystics.[27] This proposal has much to commend it. I would, however, suggest that the picture is more complex, involving other groups.

First, we should recall that not all of the texts of human-angelic praise discovered at Qumran were produced by members of the Qumran community or by its forerunners. Thus, a non-Qumranic origin has been proposed for *Dibre Hame'orot*, the *Daily Prayers* in 4Q503, and even for *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*.[28] Second, this religious phenomenon as a whole is broader both synchronically and diachronically than apocalyptic, Qumranic, and mystic circles. Its vitality among other segments of the population is attested by LXX Daniel, *Dibre Hame'orot*, the *Apostolic Constitutions* (Books 7–8), and the later *Qedushah* liturgy. Thus, in the arena of religious *praxis*, the theory of a historical trajectory from the Qumran Community to the *merkabah* mystics may ultimately apply only to the highest level of joint praise,

---

[26] C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

[27] I. Gruenwald, *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1988), 125–67, and R. Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrine: Prayer and Sacred Song in the Hekhalot Literature and Its Relation to Temple Traditions," *JSQ* 4 (1997): 217–67.

[28] E. G. Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and Their Historical Implications," *DSD* 1 (1994): 265–85, especially pages 271–73 (for *Dibre Hame'orot*, *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*, and the criteria of provenance) and page 282, n. 68 (for 4Q503). See also note 11 above. For the *Shirot* and a seminal discussion of the entire issue see C. A. Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman; Biblical and Judaic Studies 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87.

that which unites human beings to the angels most closely, elevating them to angelic heights. Other modes of joint praise may prove to be common religious practices shared by diverse groups living under different circumstances. In light of the new texts from Qumran, a more nuanced model appears to be emerging, one that more fully reflects the multi-faceted character of this special dimension of religious life—the phenomenon of praying with the angels.

This page intentionally left blank

QUMRAN AND THE ROOTS OF THE ROSH HASHANAH LITURGY

Torleif Elgvin
Lutheran Theological Seminary, Oslo

Although the final form of the Rosh Hashanah prayers is post-talmudic, dating from Eleazar Kallir (sixth to seventh century) and onwards, a core must go back to the tannaitic and amoraic periods. The earliest rabbinic references to the Rosh Hashanah liturgy are *m. Rosh HaSh.* 3:5, 4:5–7, and *Lev R.* 29:1.[1] The last-named source attributes the composition of the Shofar benediction to Rav (Babylon, third century CE), and quotes sentences from this prayer. Some of the *piyyutim* of Rosh Hashanah are attributed to Yose ben Yose (early fourth century CE). This paper examines several texts from the last two centuries BCE which demonstrate a number of parallels with the Rosh Hashanah liturgy,[2] and oblige us to ask whether elements of the liturgy have roots as early as the second century BCE.

I will primarily focus on two literary units from the sapiential composition *4QInstruction*. One text (4Q416 1) deals with eschatology, the other (4Q417 1 i) reflects on creation and revelation (see texts in *Appendix* below).[3] Both passages demonstrate poetic features that might reflect liturgical traditions.[4] In addition, I will consider David Flusser's

---

[1] According to J. Heinemann, the three benedictions, *Malkhuyyot*, *Zikhronot*, and *Shofarot*, composed of biblical verses, were already part of the Temple liturgy, and each was followed by a shofar blast. See his *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (Studia Judaica 9; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977), 128. The prayers *Ten paḥdekha* and *Aleinu*, both introductions to *Malkhuyyot*, must have early roots, as they are alluded to in *Apostolic Constitutions* 7.35; ibid., p. 223.

[2] I am indebted to Moshe Weinfeld, who first made me aware of the similarities between this liturgy and these texts from *4QInstruction*.

[3] See J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington, "4QInstruction," in *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (ed. J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, T. Elgvin; DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 1–503, pp. 81–88; 151–69. Translations of texts from *4QInstruction* are my own, based on my dissertation, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1998), and partly revised.

[4] In 4Q416 1, cf. the stereotypical listing of the objects of God's visitation in lines 4–5 and the parallelism in lines 7–8: "For the host of heaven he established from [the beginning . . . He set stars and luminaries] as their portents and signs of [their] set[times . . ." In lines 10–13, a main clause is followed by a series of six

suggestion that *1Q/4QMysteries*, a composition related to *4QInstruction* and likewise containing poetical elements, has influenced the Rosh Hashanah liturgy.[5] Relevant material from *1 Enoch* and other Second Temple sources will be discussed. I will proceed by describing central motifs in the liturgies of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, and noting parallels in Second Temple sources.

I. *Creation and its Remembrance*

In the Rosh Hashanah liturgy, the first of Tishrei is the day of creation, and the festival is a memorial of the creation: "From the beginning You made this Your purpose known, and from aforetime you revealed it. This day, on which was the beginning of Your work, is a memorial of the first day" (מראשית כזאת הודעת ומלפנים אותה נלית. זה היום תחלת מעשיך זכרון ליום ראשון) (= *Lev. R.* 29:1).[6] Accordingly, God is designated יוצר בראשית, "The One who fashioned the first things."[7]

4Q417 1 i preserves a long discourse that admonishes the addressee to meditate on the mysteries of creation and history which have now been revealed: ". . . what was and what comes into being with what will be" (lines 3–4). The passage describes God's creation of the world and its creatures (lines 8–10). Further, mortals will understand

---

subordinate clauses, within which four negative members are framed by two positive ones:

> [10]In heaven He will judge the work of iniquity,
> * and all His true offspring will take pleasure in[ ] [11]its end,
> —and all those who have defiled themselves by it will fear and cry out.
> —[12]For the heavens shall fear [and the earth] be shaken,
> —[the s]eas and the depths will fear,
> —all the spirit of flesh will be stripped naked,
> * and the sons of heave[n will rejoice on the day] [13]of its [jud]gment.

The teaching in 4Q417 likewise contains a number of parallel clauses. Other parts of *4QInstruction* show poetic features as well, e.g., 4Q417 2 i 15–17: "For before His wrath no one can stand,/And who can be deemed righteous in his judgment?/ And how can the poor one [stand] without forgiveness?"

[5] See D. Flusser, "'The Book of Mysteries' and a Synagogal Prayer," *Knesset Ezra: Literature and Life in the Synagogue. Studies Presented to Ezra Fleischer* (ed. S. Elizur et al.; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1994), 3–20 (Hebrew).

[6] *Musaf* RH, from the paragraph אתה זוכר מעשה עולם, Adler, 137. Machzor references are given according to M. Adler, *Service of the Synagogue. New Year/Day of Atonement* (New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.). Translation adapted and modernized.

[7] *Musaf* RH, עלינו לשבח, Adler, 135.

God's ways when they remember the time of creation, the time when the heavenly tablets were inscribed (lines 13–14, see below, n. 55).

Creation and the Order of the Luminaries

The God who sits in judgment is the creator of the heavens and the luminaries: "He stretched out the heavens and established the foundations of the earth";[8] "He changes the times and appoints the stars in their heavenly courses according to his will, he who is the Creator of day and night."[9]

4Q416 1, the opening passage of *4QInstruction*, preserves a text on the final judgment. The text appears to open with a theophanic description (lines 1–6, fragmentarily preserved). It refers to the creation of the heavenly hosts and the luminaries, and may connect their celestial movement to the earthly calendar (lines 7–9); it continues with a description of the judgment in heaven and on earth (lines 10–13).

Similar motifs are found in *1 Enoch* 2 and 72–82. Like 4Q416 1, *1 Enoch* 1–2 brings together the themes of theophany, universal judgment, and the order of the luminaries. The Enochic texts compare the order of the heavenly realms with the sin and disorder which characterizes the world of human beings, a theme found also in the *Festival Prayers*, 1Q34^{bis} 2:1–5. According to *1 Enoch* 100:10–13, angels and luminaries testify against the ungodly on earth. A related motif is found in another eschatological discourse in *4QInstruction*:

> [And then] all the foolish of heart will be destroyed, the sons of iniquity will not be found any more, and all who support evil will be asham[ed] at your judgment. The foundations of the firmament will shout, all the h[osts of God] will thunder, [and al]l who love[righteousness will rejoice.] (4Q418 69 ii 7–9)

II. *Day of Judgment*

Rosh Hashanah is the day of judgment, יום המשפט, יום הדין. Some rabbis expected the eschatological redemption to happen on Rosh

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] *Maariv* YK, Adler, 18. This benediction also occurs in the regular *Maariv* prayer; it may be difficult to decide which location was original.

Hashanah, so that the world would be judged in the same month in which it was created (*Mekilta* to Exod 12:42; *Lev. R.* 29:1; *b. Rosh HaSh.* 10b, 11b).

A major theme in the Rosh Hashanah liturgy is God's yearly judgment of all creation and determination of their fate for the year to come: "Today is the birth(day) of the world, today all creatures of the world stand in judgment";[10] "For the remembrance of every creature comes before You, each person's deeds and destiny" כי זכר כל מעשה איש ופקדתו, היצור לפניך בא; "You will bring on the appointed time of memorial when every spirit and soul shall be visited" כי תביא חק זכרון להפקד כל־רוח ונפש.[11] Rabbinic literature frequently refers to this dimension of Rosh Hashanah: *m. Rosh HaSh.* 1:2; *t. Rosh HaSh.* 1:13; *Lev. R.* 29:1; *b. Ber.* 18b; *b. B. Bat.* 10a; *b. Rosh HaSh.* 16b; *Ber. R.* 25:1.

Allusion to the final judgment occurs as well, and there is a correlation between the two 'judgment days' (see discussion below on the *piyyut* ונתנה תוקף). The divine judgment upon people and nations on Rosh Hashanah foreshadows the end-time judgment. "Hidden in (God's) heart is (the time of) the final vengeance";[12] "You look and see unto the end of all generations."[13]

The eschatological passage in *4QInstruction* looks forward to the end-time day of 'its judgment' (יום משפטה, i.e., the day of the judgment of evil, 4Q416 1 13–14). The terminology in *4QInstruction* is close to *1 Enoch* 10:6 "the great day of judgment" (of the forces of evil). The RH liturgy uses the word פקודה for God's visitation of humanity each year, the destiny of each and every creature, and the ultimate visitation at the judgment day. We find a similar usage in 4Q417 1, where פקודה is used for 'punishment' (l. 7), 'visitation' (l. 14) and 'eternal visitation' (ll. 7–8). Thus *4QInstruction* and the Rosh Hashanah liturgy share an understanding of the link between present and final judgment, an understanding manifested in common terminology as well as common motifs.

In a related vein, according to the liturgy, on Rosh Hashanah God determines the fates of countries for the coming year: "And on countries <sentences> will be pronounced, which one to the sword

---

[10] *Musaf* RH, in the paragraph היום הרת עולם, Adler, 157.
[11] *Musaf* RH, אתה זוכר, Adler, 137.
[12] *Musaf* RH, in the paragraph אף אדה משפטיך, Adler, 144.
[13] *Musaf* RH, אתה זוכר, Adler, 137.

and which to peace, which one to famine and which to abundance" ועל המדינות בו יאמר, איזו לחרב ואיזו לשלום, איזו לרעב ואיזו לשבע[14] (= *Lev. R.* 29:1). If my interpretation is correct, *4QInstruction* preserves remarkably similar terminology in its description of the end-time judgment: God will judge everything created: "measure by measure, ge[neration by generation, city by city(?), kingdom] by kingdom, coun[try] by country, person by person" (4Q416 1 4–5).[15] Both sources use the word מדינה for the countries to be censured by God.

4QInstruction distinguishes sharply between the righteous, inscribed before God, and the ungodly, who face perdition. In the discourse on meditation (4Q417 1), we encounter "the Book of Remembrance . . . of those who keep His word" (וספר זכרון . . . לשמרי דברו), a book which records the names of the righteous (4Q417 1 i 15–16). This motif recurs in the liturgies of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, in the *Amidah* petitions to be inscribed and sealed in the Book of Life, as well as in the allusion to the "Book of Remembrances" (ספר הזכרונות in ונתנה תוקף), in which God's judgment is recorded.

In both contexts, as we might expect, God's might is contrasted with the humble position of God's creatures. "Every creature will know that You made him, and every being understand that You formed him, every living being shall acknowledge You"; "Are not all the mighty men as naught before You, the men of renown as though they had not been, the wise as if without knowledge, and the men of understanding as if without discernment?";[16] "Before His wrath no one can stand, and who can be deemed righteous in His judgment? And how can the poor one [rise] without forgiveness?" (4Q417 2 i 15–17).

The *Aleinu* prayer, featured prominently in the Rosh Hashanah liturgy, asks God to "appear and be exalted over us before the eyes of all living," and proclaims that "all humanity will call upon Your name, when You will turn unto You all the wicked of the earth."[17]

---

[14] *Musaf* RH, in אתה זוכר, Adler, 137.

[15] In this construal of the passage, I take issue with E. Tigchelaar, who holds that these lines refer not to judgment, but to the luminaries giving their signs to all lands and peoples: "Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels)," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETL 159; ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 99–126.

[16] *Musaf* RH, in the paragraph אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו, Adler, 136; *Shaḥarit* RH, par. רבון כל העולמים, Adler, 30 (found also in the regular prayers).

[17] *Musaf* RH, על כן נקוה לך, Adler, 135.

Not surprisingly, the theophany scene in *4QInstruction* closes with the conviction that everyone will know God's judgments and understand that human beings are only flesh before the divine judge (כ]א יצר בשר הואה; 4Q416 1 15–16). The same scene opens with God's coming to confront 'every spirit of flesh,' כול רוח בשר. The wording is close to the liturgy's "all *sons of flesh* (כל בני בשר) will call upon Your name" (cf. *1 Enoch* 1:9 and *Jub.* 1:28).

III. *The Annihilation of Evil*

The liturgy and the Qumran texts share a hope for the ultimate annihilation of all evil.[18] D. Flusser has proposed that *1QMysteries* influenced the תן פחדך prayer said on Rosh Hashanah.[19] According to Flusser, this prayer reflects a sectarian dualistic view of this world and its approaching end, uncommon to rabbinic theology, and portrays God in opposition to the transcendent 'kingdom of evil.' Both *1QMysteries* and the liturgy use the image of smoke that disappears to describe the consumption of evil:

> When the begotten of unrighteousness are delivered up, and wickedness is removed from before righteousness, as darkness is removed from before light; (then), just as smoke wholly ceases and is no more, so shall wickedness cease for ever . . . (וכתום עשן ואיננו עוד כן יתם הרשע לעד) and all the adherents of the mysteries of [evi]l will be no more. (1Q27 [1QMyst] 1 i 4–6)[20]

> Then the righteous will see and be glad, the upright will rejoice, the pious will shout in happiness, iniquity will shut its mouth, and all evil

---

[18] The hope that "all evil shall be consumed" is a central feature in apocalyptic thinking, cf. *1 Enoch* 1:9, 10:13–22, 91:8–9, 107:1, 4Q245 (4QpsDan^{c} ar) 2 2 לֿמסף רשעה "to exterminate evil"; *T. Dan* 6:4, "the enemy's kingdom will be brought to an end"; 1Q27 (1QMyst) 1 i 5–7 כן יתם הרשע לעד "so shall wickedness cease for ever"; 4Q301 (4QMyst^{c} ?) 3 8 בֿכלו[ת]קץ רשעה "at the completion of the period of evil"; *Jub.* 23:29 "there shall be no Satan nor any evil destroyer."

[19] See n. 4 above. J. Bloch had already noted the apocalyptic character of these prayers, *On the Apocalyptic in Judaism* (*JQR* Monograph Series 2; Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952), 62–65. L. H. Schiffman characterizes the book as reflective (i.e., non-liturgical) poetry: "4QMysteries^{a}, A Preliminary Edition and Translation," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Z. Zevit et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 207–60, 208. See further L. Schiffman's comment in "Mysteries," *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (ed. T. Elgvin et al., in consultation with J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J.; DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 38.

[20] Translation by L. Schiffman, ibid., 36.

> will disappear like smoke, for You will remove the kingdom of evil from the earth (ובכן צדיקים יראו וישמחו, וישרים יעלזו, וחסידים ברנה ינילו, עולתה תקפץ פיה והרשעה כולה כעשן תכלה כי תעביר ממשלת זדון מן הארץ). (RH *Musaf*)[21]

For Flusser, the 'kingdom of evil,' ממשלת זדון, originally did not refer to the Roman empire, but to otherworldly forces antagonistic to God, an assertion supported by these Qumran texts.[22]

Flusser saw *1QMysteries* as a work of the *Yaḥad*, and thus asserted a direct influence from the *Yaḥad* upon the Rosh Hashanah liturgy. The ascription of the composition of *1Q/4QMysteries* to circles of the *Yaḥad* can hardly be upheld. I would rather speak of a common background for *1Q/4QMysteries* and this part of the liturgy, a common background manifest in parallels of language and thought in other texts as well. Three additional manuscripts from *1Q/4QMysteries*, for example, refer to the coming day of judgment: 4Q299 53; 4Q300 9; 4Q301 (4QMyst^{c}?) 3 8. Likewise, the theophany scene in *4QInstruction* describes a cosmic judgment upon evil forces, above and below, with their consequent eradication: "In heaven he will judge the work of iniquity . . . For the heavens shall fear [and the earth be shaken] . . . and all iniquity shall be consumed when the period of tru[th] is completed" (4Q416 1 10–13).[23] *1 Enoch* 10 similarly expects the judgment of the forces of evil.

---

[21] From the paragraph ובכן צדיקים יראו, Adler, 132.

[22] A similar dualistic view of the evil powers opposing God is reflected in the Geniza version of Sirach 32:22–23 (Ms. b) which mentions שבט זדון ומטה רשע "the scepter of arrogance and the staff of wickedness": נם אל לא יחמהמה וכנבור לא יתאפק עד ימחץ מתני אכזרי ולנוים ישיב נקם עד יוריש שבט זדון ומטה רשע נדוע ינדע "God indeed will not delay, and like a warrior, will not be still, till he breaks the backs of the merciless, and wreaks vengeance upon the nations; till he destroys the scepter of arrogance, and breaks off short the staff of wickedness" (= Greek text 35:22–23; translation adapted from P. W. Skehan and A. A. di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira. A New Translation with Notes* [AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987], 412–13). For the Hebrew text, see *The Book of Ben Sira. Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1973), 28. B. Z. Wacholder has suggested that the Geniza versions of Sirach contain Qumranic interpolations: "Historiography of Qumran: The Sons of Zadok and their Enemies," *Qumran Between the Old and the New Testament* (ed. F. Cryer, T. L. Thompson; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 347–77, pp. 360–63. The underlined words, which are not extant in the Greek, could well be such sectarian interpolations.

[23] The motif of 'cosmic trembling' in connection with judgment is also found in the RH liturgy: *Shaḥarit* את חיל יום פקדה (Adler, 96); *Musaf* תן פחדך (Adler, 132); *Musaf* אתה נגלית (Adler, 139); *Musaf* ונתנה תקף (Adler, 146).

4Q416 frg. 3, which also looks towards the (eventual) end of wickedness, has additional material that bears on the subject:

]שׁלומכה ובנחלתכה [. . .]א כי מאתו נחלת כל חי ובידו פקו[דת כל יצור?
. . .]א תשקוט עד תום רשעה כי חרון בכל קו[ץ . . .]לא תובד צרה כי נדולים
רחמי אל ואין קצ[לחסדו . . . ש]מכה הלל מאד[ה]

]your peace, and in your inheritance [. . .] for from Him is the inheritance of every living being and in His hand lies the des[tiny of every creature(?) . . .] Do not be silent until wickedness has come to an end, for there is wrath on every per[iod . . .] affliction will not disappear, for great are the mercies of God and there is no end [to His goodness . . .]. Your [na]me be praised greatl[y.

The use of פקודה here is similar to the way we have seen the term used in the Rosh Hashanah liturgy and 4Q417 1. The concluding lines proclaim the great mercy of God. Not surprisingly, the Rosh Hashanah liturgy also appeals to God's mercy; "have mercy upon us and upon Your sanctuary in Your abundant compassion," ותרחם עלינו ועל מקדשך ברחמיך הרבים.[24]

Finally, the liturgy's reference to the rejoicing of the righteous at God's judgment has close parallels in the two eschatological discourses of *4QInstruction*, 4Q416 1 12 and 4Q418 69 ii 7–9. One might also point to the description of the first of Tishrei as a day of rejoicing already in the late biblical period (Neh 8:9–12; cf. 11QT 25:9 "you shall rejoice on this day").

IV. *Revelation of God's Mysteries*

Divine revelation is mentioned a number of times in the liturgy. The liturgy reserves "the hidden things" (נסתרות) for God: "You remember what was wrought from eternity and are mindful of all that has been formed from of old. Before You all mysteries were revealed and all the hidden things from the beginning, for nothing is forgotten before your glorious throne, and nothing is hidden from Your eyes"—אתה זוכר מעשה עולם ופוקד כל יצורי קדם. לפניך נגלו כל תעלומות וחמון נסתרות שמבראשית כי אין שכחה לפני כסא כבודך ואין נסתר מנגד עיניך.[25]

---

[24] *Musaf* RH יהי רצון מלפניך, Adler, 133.

[25] *Musaf* RH, par. אתה זוכר מעשה עולם, Adler, 136. Rabbinic literature warns against speculations into divine mysteries. *M. Hagigah* 2:1: "The forbidden degrees

At the same time, the supplicant opens his mouth before God "based on the secrets of the wise and understanding ones, the knowledge of the discerning ones," אפתחה, ומלמד דעת מבינים, מסוד חכמים ונבונים פי בתפלה ובתחנונים.[26] He asks the Master of the Universe to give him "knowledge and insight (בינה להבין ולהשכיל) to understand and discern the depths of Your mysteries."[27]

Revelation is similarly a main thrust in *4QInstruction*. The central revelatory concept throughout this work is *raz nihyeh*, 'the mystery to come,' a term referring to the creation, history and salvation of the elect.[28] The discourse in 4Q417 1 deals with revelation, and exhorts meditation on the mysteries of creation as well as on God's preordination of history and the ways of humanity, in the past, present and future. *4QInstruction* is addressed to the ('son of') the discerning one, מבין (בן), משכיל (בן), those to whom the mysteries of God have been revealed.[29] According to *4QInstruction* and the Qumran covenanters, these 'hidden things' have been revealed to the elect of the remnant community.[30] The Bible contains both 'clear laws' (נגלות) and 'hidden laws' (נסתרות). The latter may be discovered through

---

may not be expounded before three persons, nor the story of creation before two, nor the chariot before one alone, unless he is a sage that undertands of his own knowledge. Whosoever gives his mind to four things it were better for him if he had not come into the world—what is above? what is beneath? what was beforetime? and what will be hereafter" (trans. M. Danby, *The Mishnah* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933]); cf. *b. Ḥagigah* 11b, *y. Ḥagigah* 2:1. See S. E. Loewenstamm, "On an Alleged Gnostic Element in Mishnah Ḥagigah 2:1," *Festschrift J. Kaufmann* (ed. M. Haran; Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1960), 112–21 (Hebrew). The mishnah uses the words היה חכם ומבין מדעתו for those who are allowed to discuss lofty matters in private. The root *byn* implies contemplating and revealing mysteries (cf. Dan 9:2 בינתי בספרים). It is common in *4QInstruction*: מבין is the designation for the enlightened addressee; he is admonished to contemplate (התבונן) the *raz nihyeh*; his understanding is designated מבינה, מבינות and נבונות.

[26] *Musaf Amidah* RH, Adler, 142.

[27] *Musaf* RH, par. יהי רצון מלפניך, Adler, 194.

[28] See T. Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation," *Qumran Between the Old and the New Testament* (in Cryer and Thompson), 113–50; D. J. Harrington, "The *raz nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text (*1Q26, 4Q415–418, 423*)," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 549–53.

[29] The same motif is found in Qumran festival prayers for Yom Kippur (4Q508 2 4): "You know the hidden things and the revealed things." See D. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 168–69.

[30] See CD 3:14, 1QS 5:11, 8:11, 11:6; 5Q513 (*5QSectarian Rule*) 1 11; cf. 4Q299 [4QMyst[a]] 6 ii 4: נסתרה מכול תומכ[י רזי פשע.

the covenanters' careful searching in the Scriptures (cf. 4Q417 1 i 11–13). In a similar way and in similar language, the liturgy proclaims that to God "belong the revealed (נגלות) as well as the secret things" (נסתרות); "You know the *eternal secrets* and the hidden mysteries of all the living" אתה יודע רזי עולם ותעלומות סתרי כל חי.[31] Thus, both *4QInstruction* and the Rosh Hashanah liturgy connect the dimensions of creation, judgment and the revelation of hidden mysteries, albeit *4QInstruction* claims revelation of these mysteries in a way that the liturgy does not.

V. *The Piyyut, Unetaneh toqef (ונתנה תקף)*

The early *piyyut*, ונתנה תקף, included in the *Musaf Amidah* of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, describes the day of judgment in apocalyptic fashion. This *piyyut* may well draw upon early traditions; it certainly displays a number of parallels with the two passages from *4QInstruction*. Among these are: the heavenly judgment of all mortals; the judgment of angelic powers who tremble before God; a day of awe; the Book of Remembrance; God's dual role as Creator and Judge. As in *4QInstruction*, 'this day' and יום הדין refer to present judgment, but also allude to the last day with its judgment on the heavenly powers:

> Let us proclaim how majestic is this holy day, for it is a day of terror and of awe.
> On this day, Your kingdom is lifted high, Your throne established in mercy, as You sit upon it in truth.
> Truly it is You who are judge and plaintiff, discerner and witness;
> You record and set the seal, You count and number, You recall all forgotten things;
> You open the Book of Remembrance, from which it will be read;
> the signature of every one is in it.
> A great trumpet is sounded; a still, small voice is heard;
> angels scurry, seized with pain and trembling,
> as they declare: "Behold the Day of Judgment,
> to visit upon the host of heaven in judgment,"
> for they are not innocent in Your sight in the judgment.

[31] *Maariv* and *Minḥah* YK, Adler, 47, 8. Daniel 2 presents God as the one who reveals secrets; vv. 28, 29, 47.

And all that have come into the world will pass before You like troops on parade,[32]
. . . so do You parade, count, number and remember the life of every living thing,
as You sentence all creatures and record their verdict.

On Rosh Hashanah their fate is inscribed,
and on the Fast-Day of Atonement it is sealed:
how many will pass away, and how many will be born,
who is to live, and who is to die . . .
Truly it is You who fashioned them and You know their nature;[33]
they are but flesh and blood; they come from dust and to dust return . . .[34]

There can hardly be a direct literary relationship between ונתנה תקף and the Qumran texts. However, these striking parallels between the Qumran material and this *piyyut* illustrate the persistence of the earlier motifs and expressions to configure Rosh Hashanah as the apocalyptic day of judgment.

VI. *Other Terminological and Thematic Parallels*

The liturgy and *4QInstruction* use similar (albeit traditional) terms with regard to human hopes for salvation. Both use the words חלק and גורל for the spiritual inheritance of the elect (4Q418 81 3–5), and שמחת עולם for their end-time hope (4Q417 2 i 12). Both texts refer to the turning away of God's wrath: "Let Your wrath turn from Your people, Your city, Your land and Your inheritance" ישוב חרון אפך מעמך ומעירך ומארצך ומנחלתך;[35] 4Q417 2 i 15–17: "Then God will appear, His anger will subside and He will overlook your sin.

---

[32] Compare וכל באי־עולם with 4Q417 1 4–5: למה הייא ולמ[ה] נהיה במה[יהי]ה :בכול [קצי עד; "what was and what comes into being and wh[at will be in all [the periods of eternity."

[33] Compare כי אתה הוא יוצרם ויודע with 4Q416 1 15–16 כי]א יצר בשר הואה ומבינו[תו; "th]at it is a [cr]eature of flesh, and [its] understandi[ng . . ."

[34] T. Carmi, *The Penguin Book of Hebrew Verse* (London: Penguin, 1981), 207–209 (translation slightly adapted). This piyyut has its origins in the Land of Israel. Goldschmidt dates it prior to Kallir (the sixth century); see D. Goldschmidt, *Maḥzor for the High Holy Days. I: Rosh Hashanah* (Jerusalem: Koren, 1970), 42 (Hebrew). For J. Heinemann, the pre-classical style of the piyyut indicates authorship in the early Byzantine period; see *Prayer in the Talmud*, 241.

[35] *Musaf* RH, par. אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו (Adler, 138) based on Dan 9:16, cf. Exod 32:12).

For before His wrath no one can stand, and who can be deemed righteous in His judgment, and how can the poor one [rise] without forgiveness?" ואז ירא[ה] אל ושב אפו ועבר על חטאתכה כיא לפני אפו לוא יעמוד כול ומי יצדק במשפטו ובלי סליחה [א]ֿכה [יתקומם] אביון; 4Q418 81 10: "It is in your hands to turn aside wrath from the men of <His> favour" ובידכה להשיב אף מאנשי רצון.

Similar appellations for God occur in both contexts. Both refer to the 'God of truth.' In 4Q416 1 14, the One who sits in judgment is אל אמת. The liturgy proclaims that "You are a God of truth (אלהים אמת), and Your word is true."[36] Furthermore, in both settings the God of judgment is called 'the awesome God,' (אל נורא(ים) (see 4Q417 1 i 2; 4Q300 [4QMyst^{b}] 3 5). Reads the liturgy: "Impose Your dread upon all You have created, that all creatures may fear You . . . and Your name is to be feared above all You have created," ושמך נורא על כל מה שבראת.[37]

The liturgies of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur often use the word מעשה with the meaning 'creature.' The same word occurs three times in 4Q417 1 i 9, 19, where the translation 'creatures' makes good sense. The identical use of מעשה is found in 4Q300 (4QMyst^{b}) 2 ii 15 'the tribulations of every creature.'

In 1979 Lars Hartman investigated the parallels between *1 Enoch* 1–5 and the liturgies of Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur and Shavuot.[38] He found the following five elements in each of these contexts: (1) a theophany that imposes dread; (2) the order of nature; (3) God as creator; (4) judgment; (5) the blessing of the righteous and cursing of the wicked. Hartman tended to see in *1 Enoch* 1–5 a reflection of liturgical traditions connected to the feasts of Tishrei and perhaps to Shavuot. The wider selection of Qumran material available today confirms Hartman's perception of the more likely link to Tishrei.

Incorporating several of these themes, one of the festival prayers in 1Q34 would work well as a prayer for Rosh Hashanah:[39]

---

[36] *Musaf* RH, אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו. Adler, 136.

[37] *Musaf* RH, Eve YK, תן פחדך. Adler YK, 22; Adler RH, 132. However, האל הנורא is a biblical idiom as well.

[38] L. Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5* (Lund: Gleerups, 1979), 101–24.

[39] See D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, "34bis. Recueil de prières liturgiques," *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 152 (frg. 3). They associate the

> You will reward the righteous ones] with the lot of the right[eo]us, and [give] to the evil ones the l[o]t [of the evil, . . .] in their bones a disgrace to all flesh. But the righteous ones [. . . You will let fl]ourish, thanks to the yields of the heavens and the produce of the earth, when (You) di[sce]rn [between the righte]ous and the wicked. You will give wicked ones for our [ra]nsom and tr[ai]tors [in our stead, and bring about the de]struction of all our enemies. And we will praise Your name forever [and ever . . .] for this is why You created us. Thus [we will praise]You: Blessed [
>
> (1Q34 3 i = 4Q508 1)

A couple of other Second Temple sources may bear on the issue. According to *Jub.* 12:16–18, on the 1st of the 7th month Abraham "observed the stars from evening until daybreak so that he might see what the nature of the year would be with respect to rain."[40] The text continues with Abraham praying to the creator of all things. Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* 13.6 connects the Feast of Trumpets on the first of Tishrei with creation as well as with the fate of human beings. At this time God musters all people and decides their fates.

Already in the 1950's, S. Mowinckel had used later Rosh Hashanah traditions to understand the nature of the New Year festival in biblical times.[41] He asserted that the themes and celebration of the ancient New Year festival inevitably would create among the Israelites the hope of eschatological fulfillment of the kingship of YHWH. The later sources connected to the feasts of Tishrei seem to confirm Mowinckel's suggestion.

VII. *Concluding Remarks*

How are these various sources to be dated, and what, therefore, are the possible lines of influence between the texts? *Biblical Antiquities* was probably authored in Judea around the turn of the era, *Jubilees*

---

fragment with Yom Kippur, as does M. Baillet, "508. Prières pour les fêtes," *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 177–78. Falk tentatively suggests that this could be a prayer for Passover (*Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 177–78); cf. Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*, 105. Translation is my own.

[40] Translation: O. S. Wintermute, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–85), 2:81.

[41] S. Mowinckel, *Zur Israelitischen Neujahr und zur Deutung der Thronbesteigungspsalmen: Zwei Aufsätze* (Oslo: Dybwad, 1952), 26–38; idem, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962), 1:106–92.

in the Maccabean period or shortly thereafter.[42] The introduction to the *Book of Watchers, 1 Enoch* 1–5, may be dated to the first half of the second century BCE.[43] Although all its copies are written in Herodian hands, most interpreters tend to date *4QInstruction* somewhere in the second century BCE (so Elgvin, Lange, Harrington, Collins),[44] while Strugnell and Stegemann advocate an even earlier dating.[45] With Harrington I tend to ascribe *4QInstruction* to precursors of the *Yaḥad*. *1Q/4QMysteries* is also a non-*Yaḥad* text from Qumran, perhaps with origins in the Maccabean period.[46]

4QInstruction was highly esteemed in the Community and was influential for the development of sectarian thinking. Six or seven copies of the work were found in Cave 4, one in Cave 1. Writings authored in the *Yaḥad* quote *4QInstruction* at least three times, and probably allude to it in other cases.[47]

Is it possible to draw conclusions from this survey of texts of somewhat different backgrounds? Caution is needed, and my conclusions are tentative and by nature hypothetical. However, the weight of the assembled evidence seems to point in certain directions.

---

[42] J. C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975); J. A. Goldstein, "The Date of the Book of Jubilees," *PAAJR* 50 (1983): 63–86.

[43] G. W. E. Nickelsburg suggests the middle of the second century: "The Qumranic Transformation of a Cosmological and Eschatological Tradition (1QH 4:29–40)," in *The Madrid Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 2:649–59, p. 650. Hartman suggests a date earlier in the second century: *Asking for a Meaning*, 138–45.

[44] T. Elgvin, "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an early Essene Writing," *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 440–63; idem, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction," 176–89. A. Lange suggests the late third or early second century: "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und Weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel," in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113–59, p. 130. See further D. Harrington, "Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A," *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 123–32; J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 117–27.

[45] *DJD* 34.30–31, 36; H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (4th. ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 142–43.

[46] *1Q/4QMysteries* seems to be more national and less sectarian than *4QInstruction*, as it refers both to a king and to the people of Israel; see 4Q299 (4QMyst[a]) 10 1–3, 13a–b 2, 66 3, 68 1–2.

[47] Elgvin, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction," 160–68. According to Strugnell, *4QInstruction* "almost attained to 'canonical' status at Qumran": DJD 34.31, 36.

We have observed striking parallels between three Qumran writings (*4QInstruction, 1Q/4QMysteries*, 1Q34) and traditions connected with the first of Tishrei, from the medieval and rabbinic periods and going back to the second century BCE. Against this background I suggest that the eschatological passages in *4QInstruction* and *1Q/4QMysteries* reflect traditions connected with the first of Tishrei, as it was celebrated by the members of the *Yaḥad* and their predecessors. Both the Temple Scroll and the calendrical scroll 4Q321 confirm that the 'Day of Remembrance' or 'Day of Remembrance and Trumpet-blowing' was an important one in the festival calendar of the *Yaḥad*. We must admit that neither *4QInstruction* nor *1Q/4QMysteries* explicitly mention the first of Tishrei. Furthermore, some of the parallels between *4QInstruction* and the liturgy may be incidental, reflecting analogous but independent use of biblical terms and motifs in similar eschatological contexts. However, the large number and concentration of parallels does suggest common roots.

The evidence further suggests that the later Rosh Hashanah prayers, together with these Qumran texts, *1 Enoch* 1–5, and the *Epistle of Enoch*, have common origins in eschatological traditions in the land of Israel in the early second century BCE, before the *Yaḥad* separated from Israel at large.[48] There is thus reason to believe that some kind of nucleus of the (later) Rosh Hashanah prayers was formulated as festival prayers at least by the beginning of the second century BCE. It is not easy to decide whether the origin of these prayers should be sought in Temple liturgy, pietist groups, or circles seeing themselves as an alternative to the Temple and its worship. The fact that these eschatological traditions were included in mainstream liturgy may point to Temple celebration or other non-sectarian contexts as the milieu of origin.[49]

A tentative tradition-historical hypothesis may be outlined: early liturgical and interpretative traditions connected to the first of Tishrei gave voice to the hope for the end-time renewal of Israel[50] and the

---

[48] Compare E. Fleischer, *Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals as Portrayed in the Geniza Documents* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1988), 132 (Hebrew), who places the composition of the תן פחדך prayer of Rosh Hashanah in Babylon, although he adds that the prayer may have roots in earlier Palestinian liturgical practices. Cf. Flusser, "'The Book of Mysteries' and a Synagogal Prayer," 14–15.

[49] Cf. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 194–215.

[50] Cf. the thesis of Mowinckel, n. 41 above.

Day of the Lord, bringing judgment upon Israel's enemies and perhaps on the ungodly of Israel as well.[51] These traditions were adopted by more narrow 'sectarian' groups arising in the second century BCE. Enochic and proto-Qumranic groups characterized by apocalyptic eschatology used these traditions when they expressed their hope for an apocalyptic rebirth of the world and the people of God, based on a more narrow 'ecclesiology.'[52]

VIII. *Appendix: Texts from 4QInstruction*[53]

4Q416 1. Overlap with 4Q418, underlined: 4Q418 2a 8–10; 4Q418 209 9–10; 4Q418 218 10; 4Q418 213 11–13; 4Q418 212 11–13; 4Q418 217 16–17; 4Q418 224 17–18. Overlap with 4Q418*, broken underline: 4Q418 286 1–3; 4Q418 1 4–7; 4Q418 2 10–18.

1 כל רוׄחׄ[ ]
2 ולתכן חפצו [ ]
3 מועד במועד וׄ[בׄעד]
4 לפי צבאם למשׁ[ור במשורה ולדור ודור לעיר ועיר? לממלכה]
5 וממלכה למד[ינה ומדינה לאיש ואיׄשׁ]
6 לפי מחסור צבאם [ומשפט כולם לו]
7 וצבא השמים הׄכיׄן מׄ[קדם ויתן כוכבים? ומאורות]
8 למופתיהמה ואתות מו[עדיהמה כל אחד בסדרו]
9 זה לזה וכל פקודתמה י[שלימו וי]ספרוׄ[ימים וירחם ומעדים?]
10 בשׁמׄים ישפוט על עׄבודת רשעה וכל בני אמתוׄ ירצו לׄ[מועד?]
11 קצה ויפחדו ויריעו כל אשר התגללו בה כי שמים יראׄוׄ[ותרעש ארץ]
12 [י]מים ותהמות פחדו ויתערערו כל רוח בשר ובני השמי[ם יגילו ביום]
13 [מש]פטה וכל עולה תתם עד ישלם קץ האמׄ[ת לם וימשׁל?]
14 בכל קצי עד כי אל אמת הוא ומקדם שנו[ת עולם? ויראה? אלׄ]
15 להכין צדק בין טוב לרעׄ להׄ[כי]ר כל משפׄ[טי אל ויבין כל יצור? כיא]
16 [י]צר בשר הואה ומבינו[תׄו]
17 בׄראתיו כׄיׄ האׄ[דם?]
18 [ו]ידעׄ[כל°]

[51] Cf. the division between the praying 'I' and ungodly Israelites in late biblical psalms.

[52] Cf. G. Boccacini's thesis of Enochic (proto-Essene) groups as offshoots of Zadokite priestly circles: *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

[53] Suggested reconstructions (and the accompanying translations) are based on my dissertation (see n. 3 above) and may differ from those suggested in the DJD edition. Compare DJD 34.81, 151–52.

Translation. (Overlap with 4Q418 and 4Q418* underlined, tentative reconstructions italicized):

1. all spirit [*of flesh*]
2. and mete out His will [for]
3. set time by set time.]
4. according to their host, mea[sure by measure, *generation by generation, city by city*, kingdom]
5. by kingdom, coun[try by country, person by person,]
6. according to the poverty of their host. [The judgment of them all belongs to Him]
7. For the host of heaven He established from[the beginning . . . He set stars and luminaries]
8. as their portents and signs of [their] set[times . . . *each one in* its *order,*]
9. each one in relation to the other. All their assignments [they] shall [complete, and they shall] number[*days and months and seasons* . . .]
10. In heaven He will judge the work of iniquity, and all his true offspring will take pleasure in [ ]
11. its end, and all those who have defiled themselves by it will fear and cry out. For the heavens shall fear[and the earth be shaken,]
12. [the s]eas and the depths will fear, all the spirit of flesh will be stripped naked, and the sons of heave[n will rejoice on the day]
13. of its [jud]gment. And all iniquity shall be consumed when the period of tru[th] is completed[*and He will reign*]
14. in all the ages of eternity, for a God of truth is He, from the days of old, from years[*of eternity, and God will appear*]
15. to establish justice between good and evi[l,][54] that everyone should k[no]w the judg[ments *of God, and every creature will understand that*]
16. it is a [cr]eature of flesh,[55] and [his] understandi[ng]
17. when he sees that m[an is but]
18. [and] He knows[all]

4Q417 1 i 2–19. (4Q418 frg. 43, 44, 45, underlined):

2 [ ]°° וה̇ת̇[בונ]ן̇ ב̇ר̇זי פל[או כיא הוא̇ אל הנוראי̇ם̇ תשכיל ראש° [ ]
3 [ ]°ו ופ°°[ ]כה °°ה̇ הבט[ברז נהיה ומעשי קדם למה נהיה ומה נהיה]
4 [במה יהיה ובכו]ל ר̇ז̇[י] ע̇ו̇לם̇ לתע̇[לומות עד? ואז תראה? למה]
5 [הייא ולמ̇ה נהיה במה̇ יהי]ה̇ בכול [קצי עד? הבט ב]מ̇עשה ומ[עשה]
6 [יומם ולילה הגה ברז נ]היה ודורש תמיד̇ ואז תדע אמת ועול חכמה
7 [ופו]ת̇ ת[ ]הב̇ן̇? מעש̇[י אדם?] בכול דרכיהם עם פקודתם לכול קצי עולם ופקודת

[54] Or (with 4Q418): "that the righteous may discern between good and evil, so that [ ] every regulat[ion . . ."

[55] Or: "fo]r it is an inclination of flesh . . ."

8 עד ואז תדע בין [טו]ב ל[רע כ]מעש[יהם] כיא אל הדעות סוד אמת וברז נהיה
9 פרש את אושה מעשיה עם כ[ול חכ]מה ולכל[ער]מה יצרה וממשלת מעשיה
10 לכ[ו]ל [בי]נה? לכה יתול[א]ת כ[ו]ל°°בא°[פ]רש למ[ב]ינתם לכול מ[עש]ה להתהלך
11 ב[יצר] מבינתו ויפרש לא[ביונ]ים? כול[ ]°°°ריה ובכושר מבינות נוד[ע נס]תרי
12 מחשבתו עם התהלכו[ת]מי[ם בכול מ]עשיו אלה שחר תמיד והתבונן [בכו]ל
13 תוצאותמה ואז תדע בכבוד ע[ד ע]ם רזי פלאו וגבורות מעשיו ואתה
14 מבין רוש פעלתכה בזכרון הע[ת כ]י בו חרות החוק{ים}ו וחקוק כול הפקודה
15 כי חרות מחוקק לאל על כול עולת בני שית וספר זכרון כתוב לפניו
16 לשמרי דברו והואה חזון ההגי{ם}וספר זכרון וינחילה לאנוש עם ^{עם} רוח כ[י]א
17 כתבנית קדושים יצרו ועוד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר כי לא ידע בין
18 [טו]ב לרע כמשפט [ר]וחו *vacat* ואתה בן מבין הבט *vac* ברז נהיה ודע
19 [נתיבו]ת כול חי והתהלכו בפקודת[מ]עשה[א]ל[ ]ה ועו[ ]

Translation:

2. [*Med[itat]e* on [His won]drous mysteries,[for He is the awesome God. Get knowledge about the beginnings of]
3. [ ]. . your . . . Look[at the mystery to come and the deeds of old, at what was and what comes into being]
4. [with what will be, and at al]l eternal myster[ies] with the [*everlasting] se[crets* , then you will see what]
5. [was and what comes into being with what will b]e, in all [*the periods of eternity* look upon] deed and d[eed.]
6. [Day and night meditate on the mystery to c]ome, and study (it) always. Then you will know truth and evil, wisdom
7. [and simplici]ty . . . [ ] *understand* the deeds [*of man*] in all their ways with their punishment in all the periods of eternity as well as the eternal
8. visitation. Then you will discern between [go]od and [evil according to their]deed[s,] for the God of knowledge is the foundation of truth. By the mystery to come
9. He designed its foundation, <and> its creatures with a[ll wis]dom. According to all[cun]ning He fashioned it, and the domain of its creatures
10. according to a[l]l [*under]standing*. To you He will assign a[l]l [*His*] . . . [He inte]rpreted for their understanding about [the meaning of] every d[ee]d, so that he could walk
11. according to the [inclination] of his understanding. And He interpreted for the *p[oor on]es* all her [ ]. ., and with proper understanding [the hid]den things
12. of His thought are known, when one walks [b]lameless[ly in all]one's d[ee]ds. These things seek always, and meditate [on al]l that
13. results from them. Then you will have knowledge of et[ernal] glory [wi]th His wondrous mysteries and mighty deeds. O you

14. that understand the origin of your own doing when you remember the *st[ylus*. For] with it[56] was the decree engraved, and decreed is the entire visitation.
15. For the engraved (edict) is decreed by God against all iniquity of the sons of perdition, and written in His presence is a Book of Remembrance
16. of those who keep His word. It is the Vision of Hagi and a Book of Remembrance. He gave it as inheritance to man with a spiritual people, f[o]r
17. his inclination is after the likeness of the holy ones. He had not before given Hagi to the spirit of flesh, for it could not discern between
18. [goo]d and evil with the judgment of its [sp]irit. O you, understanding son, gaze on the mystery to come, learn
19. [the path]s of every living thing and its walking according to what is appointed for the creatur[es of *G*]*od*[

[56] The preserved text reads בזכרון העֹ[ ]ְ בא. I suggest emending to בזכרון העֹ[ט]ְ כו "when you remember the st[ylus" (with which the decree was engraved)—correcting בא to בו. Alternatively one could reconstruct בזכרון העֹ[ת] "when you remember that ti[me. For] in it (i.e. in that time) . . ."

This page intentionally left blank

APOTROPAIC PRAYERS IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

Esther Eshel
Bar-Ilan University

Introduction

Apotropaic prayers and hymns request God's protection from evil spirits. These prayers, already known in ancient Israel, became more common in the Second Temple period.

In this paper, I will investigate the biblical background and early development of apotropaic prayers, through the lens of Qumran.[1] I begin with a brief look at biblical apotropaic prayers and their non-biblical usage and then survey the corpus of apotropaic prayers composed during the Second Temple period, focusing on two groups of such prayers. The first group comprises five apotropaic prayers of non-sectarian origin, but known at Qumran: one in the *Aramaic Levi Document*; two among the apocryphal psalms of 11QPs^{a}; and two found in the book of *Jubilees*. The second group comprises four documents found at Qumran containing apotropaic hymns, all of which seem to be close to the thought of the Qumran sect, and which thus may have been composed by members of the sect. These are: 4Q510–4Q511, 4Q444, 6Q18, and 1QH^{a} Frg. 4.

I will conclude by contrasting these apotropaic prayers with another group of magical texts found at Qumran, but probably not of sectarian origin: incantations against demons (4Q560, 8Q5, 11Q11). Whereas apotropaic prayers request God's protection from threatening external evil forces, incantations address the evil forces directly, seeking to expel demons already at work. Finally, I will draw some

[1] Recent research on the Qumran scrolls has begun to give more attention to the magical texts found at Qumran, to the terminology they use, and to the ideas and practices they may represent. For a helpful summary of the state of the question, along with recent bibliography, see P. S. Alexander, "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; ed. P. Flint and J. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:331–53.

inferences about the relationship between prayer and magical practice in the Qumran sect.[2]

I. *Biblical Antecedents: The Priestly Blessing and Psalm 91*

The oldest Jewish apotropaic prayer is the Priestly Blessing found in Numbers 6:24–26:

יברכך יהוה וישמרך
יאר יהוה פניו אליך ויחנך
ישא יהוה פניו אליך וישם לך שלום

The Lord bless you and protect you!
The Lord deal kindly and graciously with you!
The Lord bestow his favor upon you and grant you peace! (NJPS)

Elements of this prayer have been found in inscriptions and amulets dating from as early as the ninth and eighth centuries BCE.[3] The Priestly Blessing was used by the authors of 1QS 2:2–4, 1QSb, 11QBer 1–2, and 4Q285 1, who adapted and enlarged it. In 1QS 2:5–9, the blessing is inverted into a curse pronounced by the Levites against "the people of Belial's lot."[4]

---

[2] Apotropaic prayers can be found in non-Jewish sources as well. I note a Greek apotropaic silver phylactery found in Therasos, dated to the second or third century CE. It reads: "Blessed be The Lord Sabaoth," followed by a long list of angels, and finally the request: "Protect from every male demon or female demon, Phaeinos whom Paramona bore." See R. Kotansky, *Greek Magical Amulets: The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper, and Bronze Lamellae, Part I: Published Texts of Known Provenance* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 22; Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994), 206–10, No. 38, ll. 6–8.

[3] Cf., for example, this inscription, found at Kuntillet ʿAjrud:

אמר אמריו אמר לאדנ[י] השלם. את. ברכתך. ליהוה תמן ולאשרתה. יבר<כ>ך וישמרך ויהי עם. אדני[עד עולם (?)

Amaryahw says: "Say to my lord: Is it well with you? I bless you by YHWH of Teman and his Asherah. May he bless you and keep you and be with my lord [forever (?)].

See Z. Meshel, *Kuntillet ʿAjrud. A Religious Center from the Time of the Judaean Monarchy on the Border of Sinai.* (Israel Museum Catalogue 175; Jerusalem: Israel Museum, 1978); M. Weinfeld, "Kuntillet ʿAjrud Inscriptions and their Significance," *SEL* 1 (1984): 121–30; and J. M. Hadley, "Some Drawings and Inscriptions on Two Pithoi from Kuntillet ʿAjrud," *VT* 37 (1987): 180–211, on whose presentation the translation is based. A shorter version of the Numbers passage is found on a silver amulet from Ketef Hinnom in Jerusalem. See G. Barkay, "The Priestly Benediction on Silver Plaques from Ketef Hinnom in Jerusalem," *Tel Aviv* 19 (1992): 139–92.

[4] See the discussion of B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 145–71.

Rabbinic sources also preserve evidence of earlier apotropaic use of the Priestly Blessing. The *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* to Numbers 6:24 translates expansively:

יברכינך בכל עיסקך ויטרינך מן לילי ומזייעי ובני טיהרדי ובני צפרירי ומזיקי וטלני

> May the Lord bless you and guard you in all your endeavor from (the demons of the) darkness and from frightening demons and midday demons and morning demons and destroyers and night demons.[5]

Similarly, the *Sifre* on the same verse explains:

ד"א וישמרך מן המזיקים וכן הוא אומר כי מלאכיו יצוה לך לשמרך בכל דרכיך

> Another exposition: "And guard you," i.e., from the harmful demons; as it says, "For he will give his angels charge over you, to guard you in all your ways." (Ps 91:11)[6]

Clearly, these later sources, like those from Qumran, recognize the apotropaic power of the Priestly Blessing and witness to its ongoing function as an apotropaic prayer.[7]

The example just cited from *Sifre* also testifies to the use of Psalm 91 as an anti-demonic text.[8] Phrases from this psalm were used in diverse texts asking for protection from demons (e.g., Matt 4:6; *Genesis Rabbah* 75), and have also been found on Aramaic amulets and bowls.[9]

---

[5] Text: D. Rieder, *Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Torah* (Jerusalem: M. Rieder and M. Grinberg, 1985), 199 (Hebrew). The English translation is taken from E. G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers* (The Aramaic Bible 4; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), 205.

[6] Text in H. S. Horovitz, *Siphre d'Be Rab* (Leipzig: Gustav Fock, 1971), 44. The English translation is based on J. J. Slotki, *Midrash Rabbah: Numbers* (London: Soncino, 1939), 433–34.

[7] And see earlier *m. Sotah* 7:2, which includes the Priestly Blessing in a list of passages that must be recited "in the holy language."

[8] See also *b. Sheb.* 15b; *y. Erub.* 10:11, which label Psalm 91 as an "anti-demonic song."

[9] See, for example: J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1987), 184–87, Bowl No. 11, ll. 6–7. Here Ps 91:1 is combined with Deut 6:4, alternating word by word between the two verses and ending with אמן אמן סלה. See further the initial letters of Ps 91:1–9a, cited on an amulet found in the Cairo Genizah (T-S K1.18); L. H. Schiffman and M. D. Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah: Selected Texts from Taylor-Schechter Box K1* (Semitic Texts and

Psalm 91 in its entirety was incorporated into the last column of 11Q11, a collection of incantations to be discussed briefly below. The version of the text in 11Q11 differs in many details from that of the MT.[10] Of special interest is the last part of the psalm, vv. 14–16, where the MT reads:

כי בי חשק ואפלטהו אשגבהו כי ידע שמי יקראני ואענהו עמו אנכי בצרה
אחלצהו ואכבדהו ארך ימים אשביעהו ואראהו בישועתי

[14]Because he is devoted to me I will deliver him; I will keep him safe, for he knows my name. [15]When he calls on me, I will answer him; I will be with him in distress; I will rescue him and make him honored. [16]I will let him live to a ripe old age, and show him my salvation. (NJPS)

The parallel text of 11Q11 6:12–13 reads as follows:

[. . . ח]שקתה ו[יפלטך] ו[ישגבך ויר]אך בישוע[תו

[. . . you d]evoted and [he will deliver you] and [will keep you safe and sh]ow you [his] salvation.

11Q11 significantly shortens the psalm text. The omission might be explained as a haplography of similar words (אשגבהו and אשביעהו). The *editio princeps* suggests alternatively that 11Q11 might "preserve older readings than those of MT" on these verses.[11] Nevertheless, a look at Psalm 91 as a whole leads us to conclude that these changes were deliberate. In the first 13 verses, the anonymous speaker refers to God in the third person,[12] addressing the listener in the second person singular. Only in vv. 14–16 do we find a change, where God

---

Studies 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 71–78, ll. 21–25. Similarly, Amulet No. 36 (T.-S. NS 153.162), 1b. 17. directs: אמור ישב בסתר עליון כלה; "Say all (the psalm) 'Who dwells in the shelter of the Most High'" (Psalm 91); see P. Schäffer and S. Shaked, *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza* (TSAJ 64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 2:199.

[10] The *editio princeps* lists no less than 25 minor variants from the MT in the first thirteen verses of the psalm; see "11. 11Qapocryphal Psalms," in *Qumran Cave 11:II (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (ed. F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude; DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 205; e.g., [לוא] תרא[ה] ("you will [not] see") for the rare biblical לא תאנה ("shall not befall") in 11Q11 6:10 (= Ps. 91:10). For more on these textual variants, see O. Eissfeldt, "Eine Qumran-Textform des 91. Psalms," in *Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft. Festschrift Bardtke* (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 82–85.

[11] García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23.185.

[12] With the exception of v. 9, which reads: כי אתה יהוה מחסי; see BHS emendation to אמרת or שתה.

speaks in the first person (e.g., אשגבהו), and refers to the addressee in the third person singular (e.g., אפלטהו). This unexpected change was 'corrected' in 11Q11: the addressee is referred to in the second person singular: ויראך (and probably then as reconstructed, ו[יפלטך] ו[ישגבך]). The ending of 11Q11's version of Psalm 91 has in this way been made to conform to the style of address found earlier in the psalm.

Another significant variant is found at 11Q11 6:8, where 91:7 MT, אליך לא ינש ("you it will not approach"), is changed to א]ל[יך לו ינע ("y[ou] it will n[ot] touch"). The phrase אל + נגש, meaning 'to approach,' is common in the Bible.[13] אל + נגע, on the other hand, occurs only once, in Job 2:5, in a context similar to that of Psalm 91 and with the meaning 'to strike.' As noted by Sanders, 'touch,' (or 'strike'), "fits the context for which Psalm 91 was adapted better than MT 'approach'."[14] In another possibly significant change, the MT on 91:2 uses the verb אֹמַר in the first person singular; the LXX reads ἐρεῖ (like the Peshitta and Vulgate), to be translated as either the participle אֹמר, or the third person singular יאמר. 11Q11 6:4 itself reads האומר, the third person singular. Although this reading may be based on a textual variant like that of the LXX, I suggest that it may have been an intentional change, to address "whoever says" this apotropaic hymn.[15]

From the foregoing, we may propose that the 11Q11 version results from intentional editing of the biblical psalm, either by the copyist or by his source. If we accept this possibility, we can suggest that these changes were introduced in order to adapt the biblical psalm for use as an apotropaic prayer. As rightly argued by Sanders, the version of Psalm 91 in 11Q11 "fits the context of a

---

[13] This idiom can be compared with the Ugaritic *ngš* (UT 49, II:21), the subject of which is מות, a synonym of דבר (the subject of Ps 91:6–7). See M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography V," *Biblica* 48 (1967): 436.

[14] J. A. Sanders, "A Liturgy for Healing the Stricken (11QPsAp^{a} = 11Q11)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 4A: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and H. W. Rietz; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997), 216–233, p. 231 n. 52. Another possible reason for the interchange of ינע/ינש could be the visual similarity of *shin* and *'ayin*. Note, however, that the MT reading (ינש) is found in another copy of this psalm, 4QPs^{b} (4Q84); see: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and P. W. Flint, "84. 4QPs^{b}," in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (ed. E. Ulrich et al.; DJD 16; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 27.

[15] Cf. Sanders, "Liturgy," 231 n. 48.

psalm to be recited by or for whoever needs divine protection against demons or evil spirits."[16]

Thus, the Qumran texts reflect the tendency in the Second Temple period to adapt both the Priestly Blessing and Psalm 91 to the specific needs of apotropaic defense. As we will now see, however, the Qumran collection also demonstrates the development of genres of apotropaic prayer that move beyond the biblical models.

II. *Non-Sectarian Apotropaic Prayers*

In his discussion of apotropaic prayer, David Flusser developed a typology based on certain shared elements, including: reference to the knowledge of God and his Law; a plea for protection against sin; a request for forgiveness; and a plea for purification.[17] Flusser detected clusters of these elements in some Second Temple era texts, such as the *Prayer of Levi* found in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (4QLevi^{b}); the *Plea for Deliverance* (11QPs^{a} Col. 19); Ps 155:1–14 (11QPs^{a}, Col. 24); and the Lord's Prayer in the gospels (Matt 6:9–14; Luke 11:2–4); as well as in some later prayers, such as the version of the *Kaddish* recited today at the conclusion of public worship services.

We will now look at five non-sectarian apotropaic texts, probably all known at Qumran.[18] The first three of these texts were discussed by Flusser; three of them come from literary contexts and two may have been used liturgically.

A. *4QLev^{b} (4Q213a)*

The oldest known apotropaic prayer of the Second Temple period is found in *Aramaic Levi*, 4QLev^{b} (4Q213a). This prayer, copied in a late Herodian hand, has a Greek parallel in MS Athos (Koutloumous, Cod. 39). Parts of the first half of the prayer were preserved in the Aramaic source; the entire prayer is preserved in the Greek *Testament*

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] D. Flusser, "Qumran and Jewish Apotropaic Prayers," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194–205.

[18] Philip Alexander remarks that, "by chance," no fragment of *Jubilees* 10, which contains the prayer of Noah, has been found among the scrolls, but considers it probable that the sectarians knew this section, along with the rest of *Jubilees*. See "Demonology," 347 n. 44.

of Levi, interpolated after the word ἀδικία at 2:3. The passage in *Aramaic Levi* reads:[19]

. . .[5]מרי אנתה [. . . א]נתה בלחודיך ידע [6 . . .] אׇרחת קשט [7]ארחק[
. . . ב]איש<א> וזנותא דחא [. . .8]ת]כמה ומנדע ונבורה [. . .9]לא]שכחה
רחמיך קדמיך [. . .]ׁשפיר ודטב קדמיך [. . .10]ן]אׇל תשלט בי כל שטן
[. . .11]ע]לי מרי וקרבני למהוא לכה

With the help of the Greek parallel, the prayer can be reconstructed as follows (text extant only in Greek is in brackets):

5. O Lord, you [know all hearts,
   And] you alone understand [all the thoughts of minds.]
6. [And now my children are with me
   And (You) grant me all the] paths of truth.
7. Make far [from me, O Lord, the unrighteous spirit,
   and] evil [thought] and fornication
   [and] turn [pride] away [from me].
8. [Let there be shown to me, O Lord, the holy spirit,
   and counsel, and] wisdom and knowledge
   and [grant me] strength,
9. [in order to do that which is pleasing to you
   and] find favor before you
   [and to praise your words with me, O Lord.]
   . . . and that which is pleasant and good before you.
10. [And] let not any satan have power over me
    [to make me stray from your path.]
11. [And have mercy] upon me, O Lord, and bring me forward to be your [servant and to minister well to you.]

This ancient prayer includes several apotropaic elements: a request for the knowledge of God, a plea for protection from sin and evil spirits, a request to be distanced from unrighteousness, and a plea for salvation.

B. *Apotropaic Psalm Texts: Plea for Deliverance (11QPs[a] Col. 19) and Psalm 155*

Two additional apotropaic prayers can be found in two apocryphal psalms from Qumran Cave 11. The first is a hitherto unknown psalm

[19] The text, reconstruction and translation are found in M. E. Stone and J. C. Greenfield, "213a. 4QLevi[b] ar," in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon 1996), 28–32.

labeled *Plea for Deliverance*, and the second is Psalm 155, known both from Qumran and in a Syriac translation.

The *Plea for Deliverance* was preserved in two manuscripts: 11QPs[a] 19:13–16,[20] and the parallel in 11QPs[b], Frgs. 4–5 14–16.[21] The relevant section of the hymn reads:

[14]סלחה יהוה לחטאתי וטהרני [15]מעווני
רוח אמונה ודעת חונני אל אתקלה בעויה
אל [16]תשלט בי שטן ורוח טמאה מכאוב ויצר רע אל ירשו בעצמי

[14]Forgive my sin, O Lord,
and purify me [15]from my iniquity.
Vouchsafe me a spirit of faith and knowledge,
(and) let me not be dishonored in ruin.
Let not [16]Satan rule over me, nor an unclean spirit;
neither let pain nor the evil inclination take possession of my bones

According to the author of *Plea for Deliverance*, evil forces can cause both physical pains and sins. J. C. Greenfield noted that the verb ירש in *Plea for Deliverance* (אל ירשו בעצמי) means "have control over"; it is used in this sense in some Aramaic deeds dated to the Bar Kokhba period.[22] This meaning perfectly fits that of the control spirits presumably have over human beings. Such a combination of control over both body and mind is well-attested in other sources, among them the early references to the deeds of the Watchers (cf. Genesis 6), as described in *1 Enoch* and the *Book of Jubilees*. The same combination may be observed in the incantation text, 4Q560 1:3–4 (see below), which invokes both demons who hurt the body, and those who cause sins.

Psalm 155 was copied into 11QPs[a] Col. 24, following Psalm 144 and preceding Psalm 142.[23] This psalm was originally an acrostic,

---

[20] J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11* (*11QPs[a]*) (DJDJ 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 40, 76–79.

[21] García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23.42–44. The line numbering in the excerpt follows this edition.

[22] See, for example: Yadin 7: וכדי אהך לבית עלמי תהוין רשיה ושליטה באהרי מתנתא דא או במה די אשבוק מנהון כדי אהך [ל]בית עלמי (ll. 15–16 in the upper part = ll. 52–54 in the lower part); in: Y. Yadin, J. C. Greenfield A. Yardeni, and B. A. Levine, *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002), 82–83, 86–87. According to the editors, p. 99, "The Aramaic combination רשיה ושליטה is best taken as a hendiadys: 'The rightful possessor, owner.' The verbal root *r-š-y* conveys the sense of control." See other examples noted there.

[23] Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*, 45, 70–76.

and was only partly preserved at Qumran. However, the entire psalm appears in Syriac as part of a collection of five apocryphal psalms, for which the earliest manuscript has been dated to the twelve century.[24]

Psalm 155 is a request for God's help in a time of distress. Among its petitions we find the following apotropaic passage:

חטאת נעורי הרחק ממני ופשעי אל יזכרו לי[11]
טהרני יהוה מנגע רע [ו]אל יוסף לשוב אלי[12]
יבש שורשיו ממני[13] ואל ינצו ע[ל]יו בי

[11]The sins of my youth cast far from me
and may my transgressions not be remembered against me.
[12]Purify me, O Lord, from (the) evil scourge,
[and] let it not turn again upon me.
Dry up [13]its roots from me,
and let its le[av]es not flourish with me.

These two psalms include several characteristics delineated in Flusser's typology: requests for the knowledge of God and for forgiveness, pleas for purification, and appeals for protection against evil forces.

C. *The Prayer of Noah (Jubilees 6:1–7); The Prayer of Abraham (Jubilees 12:19–20)*

Two apotropaic prayers of a different genre are incorporated into the *Book of Jubilees*. The first is attributed to Noah, and the second to Abraham.[25]

The prayer of Noah is his response to his sons' petition when they were being threatened by evil spirits. After mentioning his rescue from the flood, Noah asks God to protect his sons:

> [3]God of the spirits which are in all animated beings—you who have shown kindness to me, saved me and my sons from the flood waters, and did not make me perish as you did to the people (meant for) destruction—because your mercy for me has been large and your kindness to me has been great: may your mercy be lifted over the children of your children; and may the wicked spirits not rule them in order to destroy them from the earth.

---

[24] For the editions of the Syriac MSS of these psalms see: W. Baars, *The Old Testament in Syriac, Part IV, Fascicle 6: Apocryphal Psalms* (The Peshiṭta Institute; Leiden: Brill, 1972), i–x, 1–25.

[25] The English translations are based on that of J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; Louvain: Aedibus and Peeters, 1989), 2:58–59, 72.

> [4]Now you bless me and my children so that we may increase, become numerous, and fill the earth.
>
> [5]You know how your Watchers, the fathers of these spirits, have acted during my lifetime. As for these spirits who have remained alive, imprison them and hold them captive in the place of judgment. May they not cause destruction among your servant's sons, my God, for they are savage and were created for the purpose of destroying.
>
> [6]May they not rule the spirits of the living for you alone know their punishment; and may they not have power over the sons of the righteous from now and forevermore (*Jub* 6:1–6).

This prayer refers explicitly to the tradition of the Watchers: "the mythological tradition related to Gen 6:1–4, which attributes evil on earth to the bastard children born through the illicit union of godlike sons and human daughters."[26] As we will see, this tradition about the origins of the evil spirits is also invoked by Second Temple incantation texts.[27]

Abraham's prayer alludes to some of the same themes:

> [19]My God, my God, God most High, You alone are my God. You have created everything: Everything that was and has been is the product of your hands. You and your lordship I have chosen. [20]Save me from the power of the evil spirits who rule the thoughts of people's minds. May they not mislead me from following you, my God. Do establish me and my posterity until forever. May we not go astray from now until eternity (*Jub* 12:19–20).

Both prayers ask for protection from the power of the evil spirits who rule over human minds or spirits. The language implies that the evil spirits can cloud knowledge of God and mislead humans from following God's will. Both prayers feature, in addition, an introductory thanksgiving for God's great and merciful deeds—Noah mentions having been saved from the Flood and Abraham refers to God's creation of all that is. This reference to God's mighty deeds provides another parallel to incantation texts, as we shall see below.

None of the texts discussed above manifest the peculiarly Qumranic vocabulary and concerns which mark the literary products of the

---

[26] E. Chazon, "444. 4QIncantation," *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. G. Chazon, et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 377; cf. *1 En* 10:9, *Jub* 10:1–13, 1QH^a Frg. 9, noted by Chazon, and 4Q444 and 4Q510–511, discussed below.

[27] See P. Alexander's discussion of "The Enochic Aetiology of Demons," in the Qumranic world view: "Demonology," 337–41.

Qumran sectarians. Indeed, we have evidence for the more broadly based circulation of all of these texts except for the *Plea for Deliverance*. We now turn to the corpus of apotropaic hymns composed by the sectarians themselves.

III. *Sectarian Apotropaic Prayers*

This group consists of four texts: 4Q510–4Q511; 4Q444; 6Q18; and 1QH[a] Frg. 4.

A. *4Q510–4Q511 Songs of the Sage*[28]

4Q510 and 4Q511, two versions of the same composition, are dated paleographically to the first century BCE. 4Q511 is one of the largest manuscripts found in Cave 4. Bilhah Nitzan describes these texts as "conventional songs of praise," intended "to frighten and terrify" evil spirits.[29]

The first part of the work was written in prose and specifies the aims of these songs. The rest of the work was hymnic and has an eschatological character. These hymns praise God and his mighty deeds on earth, and, as described by Nitzan:

> (they) constitute the instruments of war against the evil spirits. Nevertheless, the present struggle is only concerned with protecting the Sons of Light from being misled to the way of iniquity and 'afflictions of transgression.' This is a restrained war of defense, anticipating the titanic battle that God shall bring about in the future, at the End of Days.[30]

4Q510 Frg. 1:[31]

4. . . . ואני משכיל משמיע הוד תפארתו לפחד ולבֿ[הל]
5. כול רוחי מלאכי חבל ורוחות ממזרים שד אים לילית אחים ו[ציים]
6. והפונעים פתע פתאום לתעות רוח בינה ולהשם לבבם ונ[פשו]תם בקץ ממשל[ת]

---

[28] M. Baillet, "510. Cantiques du Sage (i)," *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 215–19; and "511. Cantiques du Sage (ii)," DJD 7.219–262.

[29] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 236.

[30] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 272.

[31] Baillet, DJD 7.216. The English translation is based on that of M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 415.

7. רשעה ותעודות תעניות בני או[ר] באשמת קצי <ננוע[ין]> עוונות ולוא לכלת עולם
8. [כי א]ם לקץ תעניות פשע[. . .

[4]. . . And I, the *Maskil*, proclaim his glorious splendor so as to frighten and to ter[rify] [5]all the spirits of the destroying angels and the spirits of the bastards, demons, Lilith, howlers and [desert dwellers . . .] [6]and those who strike suddenly to lead (them) astray (from) a spirit of understanding and to make their heart and their so[uls] desolate during the present dominion of [7]wickedness and predetermined time of humiliations for the Sons of Lig[ht], by the guilt of the ages of [those] smitten by iniquity—not for eternal destruction, [8][bu]t for an era of humiliation for transgression.

For some of these hymns a title survives, indicating its place in the series. For example, the title of 4Q511 Frg. 8 4 reads:[32] למשכיל ש[יר שני לפחד מזראיו; "[For the *Maskil*:] the second [s]ong to frighten those who terrify him." The end of that song shows that it was recited before an audience, who responded (4Q511 63 iv): יברכו כול מעשיכה תמיד וברוך שמכה לעולמי עד אמן אמן, "Let them bless all your works continually, and blessed be your name for ever and ever. Amen, Amen."

The names of the evil forces mentioned in this text, such as ממזרים, 'bastards,' were taken from traditions about the Watchers. Along with these, evil spirits known from other sources are mentioned, e.g., Lilith.[33] 4Q510–511 contains some of the elements discussed by Flusser as characteristic of apotropaic hymns and prayers, among them references to the knowledge of God and his Laws, and to purification.

B. *4Q444*[34]

4Q444, like 4Q510–511, refers to contending or warring spirits (רוחי ריב), and to ממזרים, 'bastards' (4Q444 1:2,8, see 4Q510 1:5, 4Q511 2 ii 3 etc.); it invokes the divine gift of spirit and God's law to help fight these spirits. The most significant shared phrase, as noted by Chazon, is at the beginning of col. 1: ואני מירא אל, which has been translated as: "and as for me, because of my fearing God . . ."[35]

---

[32] Baillet, DJD 7.224.

[33] See P. Alexander's discussion of the various terms for demons in this passage and their possible derivations, "Demonology," 332–36.

[34] E. Chazon, "444. 4QIncantation," DJD 29.367–78.

[35] Chazon, DJD 29.374.

Similar phrasing occurs in 4Q511 35 6 and in the incantation text, 8Q5, Frg. 1.[36] For the latter case, it has been suggested that מירא functions as a technical term, 'to exorcise' (see discussion below). Thus, I suggest similarly translating 4Q444 1:1 as "I exorcise (by the name) of God" (compare 4Q510 1 4–5 for the same idea, using different terminology).

The text falls into two parts, a hymn and a curse, both of which share the theme of protection from evil spirits. In content and terminology, this text is related to the apotropaic prayers of 4Q510–511. Thus, even though 4Q444 seems to draw on incantation language, the name 'Incantation' is inappropriate for it.[37] I suggest re-classifying it as an apotropaic prayer.

C. *6Q18*[38]

The next among the apotropaic hymns to be discussed here is 6Q18, of which 27 small fragments are preserved. The editor of this text found it hard to define, and labeled it only, "Composition Hymnique." From its remains one may gather that the hymn deals with the dualistic struggle between the 'Angels of Justice' and Belial. This fight is characterized by the verb כנע in the *hiphil*, 'to cause to submit' (להכני[ע, Frg. 1 6). The presence of peculiarly Qumranic terminology ([מל]אכי צדק [Frg. 5 2; cf. 4Q286 2 3]; בליעל; משטמה), along with the use of the paleo-Hebrew script for the word אל, suggest that this hymn was composed by a member of the Qumran sect.

This text also uses incantation language. First, it quotes a statement by the evil spirits: אל ח[ושך תשוקתנ]ו, "[our] desire is [for] the darkness"; and second, it uses the phrase: בתשב<ו>חות ע[ולמים, "with eternal praises." The term תשבחות is found in the titles of some later incantations; for instance, the following bilingual incantation from Egypt, dated to the end of the Roman period: "Say a song of praise (שיר תשבחות) for the noble King [. . .] the mighty one, who created the spirits [. . .] Ame[n] Hallelujah."[39]

---

[36] Baillet, "5. Passages hymnique," in M. Baillet, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (DJDJ 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 161–62.

[37] Chazon, DJD 29.370–71.

[38] M. Baillet, "6Q18. Composition Hymnique," DJDJ 3.133–36.

[39] R. Kotansky, J. Naveh, and S. Shaked, "A Greek-Aramaic Silver Amulet from Egypt in the Ashmolean Museum," *Le Muséon* 105 (1992): 5–24, ll. 22–23. The same title is found in an amulet of the 5th century CE from Horvat Kanaf, in the Golan Heights, which reads: שיר תשבחות למלך עלמ[יה], "A song of praise to the

D. *1QHa Frg. 4*

A badly preserved fragment 4 of 1QH[a] was reconstructed as part of its col. 22:[40]

1.]נתן[
2.]אשר[
3. ער]ב ובוקר עם מ[וצא
4. מנני]עי נבר וממכ[אוב
5.]ורת יצפו ועל משמרתם [יתיצבו
6.] תנער בכול שטן משחית ומר[
7.]בה ואתה נליתה אוזני כי[
8.] אנוש וברית פותו בם ויבוא[ו
9. תו]כחות לפניכה ואני פחדתי ממשפטכה[
10. מי יצדק לפנ]יכה ומי יזכה במשפטכה ומה אפה [ואדם
11. תבי]אנו במשפט ושב אל עפרו מה[
12. א]ל[י] פתחתה לבבי לבינתכה ותגל אוז[ני
13.]להשען על טובכה ויהם לבי[
14.] ולבבי כדונג ימס על פשע וחטאה

Translation:

[1][. . .] [2][. . .] which [. . .] [3][. . . ev]ening and morning with [. . .] [4][. . . form plagues of a] man and from pa[ins . . .] [5][. . .] they watch, and upon their courses [6][they shall stand . . .] You rebuke every adversary who ruins and [. . .] [7][. . .] and You have uncovered my ear. For [. . .] [8][. . .] the men of the covenant were deceived by them. And [they] shall go [. . .] [9][. . . reb]ukes before You. I have feared Your judgment [. . .] [10][. . . who can be justified bef]ore You, and who shall stand blameless in Your judgment? And what [. . .] [11][. . . you will bring] him in the judgment. The one who returns to his dust, what [. . .] [12][. . . my G]o[d], You have opened my heart to Your understanding, and You open [my] e[ars . . .] [13]leaning upon Your goodness. But my heart groans [. . .] [14][. . .] and my hear melts as wax because of transgression and sin.[41]

---

king of the World[s]"; see: Shaked and Naveh, *Amulets and Magic Bowls*, No. 3, p. 50. The title is likewise found on a magic bowl, published by C. D. Isbell, "Two New Aramaic Incantation Bowls," *BASOR* 223 (1976): 23.

[40] The line numbering and the readings of the fragment follow those of J. Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957), 227–29; see also J. Carmignac, "Les hymnes," in J. Carmignac and P. Guilbert, *Les Textes de Qumrân* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1961), 278–79. The reconstruction of the 1QH[a] fragments was done independently by H. Stegemann and É. Puech. See Stegemann's article in this volume for a summary history of the reconstruction; for a listing of the re-numbered columns and fragments, see his *Appendix 1*. See also Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du rouleau des hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 38–55, p. 46.

[41] Translation is based on Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dea Sea Scrolls*, 110–11

This text uses telling phrases found in apotropaic texts. It begins with a request for protection from evil spirits, and for their reproof: תגער בכול שטן משחית, "You rebuke every adversary who ruins" (l. 6).[42] Frg. 4 also includes other elements identified by Flusser as belonging to the genre of apotropaic prayer: mention of the knowledge of God (l. 12); a plea for forgiveness (l. 14).

We have seen that four sectarian texts found at Qumran contain apotropaic material: 4Q510–4Q511, 4Q444, 6Q18 and 1QH^a Frg. 4. These texts share some generic characteristics with the non-sectarian texts previously discussed. However, these four apotropaic texts display the same distinctive ideology expressed in other sectarian compositions, that is, the dualistic world-view of an ongoing struggle between the evil spirits and the Spirit of Truth. These prayers requested protection for the Sons of Light in their ongoing struggle with evil forces, the various evil spirits under Belial's control. The fight against these evil forces was carried out by reciting the praise of God.

Alexander Maurer, who worked on the reconstruction of 4Q511, came to the conclusion that this manuscript included two sets of four hymns.[43] We may refine his conclusion by suggesting that this text included two sets of four *apotropaic* hymns. It may be that these songs are alluded to in the summary of David's compositions, found at 11QPs^a 27:9–10, where David is said to have composed, among other hymns, "songs for making music over the stricken (פגועים), four."

It is possible that these hymns were performed at the yearly covenant ceremony, in addition to the curses and blessings recited on that occasion. The occurrence of the term 'curse,' ארור, in 4Q444 1:5 evokes the curses against Belial and his spirits, proclaimed in that ceremony; cf. 1QS 2:5b–9,[44] which we have seen to involve the

---

(who follow Puech's reconstruction, see preceding note), with some corrections and additions based on Licht's reading of the text.

[42] The similar phrase, כול שטן ומשחית, occurs in another small fragment, 1QH^a 45 3.

[43] A. Maurer, "Some Remarks on 4Q510 and to 4Q511," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Major Issues and New Approaches. An International Congress, The Israel Museum, Jerusalem, July 20–25, 1997: Abstracts* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1997), 71.

[44] See Chazon, DJD 29.369.

apotropaic use of the Priestly Blessing. Another possibility would be that these hymns were recited by the members of the sect on the days of appointed times. These are the four days added at the end of each quarter of the solar calendar year, the days "not reckoned in the reckoning of the year" (*1 En* 75:1–2; see also 82:4–6).[45]

IV. *Apotropaic Prayers vs. Incantation Texts*

The sectarian apotropaic prayers should be distinguished from a group of *incantation* texts, also found at Qumran, but probably non-sectarian in origin. This group includes: 4Q560, 8Q5, and 11Q11.[46]

4Q560 contains quotations from a magic book.[47] The first column names two groups of male and female demons, a well-known phenomenon in amulets and magic bowls. The text mentions physical maladies as well as "iniquity and transgression" (עוא]ן ופשע, l. 4), indicating that the demons cause both physical and spiritual problems.[48] The second preserved fragment seems to consist of various incantations, for which only the beginning has survived: "I adjure you, O spirit" (אומיתך רוחא).

8Q5 is a fragmentary text. Frg. 1 begins with the phrase]בשמכה[הנ]בור אני מירא ומ[. As we have seen, the term מירא is also found in 4Q511 and 4Q444 (both apotropaic contexts). Based on the Qumran parallels and the usage of this term in a Syriac text,[49] J. M. Baumgarten suggested that one should render the word מירא in 8Q5 1 1 as a *Piel* participle, used here as "a technical term for exorcising evil

---

[45] See S. Talmon, "320–330, 337, 394 1–2: Introduction," in *Qumran Cave 4:XVI* (ed. S. Talmon, J. Ben-Dov and U. Glessmer; DJD 21; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 3–4, 15; idem, "The Covenanters' Calendar of Holy Seasons according to the List of King David's Compositions in the Psalm Scroll from Cave 11 (11QPs[a] XXVII)," *Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research, Studies in Memory of Jacob Licht* (ed. G. Brin and B. Nitzan; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2001), 215–19.

[46] I discussed these texts in my dissertation, "Demonology in Palestine During the Second Temple Period" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), 313–16 (Hebrew).

[47] D. L. Penny and M. O. Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560)," *JBL* 113 (1994): 627–50; J. Naveh, "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book from Qumran," *IEJ* 48 (1998): 252–61.

[48] Cf. similarly Amulet 12, Naveh and Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls*, 94–97.

[49] A Christian magical text dated to the sixth or seventh century CE reads *my'r' 'tqr'by mykl* "an exorcist, Michael, come near . . ." (Page 4, ll. 1–2); see M. Baillet, "Un livret magique en christo-palestinien à l'Université de Louvain," *Le Muséon* 76 (1963): 377, 382, 390–91.

spirits."[50] The translation would then be "I am an exorcist by your name."[51] Nevertheless, in this text the participle seems to be followed by another one, which might be reconstructed as the participle ומשׁ[ביע 'and adjure' (that is, "I exorcise and adjure by your name").

The author of 8Q5 directly addresses a group of evil spirits asking, ומה תשביתו אורו "And why do you cause his light to cease?" It is unlikely, however that this 'light' implies a reference to one of the 'Sons of Light' (בני האור, a sectarian term).[52] The use of the *Tetragrammaton* in frg. 2 indicates that 8Q5 is likely non-sectarian in origin.

11Q11 (*Apocryphal Psalms*) is a collection of incantations to be said "by the name of God." Some incantations mention David in their titles; one mentions King Solomon. Some conclude with the formula אמן אמן סלה. In this collection one finds the special terminology of incantations known from later texts, such as the term לחש—'an incantation,' or the verb משביע 'adjure,' the most popular formula in later incantation texts. The incantations in this text are addressed directly to the demons, and the *Tetragrammaton* is frequently used. The work does not include any explicitly sectarian terminology, and thus 11Q11 seems to be a non-sectarian composition.

As noted above, the last hymn in the collection of incantations is Psalm 91, cast as an apotropaic prayer. At 11Q11 6:14, Psalm 91 ends with this addition: סלה [אמן אמן] ויע[נו. The phrase אמן סלה is also found at the end of the preceding incantation (11Q11 6:3) and has been reconstructed for the one before that (5:3); סלה was also added in 11Q11 6:6 after Ps. 91:4, where it is followed by a *vacat*. The repetition of this formula is assumed to indicate a communal liturgical context for the recitation of these incantations.[53]

Like apotropaic texts, the incantations make reference to God's mighty acts on the earth. In 4Q560, the end of column 2, although very fragmentary, reads: על ארעא בעניא "on the earth in the clouds,"

---

[50] J. M. Baumgarten, "On the Nature of the Seductress in *4Q184*," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 135–36.

[51] Ibid., "The Qumran Songs Against Demons," *Tarbiz* 55 (1986): 442–45 (Hebrew).

[52] *pace* Baumgarten, "The Seductress," 136, who on the strength of this allusion to light, suggests reconstructing the previous line as: האיש הזה אשר הוא מבני א[ור, "this man who is from the Sons of Light." Only the *aleph* of the final word can be clearly read. Might it instead be something like בני אל, "sons of God" (cf. Hos 2:1)?

[53] García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23.181–85; Sanders, "Liturgy," 216–17.

which might pertain to God's act of bringing clouds and rain upon the earth.[54] 11Q11 refers to the Creation: "[on YHWH, the God of Gods, who made] the heavens [and earth . . . w]ho separated [light from darkness" (2:10–12). 11Q11 5:8 alludes to שר הצבא יהוה "the chief of the army of the Lord" as the one who fights evil spirits. This reference is drawn from Josh 5:14–15 (cf. Daniel 8). A similar brief reference to the "chief of the army" in Joshua 5, identified with the angel who led the people of Israel out of Egypt, also appears in a Greek incantation text dated to the first or second century CE.[55]

V. *Conclusions*

The foregoing discussion enables us to arrive at more precise definitions of the apotropaic and incantation texts found at Qumran, and more clearly to articulate similarities and differences between the two genres.

Incantations and apotropaic hymns share some elements of form and content. Both genres may make reference to God's mighty deeds in the past, apotropaic hymns as part of their thanksgiving to God, and incantations by way of forecasting the doom of the evil forces. Both genres share a perception that these forces control both body and mind or spirit. As we have seen, there is some generic crossover between (non-sectarian) incantation texts and the sectarian apotropaic prayers found at Qumran. Some of the latter use the terminology of exorcism, and the incantations of 11Q11 end with a version of Psalm 91 formulated as an apotropaic prayer.[56]

---

[54] A later incantation text, the Great Paris Magical papyrus (fourth century CE), likewise mentions Israel crossing the Red Sea and the Jordan River (ll. 3052–56; see A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (trans. L. R. M. Strachan; London: Hodder, 1927), 255–63. For a new edition, see R. Merkelbach, *Abrasax: ausgewählte Papyri religiösen und magischen inhalts; Band 4: Exorzismen und jüdisch/christlich beeinflusste Texte* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 17; Opladen: Stoughton, 1996).

[55] P. Benoit, "Fragments d'une priére contre les Esprits impurs?" *RB* 58 (1951): 549–65. This Greek incantation has an additional parallel to our texts in a reference to the myth of the Watchers, mentioning the angel who throws the demons into the abyss.

[56] A similar combination of incantational and apotropaic elements can be also found in some amulets. See, for example, Irbid, no. 27, which leads with the incantational formula: "I adjure you, spirit, that you should be expelled from Marian . . ."; followed by the apotropaic prayer: "By the name of the Great God *mn 'lpy 'l kd'y'*, [g]uard Marian the daughter of Sarah . . ." See J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Magic*

Both the apotropaic prayers and the incantations draw on traditions stemming from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, particularly those pertaining to the Watchers. Both types of texts use the epithet 'bastards,' ממזרים, and refer to other figures related to that myth (משטמה [Mastema] and בליעל [Belial]). They name the descendants of the Watchers as the evil spirits, and allude to their punishment, of being sealed in the abyss.[57] These shared elements illustrate the widespread influence of the Enochic literature and the book of *Jubilees* on the literature written during the Second Temple period, and indicate the common provenance of the apotropaic prayers and the incantation texts.

Nevertheless, the differences between the two genres are more significant than the similarities:

1) The incantations in general, and those of 11Q11 in particular, are directly addressed to the demon; he sometimes has a particular name, while in other cases only general designations, such as 'the demon' are found. In the apotropaic prayers, on the other hand, one finds non-vocative references to evil forces in the world, such as "the demon, Lilith, the howlers" etc., who are said to "strike suddenly."
2) The formal terminology used in the apotropaic prayers also differs from that of the incantation texts. While in the latter the most common word used is משביע, 'adjure,' this phrase is absent from the apotropaic prayers, which favor such verbs as ירא or פחד, בהל, and נער.
3) Another significant difference in terminology is in designations for God. In the incantation texts found at Qumran, the *Tetragrammaton* is frequently used, whereas later incantations, found in amulets and magical papyri from the Roman period on, use epithets for God and refer to him by his miraculous deeds. In the apotropaic prayers from Qumran, the *Maskil* invokes God's powers by means of God's praise. The absence of the *Tetragrammaton* may be explained by the sectarian origin of these apotropaic texts.
4) In an incantation, the exorcist tries to stop the harm done by the evil forces "from now on and forever," but the sectarian apotropaic

---

Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1993), 91–95.

[57] A related description is found in a *Hodayot* text: $1QH^a$ 11:17–19.

> prayers, as noted by Nitzan, ask for the destruction of the evil powers, "not for all the eternal time, but at the age of their dominion" (4Q510 1:7–8). These prayers seek an end to the *present* suffering of the Sons of Light, looking toward God's eschatological and final defeat of the spirits when "their dominion" is over.

Thus, the Qumran texts document both the general tendency in the Second Temple period to adapt and expand upon biblical models for apotropaic defense, and the specific contours of that defense for the Qumran sectaries. The presence of the incantation texts at Qumran, 4Q560, 8Q5 and 11Q11, shows that the members of the Qumran sect were familiar with this genre as well, and may have actually used such texts. As we have seen, this collection of texts can also demonstrate the fine, nearly invisible, line between apotropaic prayers and incantations. At the very least, the incantations, along with the Enochic literature and the book of *Jubilees*, may have influenced the composition of the sectarian apotropaic prayers, which were created to protect the members of the Qumran sect in their pivotal struggle against the Sons of Darkness and all evil forces, headed by Belial.

ANOTHER FRAGMENT (3A) OF *4QSHIROT ʿOLAT HASHABBAT*[b] (4Q401)

Hanan Eshel
Bar-Ilan University

In volume 28 of *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, H. Misgav published an unidentified fragment, labeled "XUnidentified Text 1," which is currently at the Hecht Museum of the University of Haifa.[1] This fragment of four lines, with no more than 17 letters, has been read by Misgav as follows:

1.]כ/ם עדֻ[
2.]תנבר עֹ[
3.]שׁ ישעת א[
4.]*כה [

This reading includes only two complete words: תנבר (line 2) and ישעת (line 3). Since the word תנבר appears seven times in one of the poetic units of *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*, I decided to ascertain whether this small fragment might have originated from one of the *Shirot* manuscripts.[2]

Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat includes prayers for thirteen different weeks. The passage where תנבר occurs seven times is part of the prayer for the Eighth Sabbath. It includes seven calls, recited by seven different angels. These calls, which include permission to praise God, are passed from one angel to the next in a liturgical chain. Thus, with each call, the praise to God is sevenfold strong.[3] This passage is

---

[1] H. Misgav, "XUnidentified Text 1," in *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh* (ed. D. M. Gropp); *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (ed. E. Schuller et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 28; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 225.

[2] Although the root נבר is very common in the Qumran writings, the feminine form תנבר is found only thirteen times among the Qumran fragments: nine in this particular paragraph of *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*, three in 1QH[a] (12:28, and twice in 17:16, 21), and once in the phrase תרם ידך תנבר ימינך, in the *Acrostic Hymn* of 4QPs[f]. See H. Eshel and J. Strugnell, "Alphabetical Acrostics in Pre-Tannaitic Hebrew," *CBQ* 62 (2000): 446–48.

[3] B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 310–11.

preserved in three copies of *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*, found in Cave 4 (4Q401, 4Q403, and 4Q405).[4] 4Q403 1 i reads:[5]

25. ותשבחות רומם למלך הכבוד ומגדל [א]ל[והי
26. לאל אלים מלך הטהור ותרומת לשונ̇ותם [
27. שבע רזי דעת ברז הפלא לשבעת גבולי קוד[ש קדשים . . . ולשון הראישון תגבר שבעה בלשון משנה לו ולשון משניו תגבר]
28. שבע משלישי ל[ו ולש]ון השל[שי ת]גבר שבע[ה מרביעי לו ולשון הרביעי תגבר שבעה בלשון החמישי לו ולשון החמישי תגבר שבעה בלשון]
29. הששי לו ולשו[ן הששי תגבר שבעה ב]ל[שון השביעי לו ובלשון השביעי תגבר . . .]

Translation[6]

25. and praises of exaltation for the King of glory and magnification of the [G]o[d of . . .
26. to the God of gods, King of splendor. And the offering of their tongues [. . .
27. seven mysteries of knowledge in the wondrous mystery of the seven [most] hol[y] precincts [. . . and the tongue of the first (angelic prince) will grow strong sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of the one who is second to him. And the tongue of the one who is second with respect to him will grow strong]
28. sevenfold from (the sound of) the one who is third with respect to [him. And the ton]gue of the thi[rd will] grow strong sevenfo[ld from (the sound of) the one who is fourth with respect to him. And the tongue of the fourth will grow strong sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of the one who is fifth with respect to him. And the tongue of the fifth will grow strong sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of]
29. the one who is sixth with respect to him. And the tongu[e of the sixth will grow strong sevenfold (joining with) the] to[ngue of the one who is seventh with respect to him. And with the tongue of the seventh it will grow strong . . .]

Parts of this passage are also found in 4Q405, frg. 11:[7]

---

[4] It is possible that this passage is preserved in *11QShirot ʿOlat HaShabbat* (11Q17) as well; see F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–30* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 299.

[5] C. Newsom, "Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat," in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. E. Eshel et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 280.

[6] The translations of 4Q403, 4Q405, and 4Q401 frg. 3 are based on those of Newsom, "Shirot," 201, 282, 328.

[7] Newsom, "Shirot," 327.

2. [. . . קוד]שׁ קודשים ש[. . .] ***[. . . ולשו]ן [הראישון תנבר שבעה בלשון משנה לו ולשו]ן
3. משניו תנבר משלישי לו [ו]לשון שלישי תנבר [שבעה מרביעי לו ולשון ה]רְבִ[י]עי תנבר
4. שבעה בלשון החמישי לו ולשון החמישי תנבר ש[בעה בלשון הששי]לו ולשון הששי
5. תנב[ר] שבעה בלשון ה[שב]יעי לו ובלשון השביעי ת[נבר . . .]

Translation

2. most [hol]y s[. . . And the tong]ue [of the first (angelic prince) will grow strong sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of the one who is second to him. And the tong]ue
3. of the one who is second with respect to him will grow strong sevenfold from (the sound of) the one who is third with respect to him. [And] the tongue of the third will grow strong sev[enfold from (the sound of) the one who is fourth with respect to him. And the tongue of the] fo[u]rth will grow strong
4. sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of the one who is fifth with respect to him. And the tongue of the fifth will grow strong sev[enfold (joining) with the tongue of the one who is sixth]with respect to him. And the tongue of the sixth
5. will grow stro[ng] sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of [the one who is se]venth with respect to him. And with the tongue of the seventh it [will grow strong . . .]

The script and the size of the letters of the fragment from the Hecht Museum resemble that of *4QShirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*[b] (4Q401). Moreover, the shape of the Hecht Museum resembles that of 4Q401 frg. 15.[8] Therefore, I suggest that "XUnidentified Text 1" is an additional fragment of *4QShirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*[b] (4Q401).[9] Using 4Q403 frg. 1 and 4Q405 frg. 11, as well as the photograph of "XUnidentified Text 1" published in DJD 28 (see fig. 1), I would correct Misgav's reading as follows:

[8] Newsom, "Shirot," Pl. 18. Since the scrolls were damaged while they were rolled, fragments showing corresponding shapes were probably situated one on top of the other; see: H. Stegemann, "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR Monograph Series 2; Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1990), 193–94.

[9] Newsom, "Shirot," 197–219.

1.]ם שא[
2.]תנבר שׂ[
3.]שי שעת א[
4.]ׄדכה[

Fig. 1: The fragment from the Hecht Museum

The fragment from the Hecht Museum could be part of the same column as 4Q401 frg. 3. Both deal with the description of the angels giving each other permission to praise God. 4Q401 frg. 3 reads as follows:[10]

1.]נשמׄות[
2.]תם ברוש ה◦[
3. תנ]ׄבר שבע לנשיׄא[
4. מ]שניהו תנבר [
5. ה]ׄחמישי[

Translation

1.] breaths[
2.] their [ ] as chief [
3. will grow] strong sevenfold for the prince[
4. se]cond to him will grow strong[
5. the] fifth[

Assuming that both fragments are indeed parts of the same column, I would suggest putting the Hecht Museum fragment to the right of 4Q401 frg. 3, starting at line 2, and labeling it 4Q401 fragment 3a. Following this suggestion, and based on the descriptions of the angels' praises found in the parallel texts, 4Q403 and 4Q405, I offer the following reconstruction of 4Q401 frgs. 3–3a:

1. [ ] שבע רזי דעת ברז הפלא לשבעת נבולי]נשמׄות[ם ולשוניהם]
2. [קודש קודש]ם שא[ון קולם ותרומת לשוניהם ונשמ]תם ברוש ה[עדה ולשון]
3. [הראישון] תנבר ש[בעה בלשון משנהו ולשון משנהו תנ]ׄבר שבע לנשיׄא [השלישי]
4. [והשלי]שי ש<ב>עת א[ומר לרביעי ולשון הרביעי למ]שניהו תנבר [שבעה להלל]
5. [פלאי כבו]דכה [. . . . ולשון ה]ׄחמש[י תנבר שבעה

[10] Newsom, "Shirot," 200–201.

Translation

1. [seven mysteries of knowledge in the wondrous mystery of the seven precincts] of their breathing. [And their speech is]
2. [most ho]ly, noi[se of their voice and the offering of their speech and their] breathing are at the head of the [congregation. And the speech]
3. [of the first (angelic prince)] will grow strong se[venfold (joining) with the speech of the one who is second to him. And the speech of the one who is second to him will g]row strong sevenfold (joining) the [third] angelic prince.
4. [And that of the thi]rd (angelic prince will grow) se<ve>nfold (his) sa[ying (by joining) to the fourth. And the speech of the fourth] (angelic prince) will grow strong (joining) the one who is [sec]ond to him [sevenfold to praise
5. Your [wondrous glo]ry [. . . And the speech] of the fifth [will grow strong sevenfold]

I. *Comments and Notes on the Readings*

Line 1

The reconstruction [שבע רזי דעת ברז הפלא לשבעת נבולי] (‘[seven mysteries of knowledge in the wondrous mystery of the seven precincts]’) is based on 4Q403 1:27. The reconstruction [לשוניהם] (‘their speech’) is based on line 26.

Line 2

The reconstruction ים[קודש קודש] (‘[most hol]y’) is based on 4Q405 11:2. In this latter fragment, the letter *shin* also appears after the words קודש קודשים (‘most holy’). The word [ון]שא (‘noi[se]’) did not survive in either of the extant fragments of *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat*. However it is found twice in 1QH[a]. In one of those instances, 10:29, the word appears in a related context: וכהמון מים רבים שאון קולם (‘Like the bellowing of many waters the calmer of their shouting’). The phrase: ברוש ה[עדה] (‘head of the [congregation]’) is based on 4Q403 1 ii 24: וראשי עדת המלך (‘the chiefs of the congregation of the king’).

Line 3

The reconstruction of this line is based on the parallel passages from 4Q403 and 4Q405, cited above.

Line 4

If my reconstruction is correct, the scribe appears to have omitted the letter *beth*, in the word עת<ב>ש (‘se<ve>nfold’), line 4.[11] שבעת אומר is probably a construct form, which is typical of the *Shirot* (e.g. לשבעת סודי קודש, “for the seven holy councils”; 4Q403 1 ii 22). The term אומר (‘saying’) is found twice in *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat* (4Q403 1 i 35; 4Q405 23 i 10).

Lines 4–5

The reconstruction דכה[להלל פלאי כבו] (‘[to praise] Your [wondrous glo]ry’) is based on 4Q401 14 i:7: [להלל כבודכה פלא [באלי דעת] (‘to praise Your glory wondrously [with the gods of knowledge]’). One might consider the possibility that the phrase באלי דעת (‘with the gods of knowledge’) occurred further on in line 5 of the reconstructed fragment.

The reconstruction I offer here suggests that this liturgical chain of angelic praise appears in three or four different manuscripts of *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat* (4Q401, 4Q403, 4Q405 and 11Q17). The development of this prayer and the relations between these several versions is a worthy subject for further exploration.

[11] Since the text is fragmentary, we cannot know how precisely the scribe copied 4Q401. In frg. 9 there might be another mistake in the word ‘שובועיד[ם]’; see: Newsom, “Shirot,” 204.

A TEMPLE PRAYER FOR FAST-DAYS[1]

David Levine
Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem

The description of a fast-day prayer, its format and content, commands the attention of three different sources brought together in *m. Taʿanit* 2:2–5.[2] The editor of this text collated these sources in order to establish—and elaborate on—a unique prayer structure. This paper will attempt to trace one element of this composite mishnaic construction, a liturgical text connected with the Temple precincts. Certain traits of the ritual associated with this text are explicitly described in other tannaitic traditions.[3] However, as presented in the Mishnah, this Temple prayer has already been detached from its original context and integrated into the daily Eighteen Benedictions, the *Shemoneh Esre*. Since the Mishnah most comprehensively describes the prayer under question, we will use it as a point of departure and later discuss elements of the Temple ritual alluded to elsewhere.

The general picture emerging from the Mishnah is clear. The context of the daily *Shemoneh Esre* prayer (the weekday *Amidah*) was taken for granted by the editor of this composite text. The special fast-day blessings were added on to this routine structure. The format of these additional *berakhot* was unlike that of the *berakhot* of the daily *Amidah*, and is therefore described in detail. While the daily texts use non-biblical wording, the fast-day blessings are based on biblical texts. Each fast-day *berakhah* is composed of three parts:

---

[1] This paper is based on a section from the second chapter of my doctoral dissertation, "Communal Fasts in Talmudic Literature—Theory and Practice" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1998 [Hebrew]). During the preparation of the dissertation, written under the supervision of Prof. David Rosenthal, I was assisted by fellowships from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, as well as the Institute for Jewish Studies and the Talmud Department of the Hebrew University.

[2] For the reader's convenience, I have reproduced and translated this mishnaic text as well as the parallel *baraita*, *t. Taʿan.* 1:9–13. See the *Appendix* for the texts, translations, and bibliographic information.

[3] *T. Taʿan.* 1:11–13; *b. Taʿan.* 16b.

[1] The main section of each *berakhah* (נוף הברכה) is comprised of a biblical passage, typically from Psalms, or of various individual verses with a common theme, e.g., the *Zikhronot* and *Shofarot* paragraphs.[4]
[2] The concluding מי שענה ("May he who answered . . .") sentence alludes to a biblical figure who was in distress and was subsequently saved by divine intervention.
[3] The conventional concluding formula ברוך אתה ה׳ (the *ḥatimah*) is the final element of each *berakhah*.

The Mishnah does not describe the prayer as a continuous text, but presents two lists, each treating a different part of the prayer structure. Mishnah 3 enumerates the biblical texts constituting the main part of the additional blessings [1], while Mishnah 4 details the concluding elements of each blessing, the מי שענה sentence [2] and the *ḥatimah* [3]. Mishnah 5, also dealing with the fast-day prayer, is of a different nature and will be considered later.

I will ultimately suggest that crucial elements of the fast-day prayer betray a Second Temple setting. But for now we will postpone discussion of the sources of this text, focusing instead on the common elements and the prayer as a whole.

M. Ta'anit 2:3–4: A Realignment

The accompanying table correlates the six biblical references given in Mishnah 3 with the last six concluding formulae (#2–#7) listed in Mishnah 4. My re-ordering is based particularly on the affinity of the *Zikhronot* verses to the זוכר הנשכחות formula at the end of the second *berakhah*; and the essential connection between the *Shofarot* verses and the concluding שומע תרועה in the third *berakhah*. This correlation of the various elements results in a clear and coherent series of blessings, as emerges from a more detailed look at my proposal to realign blessings #2 through #7:

---

[4] These two *berakhot* are found in the Rosh Hashanah liturgy as well (*m. Rosh Hash.* 4:5–6). For a bibliographic survey on the provenance of the *Zikhronot*, *Shofarot* (and *Malkhuyot*) liturgies, see: D. Golinkin, "Rosh Hashanah Chapter IV of the Babylonian Talmud" (Ph.D. diss., The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1988), 31–40 and *passim* (Hebrew).

The Structure of the Fast-Day Berakhot

Main section of blessing (נוף הברכה; *m. Taʿan.* 2:3)	Biblical allusion in מי שענה sentence (*m. Taʿan.* 2:4)	Conclusion (חתימה; *m. Taʿan.* 2:4)
#1	Abraham at Mt. Moriah (Genesis 22)	"גואל ישראל"
#2 *Zikhronot* verses	Our Ancestors at the Sea of Reeds (Exodus 14, 15)	"זוכר הנשכחות"
#3 *Shofarot* verses	Joshua at Gilgal (Joshua 6; 7:6; 10:12)	"שומע תרועה"
#4 Ps 120:: "אל ה׳ בצרתה לי קראתי ויענני"	Samuel at Mitzpah (1 Sam 7:5–9)	"שומע צעקה"
#5 Ps 121: "אשא עיני אל ההרים מאין יבוא עזרי"	Elijah on Mt. Carmel (1 Kings 18)	"שומע תפילה"
#6 Ps 130: "ממעמקים קראתיך ה׳"	Jonah in the belly of the Fish (Jonah 2)	"העונה בעת צרה"
#7 Ps 102: "תפלה לעני כי יעטף"	David and Solomon in Jerusalem (2 Sam 21:1, 14; 1 Kings 8:35, 37; 9:3)	"מרחם על הארץ" (or: "משפיל הרמים")

#2: The concluding phrase זוכר הנשכחות ("Who remembers things forgotten") echoes the theme of the *Zikhronot* ("remembrances") verses that comprise the first of the six additions listed in *m. Taʿan.* 2:3.

#3: The verses gathered under the rubric of *Shofarot* are appropriate for the מי שענה reference to Joshua, encamped with Israel at Gilgal in anticipation of the battle of Jericho.[5] The biblical description of this battle is characterized by the sounding of the ram's horn, the *shofar*: ". . . while the seven priests bearing the seven ram's horns marched in front of the Ark of the Lord, blowing the horns as they marched. The vanguard marched in front of them, and the rear guard marched behind the Ark of the Lord, with the horns sounding all the time" (Josh 6:13).[6] The blowing of the *shofar* is mentioned several more times throughout Joshua 6. The blessing's *ḥatimah*, שומע תרועה ("Who hears the sound of the *shofar*"), highlights this dimension.[7]

#4: Psalm 120, the next text listed in *m. Taʿan.* 2:3, utilizes *inter alia* an idiom of battle: "a warrior's sharp arrow," "those who hate peace," "they are for war" (verses 4, 6, 7). Samuel's prayer at Mizpah (1 Sam 7:5–9), mentioned in the fourth מי שענה sentence, anticipates war with the Philistines. The biblical description of the prayer—"and Samuel cried out (ויזעק שמואל) to the Lord on behalf of Israel, and the Lord responded to him"—fits well with the *ḥatimah*, שומע צעקה ("Who hears a cry").

#5: The following biblical passage in *m. Taʿan.* 2:3 opens with the phrase, "I turn my eyes to the mountains, from where will my help come?" (Ps 121:1), and is well-suited to Elijah on Mt. Carmel. The prayer offered on that occasion, ". . . the prophet Elijah came for-

---

[5] See: Ch. Albeck, *Shisha sidre Mishnah: Seder Moʿed* (Jerusalem: Bialik; Tel Aviv: Devir, 1952), 493 (Hebrew); J. Heinemann, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1981), 49 (Hebrew).

[6] Translations of biblical texts follow the JPS edition: *Tanakh: A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1985).

[7] The Mishnah records R. Yehudah's dissenting opinion regarding blessings #2 and #3. Instead of *Zikhronot* and *Shofarot*, he assigns two passages (1 Kings 8:37–40; Jeremiah 14) dealing with famine and drought as the main part of these *berakhot*. By doing so he accentuates this particular public calamity to which a communal fast is a response (maintaining the theme of *m. Taʿan.* 1:4–7); his use of whole biblical sections rather than thematic collections of verses is consistent with the construction of the succeeding blessings (cf. *b. Taʿan.* 16b–17a). However, this consistency comes at the expense of the inner connections between the different parts of these two *berakhot*. It also creates a double invocation of the Solomon theme, which appears in the seventh blessing as well.

ward and said, 'O Lord, God of Abraham Isaac and Israel! Let it be known today that you are God in Israel'" (1 Kings 18:36, 37), is calmer and more understated than Samuel's prayer alluded to previously. This is reflected in the *ḥatimah*, שומע תפילה ("Who hears prayer"), as against שומע צעקה, in the previous *ḥatimah*.[8]

#6: The setting implied in the verse, "Out of the depths I call You, O Lord" (Ps 130:1), which opens the next addition, is fitting for "Jonah in the belly of the fish," which is the reference in the sixth מי שענה sentence. The beginning of Jonah's prayer, קראתי מצרה לי אלה׳ ויענני ("In my trouble I called to the Lord, and He answered me," Jonah 2:3), is the source for the idiom in the sixth conclusion, העונה בעת צרה ("Who answers in times of distress").

#7: Psalm 102, which forms the body of *m. Taʿan.* 2:3's last additional blessing, mentions Zion and Jerusalem several times; this ties in with "David and Solomon in Jerusalem," recalled in the מי שענה sentence. Both David and Solomon take action or beseech the Lord for sustenance in times of drought and famine (2 Sam 21:1–14; 1 Kings 8:35–39). The phrase, ויעתר אלהים לארץ, "God responded to the plea of the land," from the Davidic narrative (2 Sam 21:14) is evoked by this blessing's eulogy, מרחם על הארץ ("Who has mercy on the land").[9]

Despite this apparently thoughtful and careful composition, three anomalies are apparent:

1) In the second *berakhah*, the connection between "Our ancestors at the Sea of Reeds" and the *Zikhronot* is rather forced,[10] and a

---

[8] The Bavli's comment, "There are those who exchange צעקה for Elijah and תפילה for Samuel" (*b. Taʿan.* 17a), is not sensitive to the Mishnah's specific formulation.

[9] A *baraita* records an alternative conclusion for the last *berakhah*: שביעית, סמכוס או׳ משפיל הרמים (*t. Taʿan.* 1:10, see *Appendix* for text and translation; *y. Taʿan.* 2:10 65d; *b. Taʿan.* 17a). There are several problems in interpreting this *baraita*: 1) It is unclear whether Sumkhus is responding to the list of seven *berakhot* in *m. Taʿan.* 2:4 and dissenting from the conclusion מרחם על הארץ, or whether he is departing from a list of six *berakhot* (*m. Taʿan.* 2:3) to indicate that a seventh should be added; 2) There is no mention of the other components of the *berakhah*, no biblical figure, event or calamity; 3) If משפיל הרמים replaces מרחם על הארץ, then the cohesiveness of the different parts of the blessing is impaired. For an attempt to date this opinion, see: V. Aptowitzer, *Parteipolitik der Hasmonäerzeit im rabbinischen und pseudoepigraphischen Schrifttum* (Vienna: Kohut Foundation, 1927), 51–52; J. Heinemann, *Aggadah and its Development* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1974), 77–78, 221 n. 2 (Hebrew).

[10] The idiom of remembering the covenant is employed in the Exodus story (6:5–6) but not specifically in conjunction with the events in and around the Red Sea

specific individual is not mentioned as being answered.[11] In all the other blessings the מי שענה formulae refer to individuals whose distress was addressed.

2) All biblical figures are mentioned in chronological order, except for David and Solomon; they might have been placed between Samuel (#4) and Elijah (#5). The Yerushalmi picks up on this and asks, לא צורכה דלא דוד ושלמה ואחר כך אלידו ויונה? "Was it not necessary to have David and Solomon (mentioned first) and then Elijah and Jonah?!" (*y. Taʿan.* 2:9 65d).
3) Most obvious is the discrepancy between the six biblical passages and the seven concluding formulae. הני שש שבע הויין wonders the Bavli ("These six are actually seven!" *b. Taʿan.* 16b). How can seven conclusions be appended to six *berakhot*?

It has been suggested that the last blessing, מרחם על האדץ, was added to the series at a later stage.[12] This would solve both the numerical and chronological discrepancies. Further support for this suggestion was seen in the opposing opinion in the Tosefta that advanced an alternative formula, משפיל הרמים, for the conclusion of this last blessing.[13] However, this suggestion cannot be proven and remains questionable.

The Tosefta places the fast-day prayer in the middle of the weekday *Amidah*, after the seventh of the eighteen blessings: "Where does he recite them [i.e., the special additions]? between גואל [Who redeems (Israel)] and רופא חולים [Who heals the sick]."[14] Accordingly, the first of the seven special conclusions may have been intended as a substitute for the גואל ישראל blessing of the regular *Amidah*, thereby

---

(chapters 14–15). It has been suggested that the reversal of the first two מי שענה sentences would achieve greater coherence. The exodus from Egypt and the parting of the Red Sea are archetypes of redemption, and fit in with the גואל ישראל conclusion. The binding of Isaac on Mt. Moriah and God's intervention are appropriate to the remembrance of the covenant which is the theme of the *Zikhronot* verses and their eulogy (Heinemann, *Studies*, 50–51). However, the sources at our disposal give no indication of such a textual variant.

[11] The *baraitot* which allude to "*Moses* and our ancestors on the Sea of Reeds" seem to be responding to this issue (see *t. Taʿan.* 1:13 [*Appendix*] and manuscript variants to *b. Taʿan.* 16b).

[12] I. Lévi, "Notes sur les jêunes chez les Israelites," *REJ* 47 (1903): 164–67; Aptowitzer, *Partiepolitik*, 51.

[13] See above, n. 9.

[14] *T. Taʿan.* 1:10, *b. Taʿan.* 16b.

yielding seven מי שענה sentences and seven *ḥatimot* but only six additional *berakhot*.[15] While this interpretation makes sense, it is not explicitly mentioned in the Mishnah. Alternatively, the text might be read as referring to the eighteen regular benedictions with the additions at the end.[16]

Clarification of this issue requires an understanding of the composite nature of our text. Had this been a single source one might have expected an integral presentation of each *berakhah* from its main part (נוף הברכה), through the מי שענה formula, ending with the specific *ḥatimah*. Not only is this lacking, but the gap between six *berakhot* and seven conclusions seems to be a clear indication of diverse sources. This does not resolve the somewhat inelegant combining of the sources, but at least it explains their origins.

Given this hypothesis each source must then be viewed and explained on its own. The first source actually encompasses *m. Ta'an.* 2:1–3, and deals comprehensively with the communal fast-day ritual in the city square, under the rubric, "How is the ritual for fast-days [carried out]?" (סדר תעניות כיצד).[17] After setting the scene and describing the fast-day sermon, the liturgical framework of the prayer in

---

[15] This is the solution the Bavli advances, cf. Albeck, *Seder Mo'ed*, 492–93; Heinemann, *Studies*, 47–49. The seventh blessing of the daily *Amidah*, ending with גואל ישראל, presents a problem of classification: is it a petition for personal salvation (as the wording of the הביננו abridgment seems to indicate, cf. *b. Ber.* 29a) or a request for national redemption (in which case it should be placed before the tenth blessing for the ingathering of exiles)? "Nummer 7 erscheint jetzt theils Überflüssig, theils am unrechten Orte" (L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch Entwickelt* [Berlin: Asher, 1832], 368; [2d ed.; Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1892], 381). On this issue see: I. Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (trans. R. Scheindlin; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1993), 30–31, 394–95 n. 16; L. J. Liebreich, "The Intermediate Benedictions of the *Amidah*," *JQR* 42 (1951/52): 424; R. Kimelman, "The Daily *Amidah* and the Rhetoric of Redemption," *JQR* 79 (1988/89): 169–74; E. Fleischer, "The *Shemone Esreh*—Its Character, Internal Order, Content and Goals," *Tarbiz* 62 (1993): 200–201 (Hebrew). As the introduction to the fast-day blessings its communal dimension is accentuated, since it forms the link between the ordinary *berakhot* and those dealing with communal distress.

[16] This possibility is illustrated—but not proven—in a medieval *piyyut* for the *Amidah* of communal fast-days. In this liturgical poem the six fast-day *berakhot* are added at the conclusion of the prayer, after the completion of the regular weekday *berakhot*. See A. Marmorstein, "The *Amidah* of the Public Fast Days," *JQR* n.s. 15 (1924/25): 409–14; see also the identification of the poet by I. Davidson, "Note to 'The *Amidah* of the Public Fast Days'," *JQR* n.s. 15 (1924/25): 507. This *piyyut* incorporates the *berakhah* dealing with David and Solomon in its chronological order between Samuel and Elijah.

[17] The first three mishnayot answer this opening question most directly, and

this source is given definitively as "the Eighteen of every day" to which "another six" are added. In contrast, the second source, Mishnah 4, deals only with the fast-day *berakhot* themselves, and identifies seven *conclusions/ḥatimot*. This source makes no explicit link to the daily *Shemoneh Esre*. The unique formulation of these seven blessings leads to the conclusion that they originally formed a distinct liturgical unit, unconnected to the *Shemoneh Esre* framework.[18]

I argue, then, that essentially the same fast-day prayer is preserved in two liturgical contexts: Mishnah 3 presents this prayer as incorporated into the daily *Shemoneh Esre*; Mishnah 4 describes the special fast-day prayer as a distinct liturgical unit. I will now try to demonstrate that the prayer described in Mishnah 4 is of Second Temple provenance.

II. *The Fast-Day Prayer in the Temple*

This proposal is borne out by allusions in three tannaitic sources to the fast-day liturgy in the Temple precincts.[19] None of these sources

---

comprise an integral literary unit in form as well. Their cohesiveness is expressed in the use of present tense verbs (with one exception conveying consecutive action); in the expression ואומר לפניהם, which is repeated twice; and in the description of the participating characters, where the congregation is repeatedly contrasted with an additional figure (the *Nasi* and *Av Bet Din*, a *Zaken* delivering the sermon, the prayer leader). See: Levine, "Communal Fasts," 60–61 and n. 9, for an attempted dating of this text. In form, the text is a "narrative description." This literary type is found primarily in the Mishnah and Tosefta. It describes different ceremonies and rituals by portraying an event, rather than legislating directions. This form is distinct from the *maʿaseh*, which has the function of halakhic precedent. The *maʿaseh* purports to cite an occurrence that has actually happened, in order to shed light on or bolster the authority of a legal position. In contrast, "narrative descriptions" do not comment on a specific case but seem to be directed to a generic description. Practically all such descriptive texts deal with the Temple and its cult. Notable exceptions are the above text describing the fast-day ritual and the Passover *seder* dealt with in *m. Pesaḥim* 10. It is possible that these exceptions endeavor to establish alternate frameworks for ceremonies formerly held exclusively at the Temple. This group of texts has yet to be collated and evaluated from literary and historical perspectives. I hope to return to this subject. Cf. S. Safrai, "Historical Notes on Mishnah Pesaḥim, Chapter 10," in *Bible and Jewish History: Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver* (ed. B. Uffenheimer; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1971), 298–99 (Hebrew); A. Goldberg, "Tosefta to the Tractate Tamid," in *Benjamin De Vries Memorial Volume* (ed. E. Z. Melamed; Jerusalem: Tel Aviv University Research Authority, 1968), 40–42 (Hebrew); Y. Breuer, "Perfect and Participle in Descriptions of Ritual in the Mishnah," *Tarbiz* 56 (1987): 303 n. 17 (Hebrew).

[18] Z. Karl, *Meḥqarim betoldot hatefillah* (Tel Aviv: Tverski, 1950), 93–94 (Hebrew); Heinemann, *Studies*, 48.

[19] *M. Taʿan.* 2:5; *t. Taʿan.* 1:11–13; *b. Taʿan.* 16b. Cf. Levine, "Communal Fasts,"

connect the fast-day prayer to a *Shemoneh Esre* framework. Rather, they deal solely with *Birkot Hataʿanit* (the fast-day blessings), their unique components, and the congregational responses to them in the Temple. As pronounced in the Temple, the *ḥatimot* of these blessings were introduced by a unique formula. Instead of the standard ברוך אתה ה׳, the *ḥatimot* began, ברוך ה׳ אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם ("Praised is the Lord God of Israel, from eternity to eternity"). A complex congregational response to the *berakhot* is recorded:

1) The direct response to each *berakhah*, ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד ("Praised is the name of his kingdom's glory, for eternity"). This response is a unique Temple substitute for the prevalent *amen*.[20]
2) A call to blow the *shofar*—either תיקעו הכהנים or הריעו בני אהרון.
3) The recitation of the מי שענה sentence *following* the *berakhah*.[21]
4) The actual sounding of the *shofar*.

Thus, the fast-day liturgy performed "at the Eastern Gate and on the Temple Mount," with prominent priestly participation, was a seven-part prayer, where each part consisted of the public recitation of a blessing with vocal and instrumental responses. *T. Taʿan.* 1:12–13 describes in detail the performance of the first two blessings; the מי שענה sentences and *ḥatimot* follow the sequence given in *m. Taʿan.* 2:4.[22]

123–37; S. Miller, *Studies in the History and Traditions of Sepphoris*, (SJLA 37; Leiden: Brill 1984), 103–15.

[20] On the response, ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד, see: J. Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (Studia Judaica 9; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), 133–138 and the literature cited there in nn. 32–41.

[21] Whether מי שענה was pronounced as part of the *berakhah* and then repeated here, or said only at this juncture, depends on how we understand חזר ואומר, and on the Bavli's textual variants. The medieval commentators explain חזר ואומר as indicating the repetition of the מי שענה sentence between the charge to sound the *shofar*, תיקעו הכהנים, and the actual sounding of the instrument. Cf. the commentaries of the *Meʾiri* and *Ritba* on *b. Taʿan.* 16b; R. Rabbinovicz, *Dikduke Sofrim* (*Taʿanit*), (Munich, 1870), 89–90 (*ad b. Taʿan.* 16b) n. צ (Hebrew); H. Malter, *The Treatise Taʿanit of the Babylonian Talmud*, (New York: AAJR, 1930), 62 (in notes) (Hebrew); S. Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-feshutah*, (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), 5:1074–75 (Hebrew). Thus the expression would be translated, "he repeated and said." On the other hand, it is possible to explain חזר ואומר as describing consecutiveness of action. That is, the *ḥazan haknesset* announces תיקעו הכהנים and immediately—without allowing a response—says the מי שענה sentence. In this case the translation would be, "he continued and (immediately) said."

[22] Although in its present formulation *m. Taʿan.* 2:4 has been adapted to its generic context—מי שענה appears only once, before the *ḥatimah*; the conventional introduction

Moreover, in the generation following the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, attempts were made to emulate parts of the Temple fast-day ritual in the Galilean towns of Sepphoris and Sikhnin (cf. *m. Taʿan.* 2:5). The reasons this attempt was frowned upon need not concern us here, but the fact remains that a Yavnean tradition grapples with the question of applying Temple ritual outside Jerusalem.[23]

A Jerusalem or Temple setting might explain another characteristic of *m. Taʿan.* 2:4. The first מי שענה sentence mentions Mt. Moriah and the final מי שענה notes the two most famous Israelite kings in Jerusalem. Thus the prayer text bears a literary *inclusio* that focuses attention on Jerusalem and the Temple.[24] The identification of Mt. Moriah—the site of the Binding of Isaac—with the location of the Temple might already be implicit in the Genesis story (22:14), and is explicit in 2 Chronicles 3:1 and subsequent Second Temple and

---

to the *ḥatimah* appears, rather than the more elaborate ברוך ה׳ אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם—it is clear that the Mishnah preserves the order of the blessings that form the basis for the Temple ritual described in the Tosefta.

[23] The *maʿaseh* associated with R. Ḥalafta of Sepphoris and R. Ḥananiah b. Teradion of Sikhnin is presented as an independent unit in *m. Taʿan.* 2:5; it is appended as a comment to the description of the Temple ritual in the *baraita* (*t. Taʿan.* 1:13; *b. Taʿan.* 16b). What action on the part of R. Ḥalafta and R. Ḥananiah b. Teradion evoked the sages' negative response? What was only to be practiced "at the eastern gates" and prohibited elsewhere? The traditional commentaries offer three different explanations: 1) Rashi posits that the Temple response formula, ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד was introduced by the two Galilean rabbis outside Jerusalem after the destruction. To substantiate this Rashi emends the text of the Mishnah "and they [did not] respond after him Amen" (see pseudo-Rashi *b. Taʿan.* 16b *s.v. hakhi garsenan*; Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-feshutah*, 1075 n. 21); 2) A geonic *responsum* identifies the unique Temple practice as the sounding of the *shofar* after the blessings. Proper procedure outside Temple precincts did not include this instrumental response. This is seen to be indicated in the preceding mishnayot describing the fast-day prayer, where there is no mention of *shofarot* or trumpet blasts at all (B. M. Lewin, *Ótzar haGeonim: Taʿanit* [Jerusalem, 1932], 24; cf. Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah, Taʿaniyot* 4:14, 17); 3) *Rishonim* from Provence suggest that the difference between the ritual at the Temple and in other places was the recitation of the מי שענה sentences, before or after the *ḥatimot*. This explanation neatly corresponds with the wording of the text. *M. Taʿan* 2:5, where we find R. Ḥalafta and R. Ḥanania ben Teradion's misplaced practice (which reflects Temple ritual), places the מי שענה sentence after the *berakhah*. Mishnah 2:4 addresses general practice; the מי שענה is part of the blessing and recited before the *ḥatimah* (see for example the *Meʾiri* on *b. Taʿan.* 15b, 16b). For an extended discussion of this issue, see: Levine, "Communal Fasts," 124–32.

[24] Compare N. Hacham, "Public Fasts in the Second Temple Period," (M.A. thesis, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1995), 43 n. 124 (Hebrew).

later traditions.[25] Before explaining the particular accent on Jerusalem, we must first examine the significance of stressing the geographic location of each figure mentioned. Why specify that Samuel was answered at *Mitzpah* and Elijah on the *Carmel*? This information comes at the expense of relating the type of distress or the nature of the divine intervention. Neither prayer nor the performance of a specific liturgy are perceived as essential to these past events, as evidenced by their absence in most cases.

What we do have are references to figures who were relieved of distress by divine intervention at given locations. These references note both action taken by God on behalf of those in past danger, and an expectation of parallel intervention now: He has answered in the past and is besought to do so in the present. Good deeds and obedience of past generations are not mentioned, neither are the ancestors cited as exempla for contemporary behavior. Here the expectation of divine action is direct and straightforward: Such assistance has been given in the past to different individuals in several locations and under a variety of circumstances, without explicit linkage to their merits. The accent on geographic locale suggests that choosing and highlighting references to past prayer *in Jerusalem* is of significance, and should be interpreted as indicating the setting of the prayer text at hand. The context of the prayer as a whole is to be situated in Jerusalem—as in the days of David and Solomon; on Mt. Moriah—as with Abraham.

III. *Second Temple Era Parallels and Precedents*

In addition to the characteristics of this Temple prayer, mentioned above, I would like to consider the prayer from two additional perspectives, of form and of content. The basic format of the special fast-day *berakhot* is that of biblical texts with liturgical conclusions. This is reminiscent of other Temple liturgies. *M. Tamid* 5:1 refers to a daily Temple prayer, comprised of biblical passages encompassed by prayer formulae. After the slaughtering and dismembering of the morning sacrifice, the officiating priests would retire to the Chamber of Hewn Stone (לשכת גזית), to recite the Ten Commandments and

[25] See L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (trans. H. Szold; 7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909–38), 5:253, n. 253.

the *Shema*. In this setting, the recitation of the biblical text is preceded and followed by blessings. *M. Yoma* 7:1 indicates that on the Day of Atonement, following the sacrificial rite, there was a public Torah reading by the High Priest. The reading of the appropriate passages is said to have been concluded by eight *berakhot*. In a third instance, the king's public reading of the Torah after the conclusion of a sabbatical year, a reading held in the Temple courtyard, is expressly likened by *m. Soṭah* 7:8 to the Yom Kippur format, with almost the same concluding *berakhot*. This liturgical framing of selected biblical texts by blessings seems to be a characteristic element of Temple ritual, at least as presented in rabbinic tradition. The fast-day prayer under discussion conforms to this pattern.

The rhetoric of citing historical precedent as part of a supplication for deliverance is a much-attested pattern in the literature of the Second Temple period. Even though this is not explicitly related to the question of *Temple* provenance, the presence of this pattern in the fast-day prayer suggests a literary and historical context earlier than the tannaitic sources in which the prayer is preserved.

A general review of the unraveling of Israelite-Jewish history in times of distress (for different purposes, some edifying, some criticizing), is already present in the Bible and subsequent literature (see, *inter alia*, Nehemiah 9, Baruch 2–3, Acts 7). More precise parallels—of itemized references to past persons or events, in prayers petitioning for rescue and deliverance—are found in several contexts in the literature of the period. The two prayers in 3 Maccabees appeal for God's mercy and rescue while indicating that this divine intervention had been forthcoming in the past. When the High Priest Simon prays for divine intercession in the face of Ptolemaic aggression, he says:

> You destroyed men for their wicked deeds in the past, among them giants relying on their own strength and self-confidence, upon whom you brought an immeasurable flood of water. When the inhabitants of Sodom acted insolently and became notorious for their crimes, you burned them up with fire and brimstone and made them an example to later generations. You tested the proud Pharaoh, who enslaved the your holy people Israel, with many different punishments and made known to him your mighty power. (3 Macc 2:4–6).[26]

---

[26] Trans. H. Anderson, in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday 1985), 2:519.

Later on in the book when the Jews are incarcerated at the Alexandrian hippodrome, Eleazar, "a man of distinction among the priests (or: Jews)" prays on their behalf. Eleazar's prayer mentions God smiting Pharaoh's Egypt and Sennacherib's Assyria, and begs for rescue as in the cases of the three comrades in the Babylonian fire; Daniel in the lion's den; and Jonah in the belly of the fish (3 Macc 6:4–8).[27]

Different prayer texts found at Qumran are characterized by this type of historical recollection as part of their rhetorical scheme. The *Divrei Hame'orot* scroll incorporates an historical review with a quest for penitence and deliverance. Depending on how the scroll is reconstructed, we find a sequence of references to biblical history illustrating past promise, glory and downfall. These references are introduced by a formulaic זכור אדוני or זכור נא, "Remember, O Lord." Most compelling for the purposes of our comparison are the following excerpts from *Divrei Hame'orot*:

> O Lord, act, then, in accordance with Yourself, in accordance with Your great power, You, wh[o did for]give our ancestors when they made Your mouth bitter (transgressed Your words).
>
> O Lord, since You do wonders from eternity to eternity, may, then, Your wrath and rage withdraw from us. Look at [our] d[istress,] our labour and our affliction and deliver Your people Israel . . .[28]

Here too, the rhetoric beseeching deliverance is based solely on the fact of past precedent, without alluding to present-day merit or mitigating circumstances. The enumeration of past deliverances found

---

[27] Trans. Anderson *ibid.*, p. 526. Looser parallels are the lists of past heroes found *inter alia* in Sirach 44–49 and Mattathias' deathbed scene in 1 Macc 2:50–59. Cf. D. Flusser, "Psalms, Hymns and Prayers," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. Stone; CRINT 2.2; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 570–73; T. R. Lee, *Studies in the Form of Sirach 44–50* (SBLDS 75; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 21–54; E. Richard, *Acts: 6:1–8:4: The Author's Method of Composition*, (SBLDS 41; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 141–145; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 334–340 *passim*.

[28] 4Q504 1–2 ii 7–8: אנא אדני עשה נא כוחכה אשר נשאתה לאבותינו בהמרותם את פיכה; in M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 139; 4Q504 1–2 vi 10–12: אנא אדני כעשותכה נפלאות מעולם עד עולם ישוב נא אפכה וחמתכה ממנו, וראה ע[ניינו? וונינו?] ועמלנו ולחצינו והצילה את ישראל עמכה; DJD 7:148). The translation is based on that found in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 2:1013, 1017. See E. G. Chazon, "*4QDibHam*: Liturgy or Literature?" *RevQ* 15 (1991/92): 448–50; B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 90–99; D. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers from Qumran* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 71–72.

in the fast-day prayer conforms to this general rhetorical pattern, and supports the thesis of Second Temple provenance.

In conclusion, I have claimed that rabbinic tradition has preserved remnants of a Temple prayer for fast-days. The Mishnah incorporates a source presenting the seven-blessing prayer as an integral liturgical unit, and other tannaitic traditions place these *berakhot* in the Temple precincts on fast-days. The prominence of the Jerusalem locale is attested by the opening and closing sections of this prayer, which expect divine intervention on Mt. Moriah as in the days of old. The participation of priests also points to a ritual in the Jerusalem Temple. The high profile and lasting impression of this Temple prayer is attested by the desire to emulate at least some of its components in the Galilee during the decades following the Temple's destruction.

Appendix

The text of the Mishnah is from the Kaufman manuscript (Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences Library, Kaufman collection: A 50; facsimile edition: *Mischnacodex Kaufman A50*, [The Hague: G. Beer, 1929 (reprint: Jerusalem, 1968)], 154–155). The Tosefta text is taken from the edition of S. Lieberman (*Tosefta: Seder Mo'ed* [New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962], 326–328). The translation of the rabbinic texts is my own; translations of biblical verses follow the *JPS* edition. Round parentheses in the text of the Mishnah indicate a mark for erasure in the manuscript, and square brackets indicate an addition in the manuscript's margins. The division of the Mishnah text is the prevalent one (found *inter alia* in H. Albeck's edition). Bracketed words in the translations were added for clarity.

M. Ta'anit 2:1–5

משנה א סדר תעניות כיצד, מוציאין את התיבה לרחובה שלעיר, ונותנין אפר מקלה על גבי התיבה ובראש הנשיא ובראש אב בית דין, וכל אחד ואחד נוטל ונותן בראשו.
הזקן שבהן אומ׳ לפניהם דברי כיבושים, אחינו, לא נאמר באנשי נינוה וירא אלהים את שקם ואת תעניתם אלא "וירא אלהים את מעשיהם כי שבו מדרכם הרעה," ובקבלה מהוא אומ׳ "וקרעו לבבכם ואל בגדיכם ושובו אל ה׳ אלהיכם" ונו׳.

משנה ב עמדו (לפניהם) בתפילה ומורידין לפני התיבה זקן ורגיל ויש לו בנים וביתו ריקם כדי שיהא לבו שלם בתפילה.
ואו׳ לפניהם עשרים וארבע ברכות שמונה עשרה [ש]בכל יום ומוסיף עליהם עוד שש.
משנה ג ואלו הן זכרונות, ושופרות, "אל ה׳ בצרתה לי," "אשא עיני אל ההרים," "ממעמקים קראתיך ה׳," "תפילה לעני כי יעטף." ר׳ יהודה אומ׳ לא היה צריך לומ׳ זכרונות ושופרות אלא אומ׳ תחתיהם "רעב כי יהיה בארץ דבר" וגו׳, "אשר היה דבר ה׳ אל ירמיהו (הנביא) על דברי הבצרות."
ואומר חותמותיהם.
משנה ד על הראשונה הוא או׳, מי שענה את אברהם בהר המוריה הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה, ב׳ א׳ ה׳ נאל ישראל.
על השנייה הוא אומ׳, מי שענה את אבותיכם על ים סוף הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה, ב׳ א׳ ה׳ זוכר הנשכחות.
על השלישית הוא אומ׳, מי שענה את יהושע בגלגל הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה, ב׳ א׳ ה׳ שומע תרועה.
על הרביעית הוא או׳, מי שענה את שמוא׳ במצפה הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה, ב׳ א׳ ה׳ שומע צעקה.
על החמישית הוא אומ׳, מי שענה את אליהו בהר הכרמל הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה, ב׳ א׳ ה׳ שומע תפילה.
על השישית הוא אומ׳, מי שענה את יונה ממעי הדנה הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה, ב׳ א׳ ה׳ העונה בעת צרה.
על השביעית הוא או׳, מי שענה את דוד ואת שלמה בנו בירושלם הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה, ב׳ א׳ ה׳ המרחם על הארץ.
משנה ה מעשה בימי ר׳ חלפתה בימ׳ חניה בן תרדיון, שעבר אחד לפני התיבה ונמר את כל הברכה וענו אחריו אמן.
תקעו הכהנים תקעו, מי שענה את אברהם אבינו בהר המוריה הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה.
הריעו בני אהרן הריעו, מי שענה את אבותיכם על ים סוף הוא יענה אתכם וישמע בקול צעקתכם היום הזה.
וכשבא דבר אצל חכמ׳ ואמרו לא היו נוהגים כן אלא בשערי מזרח.

Translation:

(**2:1**) How is the ritual for fast-days [carried out]? They carry the (Torah) ark out to the city square, and place burnt ashes on the ark and on the heads of the *Nasi* and *Av Bet Din*, and every person takes [some of the ashes] and places them on his head.

The elder among them speaks words of admonition to them: My brethren, it was not said of the people of Nineveh that God saw their sackcloth and their fasting, rather "God saw what they did, how they were turning back from their evil ways" (Jonah 3:10). And in tradition it says, "Rend your hearts rather than your garments, and turn back to the Lord your God" (Joel 2:13).

(**2:2**) Standing in prayer, they placed before the ark an elder, a capable man who has children and whose house is empty, in order that his heart may be true (*lit.*: whole) in prayer. He recites before them twenty-four blessings, the eighteen daily ones to which he adds an additional six.

(**2:3**) And these [six additions] are: *Zikhronot* and *Shofarot*; "In my distress I called to the Lord" (Psalm 120); "I turn my eyes to the mountains" (Psalm 121); "Out of the depths I call You, O Lord" (Psalm 130); "A prayer of the lowly man when he is faint" (Psalm 102). R. Yehudah says: He should not say *Zikhronot* and *Shofarot*, but instead say, "If there is a famine in the land, a pestilence" (1 Kings 8:37); and "The word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah concerning the droughts" (Jeremiah 14:1).

And he says their conclusions [*lit.*: their seals].

(**2:4**) For the first he says [concludes], "May he who answered Abraham on Mt. Moriah answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day. Praised are You, Who redeems Israel."

For the second he says, "May he who answered your ancestors at the Sea of Reeds, answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day. Praised are You, Who remembers things forgotten."

For the third he says, "May he who answered Joshua at Gilgal answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day. Praised are You, Who hears the sound of the *shofar*."

For the fourth he says, "May he who answered Samuel at Mitzpah answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day. Praised are You, Who hears a cry."

For the fifth he says, "May he who answered Elijah on Mt. Carmel answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day. Praised are You, Who hears prayer."

For the sixth he says, "May he who answered Jonah in the belly of the fish, answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day. Praised are You, Who answers in times of distress."

For the seventh he says, "May he who answered David and his son Solomon in Jerusalem, answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day. Praised are You, Who has mercy on the land."

(**2:5**) *Ma'aseh* [an occurrence] in the days of R. Ḥalaftah and the days of R. Ḥananiah ben Teradion. One crossed before the [Torah] ark [*i.e.*, led public prayer] and concluded the blessing in its entirety, after which they [the congregation] responded: "Amen"; "Blow [the *shofar*], priests, blow"; "May he who answered Abraham on Mt. Moriah answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day"; "Sound [the *shofar*] sons of Aaron, sound"; "May he who answered your ancestors at the Sea of Reeds answer you and listen to the voice of your outcry this day." And when the matter came before the sages they said: Such was not the practice, except at the eastern gates [of the Temple].

Tosefta Ta'anit 1:9–13:

הלכה ט או׳ לפניהן עשרים וארבע ברכות, שמונה עשרה שבכל יום, ושש היה מוסיף.

הלכה י שביעית, סמכוס או׳ משפיל הרמים, היא ברכת המינין. היכן אומ׳, בין נואל לרופא חולים.

עונין אמן על כל ברכה וברכה תוקעין ומריעין ותוקעין כך היו נוהגין בנבולין.
הלכה יא במקדש מה הן או׳, ברוך ה׳ אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם, ואין עונין אמן במקדש [. . .]
הלכה יב על הראשונה הוא אומ׳, ברוך ה׳ אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם ברוך גואל ישראל, והן עונין אחריו ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו ונו׳.
הלכה יג וחזן הכנסת או׳ לחם תקעו הכהנים תקעו, וחוזר ואו׳ לחם מי שענה את אברהם בהר המוריה הוא יענה אתכם וישמע קול צעקתכם ביום הזה, תוקעין ומריעין ותוקעין.
על השנייה הוא או׳ ברוך ה׳ אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם ברוך זוכר הנשכחות, והן עונין אחריו ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו,
וחזן הכנסת או׳ לחן הריעו בני אהרן הריעו, וחוזר ואו׳ לחן מי שענה משה ואבותינו על ים סוף הוא יענה אתכם וישמע קול צעקתכם ביום הזה, תוקעין ומריעין.
אחת תקיעה ואחת הרעה אחת תקיעה ואחת הרעה עד שינמור את כולם.
וכך הנהוג ר׳ חלפתא בצפורי ור׳ חנניה בן תרדיון בסיכני, וכשבא דבר אצל חכמים אמרו, לא היו נוהגין כן אלא בשערי מזרח בלבד.

Translation:

(**1:9**) He recites before them twenty-four blessings, the eighteen daily ones, and he adds six.

(**1:10**) The seventh, Sumkhus says, is "Who demeans the mighty"; this is the blessing concerning the heretics. Where does he recite them [the additional blessings]? Between [the blessing] *Go'el* [Who redeems Israel] and [the blessing] *Rofe Ḥolim* [Who heals the sick]. They [the congregation] answer "Amen" to each blessing, blow and sound and blow. This was the practice in the countryside.

(**1:11**) What do they recite in the Temple? "Praised is the Lord God of Israel, from eternity to eternity," and they do not respond with "Amen" at the Temple [. . .]

(**1:12**) For the first [conclusion] he says, "Praised is the Lord God of Israel, from eternity to eternity, praised is He who redeems Israel." And they [the congregation] respond, "Praised is the name of his kingdom's glory, for eternity."

(**1:13**) And *Ḥazan Haknesset* [the leader of the congregation] says, "Blow priests, blow," and immediately continues [*or*: repeats] and says to them, "May he who answered Abraham on Mt. Moriah, answer you and hear the voice of your outcry on this day." They blow and sound and blow.

For the second he says, "Praised is the Lord God of Israel, from eternity to eternity, praised is He who remembers things forgotten." And they respond, "Praised is the name of his kingdom's glory for eternity."

And *Ḥazan Haknesset* says, "Sound, sons of Aaron, sound," and immediately continues [*or*: repeats] and says to them, "May he who has answered Moses and our ancestors on the Sea of Reeds, answer you and hear the voice of your outcry on this day." They blow and sound.

One blowing and one sounding, one blowing and one sounding until he would finish them all [i.e., all the blessings].

Thus instituted R. Ḥalaftah in Sepphoris and R. Hananiah ben Teradion in Sikhnin, and when the matter came before the sages they said: Such was not the practice, except at the eastern gates [of the Temple] exclusively.

PRAYERS FOR PEACE IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE TRADITIONAL JEWISH LITURGY

Bilhah Nitzan
Tel-Aviv University

Blessings and prayers for peace abound in the Bible, in Second Temple literature, and in the traditional Jewish prayer book. An examination of the motif of peace in these corpora thus constitutes an important aspect of the study of Jewish liturgy and its history. The publication of two new texts from Qumran, 4Q291 and 4Q292 (*Works Containing Prayers A* and *B*), suggests the necessity for a renewed investigation of the use of this motif in Second Temple writings. A special feature that comes to light through study of the Dead Sea Scrolls is the emphasis on peace in concluding formulae. It is also instructive to compare the use of the motif of peace in sectarian and non-sectarian compositions.

4Q291, 4Q292 and the Priestly Blessing (Num 6:24–26)

We begin with a brief look at two fragmentary Second Temple prayer texts, 4Q291 and 4Q292.[1] The extant text of 4Q291 and 4Q292 contains prayers and blessings for peace.

4Q291 Frg. 1

1.]*k* you wish/desire[ ] ' [	1.]כ תאוה [ ] א [
2.]the burden of contention/strife would have been silenced and ' [	2.]החריש משא הריב וא [
3.]*l* to bless the name of God the Most Hig[h	3.]ל לברך שם אל עליו[ן
4.]*i* His commandments and those who choose [His] wi[ll	4.]י מצותיו ובוחרי רצ[ונו

[1] Text and translation are from: B. Nitzan. "291. 4QWork Containing Prayers A," and "292. 4QWork Containing Prayers B," *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. G. Chazon et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 9–18.

5.]*t* His holiness. Blessed are You {God}[	5.]ת קודשו ברוך אתה {אל} [
6. a]bove all bles[sing]w [	6. מ]עלה לכל ברכ[ה]ו [
7.] all?[	7.] כל[

4Q291 is a late Hasmonean manuscript from ca. 50 BCE. Its extant text in frgs. 1 and 3 consists of liturgical components. Fragment 1 includes a call to bless the Lord (line 3), and the liturgical blessing itself, ברוך אתה אל[מ]עלה לכל ברכ[ה ("Blessed are You God [a]bove all bles[sing]"; lines 5–6). The wording is similar to that of the blessing which concludes the Song of the Sacrifice for the sixth Sabbath (4Q403 1 i 28).[2] Thus, one may plausibly suggest that 4Q291 1 5–6 also represents a concluding blessing, although no remnants of an 'Amen Amen' formula have survived.

The specific content of the prayer is very scantily preserved. Fragment 1 1–2 expresses the hope of quieting a controversy: החריש משא הריב, "the burden of contention would have been silenced."[3] This phrase may allude to a hope for peace and conciliation between God and His people, since the phrases that follow call upon the worshippers who keep the commandments of God to bless God (frg. 1 3–4).[4] This does not necessarily imply the sectarian origins of the text, unless the expression בוחרי רצ[ונו ("those who choose [His] wi[ll]") is sectarian: The sectarian scrolls use the verb בחר ('choose') to indicate observing the commandments of God, and רצונו often

---

[2] ברוך [ה]אד[ו]ן מל[ך ה]כול מעלה לכול ברכה ות[שבחות; "Blessed be the Lord, the k[ing of] all, above all blessing and pr[aise]." A similar blessing of God appears in Neh 9:5 to open a prayer, but 4Q291 is clearly not an opening formula.

[3] For the phrase משא הריב, cf. Deut 1:12 משאכם וריבכם and Hab 1:3 ויהי ריב ומדון ישא. In these, the contention is between persons, but the word ריב is also used to indicate contention between God and human beings. See Isa 3:13–14; 34:8; Jer 2:9; 25:31; Hos 12:3; Amos 7:4; Mic 6:2; CD 1:2. Such a contention is also mentioned in 4Q381 76–77 10, referring to Mic 6:2; see E. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 215, 222. For similar use in 4Q302 3 ii 7–8, cf. B. Nitzan, "302. 4QpapAdmonitory Parable," in *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (ed. T. Elgvin et al., in consultation with J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J.; DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 139–41. The cessation of such contentions is mentioned in Prov 15:18 (between persons); Isa 57:16–19 (between God and men). חרש in the sense of quieting a contention is found in Job 13:19.

[4] Cf. Psalm 85 regarding God's forgiveness of His people's iniquity and the removal of His anger from them (vv. 1–8). In the second part of the psalm there is a promise of peace for God's people and His faithful ones (v. 9), and a glorification of the peace and justice prevailing all around the universe (vv. 11–12).

signifies the commandments themselves.[5] However, both בחר and רצון are used in the Bible in a similar manner (e.g., Isa 56:4, 65:12 for בחר; Ps 103:21 for רצון).[6] In any case, the terminology of the rest of the prayer is not explicitly sectarian. The fragmentary condition of the scroll does not allow us to describe with certainty the nature of the peace or conciliation between God and His people dealt with in this scroll, nor whether it is historical or eschatological.

4Q292 Frg. 2 a, b

1.] *n*	[ ]	.1
2.] *h* in your inheritance, for	] ה בנחלתכ כיא	.2
3. make] of them a thousand times as many [as the]y are and bless them	הוסף כה]ם מהם אלף פעמים וברכתמה	.3
4. as you [promised] to them by all your servants the prophets	כאשר הבטח]תה ל{ה}ם ביד כול עבדיכ הנבאים	.4
5.] [ ] [p]eace. Amen. Amen.	]ני המ[ ] ד [ש]לום אמן אמן	.5
6.] *vacat*	*vacat* [	.6

4Q292 is an early Herodian manuscript from around 30 BCE. The content and form of the preserved text of frg. 2 suggest that it represents the final section of a prayer on behalf of Israel, closing with the response formula אמן אמן ('Amen Amen'). Notwithstanding the direct appeal to God in lines 2–4, the third person plural references in lines 3 and 4—לה]ם, מהם, כה]ם—suggest that this is not a prayer said by the worshipping community, but a prayer made on their behalf, for the granting of divinely-promised benefits. These promises may encompass the prophetic assurances concerning the fertility of

---

[5] See CD 2:15: לבחור את אשר רצה (cf. 1QS 1:4); 1QS 10:12 הבחרה באשר יורני (cf. 1QSb 3:25); 1QS 9:17–18: בוחרי דרך. On רצונו, compare דורשי רצונו in 1QS 5:9, and the definition חפצי רצונו in CD 3:15, referring to the commandments of God. See also אנשי רצון (4Q418 81 10), נמהרי רצונו (4Q403 1 i 20; 4Q405 3 ii 10). Noteworthy is the text of CD 3, where the phrase ויבחרו ברצונם defines the sins of those generations that did not keep the commandments of God (lines 10–12), while Abraham, who did not sin, לא בחר ברצון רוחו, "did *not* choose the desire of his own spirit" (lines 2–3).

[6] A. Hurvitz noted the equivalence of the biblical חפץ with the late Hebrew רצה. See his *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972), 73–77 (Hebrew).

the land of Israel[7] and of the people of Israel,[8] perhaps in an eschatological context like that of Zech 8:5.[9] No sectarian terms appear here, only biblical terminology. Thus, this text may be a non-sectarian liturgical prayer said on behalf of Israel. It closes with a blessing for peace, as is clear from the words preserved in its final clause: [ש]לום אמן אמן.

Peace (שלום) is mentioned at the conclusion of various biblical prayers, such as the Priestly Blessing (Num 6:26) and certain biblical psalms (Pss 4:9; 29:11; 120:7; 122:6–8; 125:5; 128:5). The term appears in a similar concluding position in apocryphal compositions, such as Sir 50:23; in Qumran blessings, prayers and poetry (4Q503, passim; 4Q448 col. 2; explicitly sectarian writings such as 1QS 2:4 and 1QSb 3:5–21 [which themselves utilize the Priestly Blessing, see below]; 4QM[a] [= 4Q491] 11 ii 18; 1QH[a] 11:26–27; 13:17–18;[10] 4Q511 63 iv 4; etc.); and in traditional Jewish prayers, such as the *Amidah* and the *Grace after Meals*. The fact that the custom of concluding prayers with a blessing for peace is so widespread suggests a common tradition.

This liturgical custom may have originated in the Priestly Blessing of Num 6:24–26. This blessing is composed of three couplets, arranged in order of ascending length: three, five, and seven words, respectively:

24. יברכך יהוה וישמרך׃
25. יאר יהוה פניו אליך ויחנך׃
26. ישא יהוה פניו אליך וישם לך שלום׃

---

[7] בנחלתך signifies the Land of Israel as the heritage of the Lord in Ps 79:1, and similarly בנחלת ה in 1 Sam 26:19. Cf. the term בנחלת ה in 2 Sam 20:19; 21:3 and נחלת אלוהים in 2 Sam 14:16, and see the comments on these verses in M. Z. Segal, *The Book of Samuel* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1971) (Hebrew). In Qumran literature נחלה refers to the heritage of the land in 1QM 12:11 (= 1QM 19:4); 4Q501 1; 4Q393 3 9 and 4Q462 1 7. Prophetic promises concerning the land of Israel allude to its fertility in Isa 55:10–13; Jer 31:11–13, 22–24; Ezek 34:26–30.

[8] The nation of Israel is called the heritage of the Lord in Deut 4:20; 9:26, 29; 1 Kgs 8:51, 53; Ps 94:14; *Jub* 1:19, 21; 4Q393 3 3–4, 1QH[a] 6:8 (= Stegemann 14:11). In the latter, בנחלתכה ("in Your heritage" = נחלתכה with relative -ב) is parallel to בעמכה ("in Your people"). For promises concerning the fertility of the people of Israel, see, e.g., Deut 1:11; 2 Sam 24:3.

[9] An eschatological context may be assumed here on the basis of line 4, which mentions the promise made by God's servants, the prophets.

[10] In this paper I use the Sukenik column numbers for *Hodayot* texts: E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1954 [Hebrew], 1955 [English] = Stegemann 19:29–30; 5:34–35. For H. Stegemann's reconstruction, see his *Appendix 1* in this volume, pp. 224–26.).

24. The LORD bless you and protect you!
25. The LORD deal kindly and graciously with you!
26. The LORD bestow His favor upon you and grant you peace![11]

The blessing for peace in the third couplet (v. 26), is the climax of the blessing, and incorporates all aspects of the blessing.[12]

The custom of ending a prayer with a blessing for peace is reflected in Ps 4:7–9, which is clearly based upon the tradition of the Priestly Blessing: נסה עלינו אור פניך יהוה "bestow Your favor on us, O Lord," followed by בשלום יחדו אשכבה ואישן, "in peace I will both lie down and sleep." The motif of peace is also mentioned in several of the psalms in the collection of שירי המעלות ("the songs of ascents"): Pss 120:7, 122:6–8, 125:5, 128:5. According to Liebreich's theory, this term, together with יברכך (Pss 128:5; 129:8; 132:15; 133:3; 134:1–3), ישמרך (Pss 121:3–5, 7–8; 127:1; 130:3, 6) and יחונך (Pss 123:2, 3; 130:3), indicates psalms that were sung in the Temple following pronouncement of the Priestly Blessing.[13] An additional explanation has been offered for the practice of closing psalms with a prayer for peace: that is, the social norm of people taking leave of one another with such a prayer. This practice may be reflected in Ps 122:6–8, in which the pilgrimage to Jerusalem is described.[14] The free adaptation of the motifs of the Priestly Blessing that we will see in the Dead Sea Scrolls may reflect a widely known liturgical custom, connected with similar solemn occasions when all Israel was assembled in Jerusalem and at the Temple (see Nehemiah 8; 2 Chr 29:20–30; 30:13, 21–27). According to 2 Chr 30:27, on such solemn occasions the Priests and the Levites blessed the people.

4Q503

The most impressive use of the blessing for peace in Qumran liturgy is the appearance of the phrase שלום עליכה ישראל ("Peace be with

---

[11] Biblical translations are based on the NJPS version, with occasional modifications: *TANAKH: A New Translation of The Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1985).

[12] U. Cassutto, "The Blessing of Peace," *Encyclopedia Biblica* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 2:360 (Hebrew). See also the tannaitic homilies about the greatness of peace in *Sifre Bamidbar*, *Naso* 42 to Num 6:26: וישם לך שלום.

[13] L. J. Liebreich, "The Songs of the Ascents and the Priestly Blessing," *JBL* 74 (1955): 31–36.

[14] U. Cassutto, "The Blessing of Peace," 2:360.

you Israel") at the closing of each of the prayers in 4Q503 *Daily Prayers*, intended for the morning and evening of each day of the first month. 4Q503 is dated by its editor, M. Baillet, to the Hasmonean period (100–75 BCE).[15] Notwithstanding the fragmentary state of the manuscript, the regular structure of the prayers may be discerned. These daily prayers are arranged as follows: (1) a rubric of time reference for blessing God—לחודש בערב יברכו וענו ואמרו—ב-x ("In the X of the month in the evening they shall bless, they shall recite, saying"); ובצאת השמש להאיר על הארץ יברכו וענו ואמרו ("And when the sun ascends to illuminate the earth they shall bless, they shall recite, saying"); (2) a blessing of God in the third person, ברוך אל ישראל ("Blessed be the God of Israel"), praising him for the daily astronomical phenomena; (3) a blessing of Israel with peace, in the second person, שלום עליכה ישראל. Sometimes this final blessing is preceded by another blessing of God, this time in the second person.[16]

D. K. Falk, who has carefully analyzed the structure of this text, suggests that "three types of formulas punctuate the scroll at regular intervals: time references (for blessing God), opening and closing *berakhah* formulas, and response formulas."[17] He likewise notes the dissonance created at times by the double reference (to both God and Israel) in the second person singular, without a transition between the closing blessing of God and the blessing of Israel; thus, for example, ואתה [ ]ישו[ע]תכה שלום ע[ליה י]שראל ("And You [. . .] [. . .] Your salvation. Peace be with you, Israel," frg. 48–50 5–6); [הוד]עתנו בתהלי כבודכה [בכול] מועדי לילה שלום עליכה [ישראל] ("You have taught us the praises of Your glory [. . .] [. . . at all] times of the night. Peace be with you, [Israel]," frg. 51–55 9–10). He explained that, "as text, this unsignalled switch is ambiguous, but as liturgical dialogue, it is completely appropriate. Probably, then, it should be understood as some type of response pattern."[18]

---

[15] M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon 1982), 105. Translations of 4Q503 are based on that of F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–98), 2:999–1007.

[16] See B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 70; D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 41–42.

[17] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers*, 35.

[18] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers*, 46.

Falk's suggestion that the closing formula, שלום עליכה ישראל, is a response is based on the assumption that the daily prayers of 4Q503 were recited in the presence of a congregation. This assumption is supported by the opening rubric, in the third person plural: יברכו ועני ואמרו ("they shall bless, they shall recite, saying"); and by the many phrases in the first person plural, such as ואנו עם קודשו מהללים הלילה ("and we, his holy people, exult this night"; col. 5, frg. 11 3–4; and cf. col. 3:20); ופדותנו [ו] ("and our deliverance," 3:8); "[Blessed be the God of Israel] who has chosen us בנו [ר]שו בת[א] from among all the nations"; col. 7, frg. 24 4). Nevertheless, even if this literary analysis is correct, the suggestion that the closing blessing for peace serves as a liturgical response needs to be examined, both in light of what is known about the liturgical recitation of morning and evening blessings in the presence of a congregation, and in terms of the contents of the daily prayers of 4Q503.

The prayers and blessings found at Qumran were preserved in separate scrolls; thus it is impossible to know the complete order of Qumran daily, Sabbath, and festival liturgy, particularly if there is more than one prayer designated for a specific day or a specific service.[19] Other information concerning the morning and evening blessings is preserved in 1QS 10:1–3, 10, 13–14. Certain clues concerning the content of these blessings may refer to the recitation of the *Shema*, e.g.: 1) עם מבוא יום ולילה אבואה בברית אל ועם מוצא ערב ובוקר אמר חוקיו ("At the onset of day and night I shall enter the covenant of God, and when evening and morning depart I shall repeat His

[19] See E. G. Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications," *DSD* 1 (1994): 265–284. Daily prayers appear in 4Q503 and in the *Words of the Luminaries* (4Q504–506); Sabbath prayers appear in 4Q503 frg. 24–25, frg. 41 4–8 (see J. M. Baumgarten, "4Q503 [Daily Prayers] and the Lunar Calendar," *RevQ* 12 [1987]: 399–406); in 4Q504 1–2 vii; and in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. The daily prayers of 4Q503 are to be recited evening and morning of every day during the first month, but there is no information regarding a specific time for reciting the prayers in the *Words of the Luminaries*. Each song of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* is to be recited on a fixed Sabbath during each season of the four seasons of the year, according to the 364-day calendar (see J. Maier, "Shire Olat hash-Shabbat. Some Observations on Their Calendric Implications and on Their Style," *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 2:543–60). However, there is no information telling us the specific time they were to be recited on the Sabbath day. Was their recitation parallel to the time of the Sabbath sacrifice in the Temple?

precepts," 1QS 10:10);[20] 2) בראשית משלח ידי ורגלי אברך שמו בראשית צאת ובוא לשבת וקום ועם משכב יצועי ארננה לו ("When I start to stretch out my hands and my feet I shall bless His name; when I start to go out and to come in, to sit and to stand up, and lying down in my bed I shall extol Him," 1QS 10:13–14). Jacob Licht understood lines 13–14 as an allusion to the words of Deut 6:7 concerning the twice-daily times for the recitation of the *Shema*,[21] while Moshe Weinfeld found in the words אומר חוקיו (line 10), similarity to the words בשכבנו ובקומנו נשיח בחוקיך ("When we lie down and when we rise up, we will meditate on your precepts"), recited in one of the blessings preceding the evening *Shema* in the traditional Jewish prayer book.[22] However, the *Shema* is regularly recited privately. The blessing said in the midst of the congregation, במערכת אנשים (1QS 10:14), may denote other prayers mentioned in 1QS 10 rather than the *Shema* itself.

In the extant text of 4Q503 there is no hint of the recitation of the biblical *Shema* (Deut 6:4–9) as such. The main blessing in each prayer is first and foremost a praise of God concerning the cosmological appearances of the luminaries. Additional blessings addressed to God, and related to the Sabbaths and festival days of the first month, follow the main blessing over the appearance of the luminaries.[23] The phrases [קודש קו]דשים במרומ[ים (frgs. 15–16 2), and צבאות אלים (frg. 65 2) indicate the praise of God recited together with the heavenly hosts, a motif which characterizes the blessings of God over the appearance of the luminaries in 11QPs[a] 26 and in the *Yoṣer ʿOr* blessing in the traditional Jewish liturgy.[24] 4Q503 thus reflects an early tradition of blessing over the luminaries, but apparently not the recitation of the *Shema*.

---

[20] Translations of 1QS utilize García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 69–98; col. 10 is on 94–97.

[21] J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 217. Although the text contains a clear indication of the recitation of the *Shema* according to Deut 6:7, Licht notes the possibility that the words of 1QS 10:13–14 might have been taken from other books as well: the phrase צאת ובוא suggests Ps 121:8; 1 Kgs 3:7; 2 Kgs 19:27; לשבת וקום suggests Ps 139:2.

[22] M. Weinfeld, "Prayer and Liturgical Practice in the Qumran Sect," in *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert: Forty Years of Research* (ed. M. Broshi et al.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1992), 172 (Hebrew).

[23] Baumgarten, "4Q503 Daily Prayers," 401–403.

[24] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 54; Weinfeld, "Traces of *Qedusat Yozer* and *Pesuqe de-Zimra* in the Qumran Scrolls and the Book of Ben Sira," *Tarbiz* 45

Other texts from Qumran relating to the praise of God in the context of the appearance of the luminaries are the Hymn to the Creator in 11QPs[a] 26:9–15,[25] and 4Q408, *Liturgy on Morning and Evening Prayer*.[26] Moshe Weinfeld noted the motifs common to the Hymn to the Creator and the *Yoṣer ʿOr* blessing in the rabbinic morning liturgy. Among these, in addition to the cosmological motifs, he listed the motifs of God's holiness and kingship, and the praise of God recited by the angels.[27] One fragment of 4Q408 was defined by its editor, Annette Steudel, as a liturgical text, because it contains the blessing of God in a liturgical form ברוך אתה אדוני ("[B]lessed are you, o Lord," frg. 3+3a, 6+6a), and because it emphasizes the people's duty to bless God morning and evening. However, 4Q503 is the only Qumran text that 1) consists of a complete set of liturgical blessings over the luminaries, *and* 2) shows evidence of the recitation of the blessing of peace in the daily prayers.[28] 4Q503 thus contains traditional motifs of the later daily liturgy, and perhaps reflects the presence of these elements in a daily service held during the Second Temple period, before the regular prayer liturgy was established.

The consistent use in its blessings of the formula שלום עליכה ישראל suggests that 4Q503 may be related to the daily service conducted by the priests in the Temple. Falk rightly noted that the use of the

---

(1976): 15–26 (Hebrew); J. Maier, "Zu kult und Liturgie der Qumrangemeinde," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 543–86 (esp. 553–60, 579); E. G. Chazon, "The *Qedushah* Liturgy and its History in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *From Qumran to Cairo: Studies in the History of Prayer. Proceedings of the Research Group Convened Under the Auspices of the Institute for Advanced Studies of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997* (ed. J. Tabory; Jerusalem: Orhot, 1999), 7–17.

[25] J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs[a])* (DJDJ 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 47, 89–91.

[26] A. Steudel, "4Q408. A Liturgy on Morning and Evening Prayer—Preliminary Edition," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 313–34. Official edition: Idem, "4Q408. 4QApocryphon of Moses[c]?" in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts* (ed. S. J. Pfann); *Miscellanea, Part 1* (ed. P. Alexander et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 304–308.

[27] Weinfeld, "Traces"; idem, "The Angelic Songs over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem (1989–1990)* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 131–57.

[28] Josephus, *B.J.* 2.128, mentions the Essene custom of praying over the rising of the sun, a custom handed down from their forefathers. A similar custom is mentioned in *m. Sukkah* 5:4; this text emphasizes the posture of the worshipers, however, not the content of the prayers.

second person in this formula, addressing the congregation, is characteristic of the Priestly Blessing. Thus, this formula may reflect a declaration recited by a priest or group of priests over the congregation;[29] alternatively, the liturgy of 4Q503 might have been recited antiphonally by two priestly groups. Other terms in 4Q503 that suggest a priestly or Temple context are: קודש קודשים (frgs. 15–16; 29–32 23, etc.), כהונה (frgs. 64 and 81, and possibly frg. 72), משרתים . . . מעונו (frg. 20 2–3; frg. 57 2), and ניחוח, לה]א[יר pertaining to the performance of the sacrifices (frgs. 77 4; 78 4).

We may tentatively conclude that the daily prayers preserved at Qumran bring together both the liturgical custom of blessing over the luminaries, and a priestly tradition of blessing the people of Israel.

Does the blessing שלום עליכה ישראל evoke the entire Priestly Blessing, or only the motif of peace within it? To understand the liturgical use of the peace motif in 4Q503, it is worthwhile taking another look at the structure of its blessings, this time in comparison with the ancient model of the priestly morning liturgy recorded in *m. Tamid* 5:1:

> אמר להם הממנה: ברכו ברכה אחת! והן ברכו. קראו עשרת הדברים, שמע, והיה אם שמוע, ויאמר, ברכו את העם שלוש ברכות: אמת ויציב, ועבודה, וברכת כהנים.
>
> The leader said to them, "Recite one blessing," and they blessed. They recited the Ten Declarations, "Hear," "And it shall come to pass," "And he said." They blessed the people with three blessings: "True and certain," "The service," and the Blessing of the Priests.[30]

This liturgy was a private service of the priests. It took place in a room that did not serve as part of the ritual precincts of the Temple (*m. Tamid* 4:3).[31] According to *m. Tamid* 7:2, the Priestly Blessing found in Num 6:24–26 was recited after the sacrificial offering, in a public service that took place on the steps ascending to the Sanctuary proper.[32] Hence the priestly blessing mentioned in *m. Tamid* 5:1 could not have been the official blessing recited in public, נשיאת כפים ("with

---

[29] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 53, suggests that the blessings of 4Q503 were recited by a congregation, after which "a priest or group of priests declared a blessing over the congregation."

[30] The Hebrew text and its translation follow R. Hammer, "What did they Bless? A Study of Mishnah Tamid 5.1," *JQR* 81 (1991): 305–23, p. 306.

[31] See Hammer, "What did they Bless?" 306.

[32] Hammer, "What did they Bless?" 312, n. 24, following the comment of Bartinura. The presence of the public at the daily sacrificial liturgy during the

raised hands," bestowing blessing directly on the people); it may however, have been a prayer on *behalf* of the people, such as a prayer for peace.

In his discussion of this priestly service, Hammer criticizes its anachronistic elaboration by the inclusion of rabbinic prayers, which originated only later than the Second Temple period.[33] Hammer notes two kinds of blessings that the priests are called upon to recite in this section. The first, described as ברכה אחת, "one blessing," without any further identification, is a praise of God, probably in the style of the biblical praises of God.[34] The three final blessings, including the "Blessing of the Priests," are prayers on behalf of the people, incorporating motifs known from later benedictions: redemption (אמת ויציב), acceptance of the people's sacrifices (עבודה), and peace (ברכת כהנים).[35]

Hammer identified an early structure of such a prayer—consisting of summons, praise of God, and felicitation[36]—similar to that which he assumes for *m. Tamid* 5:1, in Sir 45:25–26; 50:22–23.[37]

ועתה ברכו נא את ה׳ הטוב המעטר אתכם כבוד
ויתן לכם חכמת לב [לשפט את עמו בצדק] (Sir 45:25–26)

> And now bless the Lord who has crowned you with glory.
> May the Lord grant you wisdom of mind to judge His people with justice . . .

עתה ברכו נא את ה׳ אלהי ישראל המפליא לעשות בארץ . . .
יתן לכם חכמת לבב ויהי בשלום ביניכם (Sir 50:22–23)

Second Temple period is mentioned in Sir 50:16–21; Luke 1:10; and Acts 3:1. Josephus, *Contra Apion* 2:193–98 refers to the service following the sacrificial offering.

[33] Hammer, "What did they Bless?," 310–13.

[34] Hammer, "What did they Bless?," 313–23.

[35] For a later prayer for peace based upon the Priestly Blessing, one may compare the section שים שלום in the *Amidah* prayer.

[36] That is, a request that something good be granted, without the technical language of petition (imperative) or blessing (ברוך).

[37] This is the version of Ben Sira found in the Cairo Genizah, which reflects the original text; see M. Z. Segal, *Sefer Ben-Sira ha-Shalem* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972); translation is my own. Sir 45:25–26 concludes the story of Aaron, the first High Priest; 50:22–23 presents one of the blessings that closes the story of Simon the High Priest. Segal comments that this version of the final blessing (יהי שלום ביניכם; "May there be peace *between you*"), which may reflect a controversy between the sons of Simon, was changed in the Greek translation into a prayer for peace upon *Israel* "in our days" (*Sefer Ben-Sira*, 348).

> And now bless the Lord, the God of Israel,
> who everywhere works great wonders . . .
> May He give you wisdom of mind, and may there be peace between you.

I would like to suggest a similar three-part structure in 4Q503, albeit adapted to a liturgical setting. The call to bless God in 4Q503 is styled, not as a literary summons, but as a liturgical rubric: יברכו וענו ואמרו "they shall bless, they shall recite, saying." This is followed by a praise of God for the appearance of the daily luminaries, using the formula ברוך אל. The concluding blessing, שלום עליכה ישראל, may be understood as a felicitation that God grant peace to Israel. It would seem that both the blessing of God and the blessing of the people are recited in 4Q503 by the priests—perhaps antiphonally, by different groups of priests. We may thus conclude that 4Q503 is an early liturgy of daily blessings deriving from priestly circles, the motifs of which were later elaborated in Jewish liturgy.

4Q448

In contrast to the daily liturgy of 4Q503, in which the blessing for peace to Israel is recited at fixed times and in a fixed form, the prayer on behalf of King Jonathan and the people of Israel, 4Q448 ii, seems to be a prayer composed for a specific occasion.

4Q448 ii 1–9:[38]

1. Guard (or: Rise up), O Holy One	1. עור קדש
2. over King Jonathan (or: for King Jonathan)	2. על יונתן המלכ
3. and all the congregation of Your people	3. וכל קהל עמכ
4. Israel	4. ישראל
5. who are in the four	5. אשר בארבע
6. winds of heaven.	6. רוחות שמים
7. Let them all be (at) peace	7. יהו שלום כלם

[38] The Hebrew text and its English translation follow the edition of E. Eshel, H. Eshel and A. Yardeni, "448. 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer," *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. E. Eshel et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 403–25, p. 421.

8. and upon Your kingdom	8. ועל ממלכתכ
9. may Your name be blessed.	9. יתברכ שמכ

Israelite worship does not contain any fixed liturgy for the welfare of the king, but rather psalms intended for specific royal occasions, such as a coronation (possibly Psalm 72),[39] or the victory of the king over the enemies of Israel (see Psalm 18). The king likewise blessed the people on special occasions, such as the return of the Holy Ark to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6:18) or the inauguration of the Temple of Solomon (1 Kgs 8:55–61).

Among the psalms for the welfare of the king, the motif of peace appears in Psalm 21 and Ps 72:3, 7, as well as in Isa 9:5–6, which may allude to the coronation of a new king.[40] In each of these settings the motif of peace, even though it denotes the welfare of the people and the king, is expressed differently. Hence, these contexts do not reflect a fixed form such as the Priestly Blessing, unlike 4Q503.[41] In the Second Temple period, the only ritual for the welfare of a king was the sacrificial offering that the priests were forced to make for the Roman Emperor (Josephus, *B.J.* 2.410–416); the same offering may be alluded to in the apocryphal book of Baruch (Bar 1:11).[42] In Israelite biblical and post-biblical worship, by contrast, there was no sacrificial worship for the king, and thus no set daily prayer for the welfare of the king.

---

[39] A. Weiser claims that Psalm 72 is to be regarded, like Psalms 20 and 21, as a portion of the liturgy for the festival of the king's enthronement, intended to evoke an ideal type of king; *The Psalms* (OTL; London: SCM, 1959), 502. See also A. Hacham, *The Book of Psalms* (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1990), 1.430, and 1.106–108, 113 (Hebrew).

[40] B. Uffenheimer claims that the hope for peace expressed in Isa 9:1–6 is to be related to the coronation of King Hezekiah. See "From the Eschatological Prophecy to the Apocalyptic One," in *Messianism and Eschatology* (ed. Z. Baras; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 1983), 35–36 (Hebrew). O. Kaiser connects this prophecy to an earlier historical situation, the 734–732 BCE expedition of Tiglat-Pilesar III to the kingdom of Israel. He prefers to understand the prophecy as referring to the enthronement of an ideal savior king, who will bring everlasting peace to Israel and Judaea. See *Isaiah 1–12* (OTL; London: SCM, 1963), 125–30.

[41] Among the homilies concerning the Priestly Blessing וישם לך שלום, one finds in *Sifre Bamidbar, Naso* 42 (ed. Horovitz, 46), that Isa 9:5–6 is used as a proof text for a blessing for the welfare of the kingdom of David. However, such a homily does not necessarily reflect a fixed liturgy for the welfare of the king.

[42] For the suggestion that the relations between the Jews and certain Roman emperors appear in disguised form in 1 Baruch 1:11–12 and 2:21, see R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 1:569, 574–75 (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 14.189–230; *B.J.* 2.411–416; A. Kahana, *The Apocrypha* (Jerusalem: Makor, 1970), 1:352 (Hebrew).

Similarly, the prayer in 4Q448 ii does not reflect regular worship, but was rather composed for a specific occasion. This prayer is one of two or three apocryphal psalms preserved together in one scroll; it is dedicated explicitly to Jonathan the king, who has been identified as King Alexander Jannaeus.[43] The dedication in itself reflects the uniqueness of this prayer and its occasional character. As Jannaeus is considered one of the Hasmonean kings criticized in the *pesharim*, some scholars have suggested construing the first two lines of col. 2 in opposition to lines 3–7. Lines 1–2 would then read, "Rise up, O Holy one *against* King Jonathan," and lines 3–7, "*But*/And let all the congregation of your people Israel . . . be in peace."[44] However, this interpretation, makes it difficult to suggest a specific occasion for this prayer.

Other scholars read the first three lines of col. 2 as: "Guard (or: Rise up), O Holy One, over King Jonathan (or: for King Jonathan) and all the congregation of Your people Israel." If Jonathan's kingdom is considered to be the kingdom of God (line 8),[45] column 2 may then be interpreted as a prayer for the welfare of King Jonathan and the congregation of Israel. The scholars who read the prayer in this way suggest various possible occasions for its composition. Three times during his reign, Jannaeus succeeded in saving Jerusalem from conquest by foreign armies; hence there are three separate possibilities suggested for this specific occasion. Hartmut Stegemann pro-

---

[43] Eshel et al., "448. 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer," 412–14. On p. 403 there is a bibliography of previous discussion.

[44] J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington, "Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication," *JBL* 112 (1993): 498; E. Main, "For King Jonathan or Against? The Use of the Bible in 4Q448," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 May 1996* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 113–135; idem, "A Note on 4Q448," *Tarbiz* 67 (1998): 103–20 (Hebrew).

[45] See the comments of Eshel et al. on line 8, in "448. 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer," 422. A similar idea is expressed in 4Q448 3:4–6: על [ ] פקדם לברכה [ ] ממלכה להברכ[ ] שמכ שנקרא "Remember them for blessing . . . [ ] on your name, which is called[ ] kingdom to be blessed" (ibid., 423–25). These fragmented phrases may be understood as an invocation to God to bless the people of Israel, called on His name, and the kingdom, which presumably called on His name as well (cf. ממלכתכ "Your kingdom" in 2:8). The editors' suggestion, that the phrase ממלכה להברכ (3:9) should be understood as the passive form "kingdom to be blessed," is feasible by comparison with ועל ממלכתכ יתברכ שמכ in 2:8–9. The forms הברך and יתברך are the only passive forms of ברך to be found in the Qumran scrolls. See E. Qimron, "Concerning the Blessing over King Jonathan," *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 566–67 (Hebrew).

poses that this psalm "heartily congratulates him on his victory over Seleucid Demetrius III" in 90 BCE, which prevented Demetrius from conquering Jerusalem, as reflected in *Pesher Nahum* 1:1–3.[46] Hanan and Esther Eshel have suggested an earlier occasion: in 103–102 BCE, Jannaeus succeeded in preventing Ptolemy Latirus from conquering Jerusalem by calling upon his mother, Cleopatra, to help him against Latirus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13.330–355). According to J. D. Amoussine, this incident is reflected in *Pesher Isaiah* (4Q161, frgs. 2–6).[47] Flusser prefers the latest of the three occasions, in 80 BCE, when, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 13.394; *B.J.* 1.104–106), Jannaeus was received with great honor by the congregation of Israel upon his return to Jerusalem after important victories over the course of three years.[48]

The terms and style of the prayer in col. 2 reflect the literary characteristics of a psalm, rather than the characteristics of a liturgical prayer. The title of the preserved psalm in col. 1 is שיו [ר]הללויה מזמו, whereas the composition in col. 2 has no title. Hanan and Esther Eshel have recently suggested that 4Q448 is a *set* of psalms that all refer to the same historical event: the saving of Jerusalem by Jannaeus.[49] The felicitation שלום (יהו) יהי appears in Ps 122:7, while its object, כלם, signifying here the king and the people of Israel, is in keeping with the felicitations for peace in Pss 122:8 and 72:3.[50] Although the

---

[46] H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran* (Leiden: Brill 1998), 133–34.

[47] H. and E. Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154 and 4QpIsa^a," *Tarbiz* 67 (1998): 121–30, esp. 127–30 (Hebrew); they note the following works of J. D. Amoussine (p. 128, n. 25): "A propos de l'interpretion de 4Q161 (fragments 5–6 et 8)," *RevQ* 31 (1979): 381–92; "The Reflections of Historical Events of the First Century in Qumran Commentaries (4Q161; 4Q169; 4Q166)," *HUCA* 48 (1977): 123–34.

[48] D. Flusser, "Some Notes About the Prayer for the King Jonathan," *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 297–300, p. 298 (Hebrew).

[49] See above, n. 47. The name of Zion appears in 4Q448 1:10, and according to Ps 154, the reconstruction of the verse may contain its parallel name "Jerusalem." Zion and Jerusalem are mentioned in Isa 10:32 as the goal of Sennacherib's expedition of 701 BCE. According to the title of Psalm 154 in its Syriac manuscript, this psalm refers to Hezekiah's prayer concerning that event. In 4QpIsa^a 5–6 10–13, Sennacherib's expedition is interpreted homiletically as alluding to the expedition of Ptolemy Latirus in 103–102 BCE, which the Eshels connect with 4Q448.

[50] As Eshel et al. noted, both the style and the content of the blessing for peace in 4Q448 are reflected in a later prayer, the Kaddish; they are also found in a synagogue inscription from Alma, in the upper Galilee ("A Scroll from Qumran Which Includes Part of Psalm 154 and a Prayer for King Jonathan and his Kingdom," *Tarbiz* 60 [1991]: 306 [Hebrew]; DJD 11.422 and the bibliography there).

expressions קהל עם and קהל ישראל are used in the Bible to indicate the people who are present (e.g., Josh 8:35; Jer 26:17), it would seem that the prayer here, "for King Jonathan and all the congregation of Your people Israel (וכל קהל עמך ישראל) who are in the four winds of heaven" (2:2–7) requests peace for all the people of Israel wherever they are scattered, and not only for a specific group assembled in the Temple or at some other public place.[51] The only phrase that appears to indicate a liturgical setting is the closing praise of God in the form יתברך שמך. However, Eshel et al. have noted that even this phrase may reflect the Second Temple *literary* usage of the expression ברך שם ("Bless the name') in place of other expressions with the name of God (in psalms, e.g., Ps 72:17 LXX; and in other writings, e.g. 1QIsa[a] on Isa 56:6).[52] We may thus conclude that the prayer for peace in 4Q448 represents a literary rather than a liturgical blessing.

On the basis of the national characteristics of the psalm, its positive attitude towards Jannaeus, and the absence of sectarian terms, it has been suggested that the scroll of 4Q448 was brought to Qumran from outside. However, Stegemann has recently suggested that "an Essene living in Qumran obviously wished to give expression, by dedicating the psalm in this way, to his joy that King Alexander Jannaeus had preserved the city of Jerusalem, and the Temple, from the assault of the pagans."[53] Hanan and Esther Eshel tend to support this conclusion, based upon a similar reasoning.[54] Nevertheless, this is clearly not a typical sectarian prayer.

The broadly stated object of the prayer for peace, יהו שלום כלם, "all the congregation of Your people Israel who are in the four winds of heaven" (2:3–7), does not reflect the particularistic conception of the Qumran community (see below). But neither does this particularistic concept characterize the liturgical texts found at Qumran,

---

[51] See D. Flusser, "Some Notes about the Prayer for the King Jonathan," 298–300. In light of the difference between the actual situation of Israel as scattered to the four winds of heaven, and the traditional use of such a phrase for the hope of ingathering the exiles, Flusser suggests that this is an expression of the consciousness of sovereignty of the Hasmonean leadership over all the people of Israel. He found traces of such consciousness in the letter sent by Judah Maccabee to the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt (2 Macc 1:10–2:18).

[52] See Eshel et al., "A Scroll from Qumran," 307, and DJD 11.422; Hurvitz, *The Transition Period*, 96–97; and Qimron, "Concerning the Blessing over King Jonathan," 566–67.

[53] Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 134.

[54] Eshel and Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm 154 and 4QpIsa[a]," 130.

such as the *Daily Prayers* (4Q503), the *Words of the Luminaries* (4Q504–506) and the *Festival Prayers* (4Q507–509; 1Q34bis). These prayers, when invoking peace and deliverance for *all* Israel, follow the pattern of biblical prayers and conform to the situation of the Jewish nation in the Second Temple period, as expressed in Jewish prayers of that time.[55] In light of this, the prayer of 4Q448 is not incongruous with the liturgical texts found at Qumran.

The Motif of Peace in Sectarian Liturgy and Poetry

In the sectarian liturgy, the motif of peace is shaped by two aspects of the sect's distinctive worldview: dualism and eschatology. The dualistic outlook is apparent in the blessing of peace upon the righteous and the denial of peace to the wicked. The eschatological outlook is evident in the characterization of peace as eternal.

These two characteristics are expressed in a salient way in the blessings and curses recited during the annual covenant ceremony (1QS 2:2–18), which are based upon the Priestly Blessing of Num 6:24–26. The felicitation of peace to the men of God's lot is combined with the motif of ישא פניו, as in Num 6:26, but expanded in form and content: "May He lift up His *merciful countenance* upon you *for eternal peace*" (1QS 2:3). In the curse against the men of the lot of Belial, the same priestly felicitations (ישא פניו and ישם לך שלום) are expanded in the negative. Although now separated grammatically, the two phrases are still linked in content: "May He lift up His *angry countenance* to wreak His vengeance upon you; *May there be no peace for you at the mouth of any intercessors*" (1QS 2:9). Hence, the dualistic opposition between those of the community and those of Belial is expressed in the opposition between the eternal granting of peace to the righteous and eternal denial of peace to the wicked.[56] This dualistic use of the Priestly Blessing contrasts with its use in the *Rule of Blessings* (1QSb = 1Q28b), where it is used only in a positive construction, referring only to the righteous.

---

[55] This phenomenon in Qumran liturgical texts has been explained differently by several scholars. See Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 92–111; E. G. Chazon, "A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications: Words of the Luminaries (4QDibHam)" (Ph.D. diss.; The Hebrew University, 1991), 81–98; 292–93 (Hebrew); Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers*, 61–94, 215.

[56] See Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 148–54. The use of the Priestly Blessing in a covenantal ceremony is explained on 133–35.

The *Rule of Blessings* also features the systematic use of a number of motifs from the Priestly Blessing. In this text, terms from Num 6:24–26 are elaborated into a sequence of blessings for the welfare of various classes of the eschatological community of Israel, assembled in a solemn ceremony.[57] The motif of peace (here also expanded as *eternal* peace) appears in the phrases שלו]ם עולם יתן לכה [("May He give you eternal [pea]ce"; 3:5); יסד שלומכה לעולמי עד ("He has established your peace for ever"; 3:21).[58] These felicitations are presumably directed to the leaders and distinguished figures in the eschatological community of Israel.[59]

The motif of eternal peace appears in other sectarian writings as well, but not couched in the language of the Priestly Blessing. Eternal peace is mentioned as the desirable reward for the righteous in diverse contexts. In the lists of dualistic recompense and retribution found in 1QS 4:6–14, the reward of those who walk in the way of truth is "plentiful peace in a long life," as against the retribution of "eternal damnation" to those who walk in the way of wickedness.[60] This idea of antithetical retribution is expressed in poetical form in $1QH^a$ 13:16–18 (5:33–35) and 4Q511 63 iii 4–5.[61] 4Q502 *Ritual of Marriage* features a blessing of peace in a very different context: the bride is wished a long, peaceful life among an everlasting people (4Q502 24 2–6). Formally, this text is a liturgical blessing, opening with the formula ברוך אל ישראל ("blessed is the God of Israel").[62]

Eternal peace also characterizes more generally the eschatological age. This idea is expressed in writings concerned with situations of crisis. The high priest will encourage the Sons of Light after a defeat

---

[57] For the literary practice of elaborating motifs of the Priestly Blessing into blessings directed towards specific classes or persons, see Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 155–64.

[58] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 158–61.

[59] As the blessings of 1Q28b are arranged in ascending order from the simple God fearers (col. 1) to the Prince of the Congregation (col. 5), one may assume that the blessings of col. 3 are directed toward the leaders and distinguished persons in the eschatological community of Israel (cf. 1QSa [= 1Q28a] 1:25–2:14–17; 11QTS 42:12–17). See J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 274–75 and 261–62; B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 140–41, 158–61; Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Shrine of the Book, 1977), 2:126–27 (Hebrew).

[60] The English translation follows that of F. García Martínez and W. G. E. Watson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 6–7.

[61] On 4Q511 63 iii 4–5 see Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 361.

[62] What some scholars consider to be a marriage ceremony, J. Baumgarten suggests is a "golden age" ceremony; see J. M. Baumgarten, "4Q502, Marriage or Golden Age Ritual?" *JJS* 34 (1983): 1–6.

in the eschatological battle against the Kittim, promising [כ]מעט לבליעל וברית אל שלום [לי]שראל בכול מועדי[עולמים] ("[of] little time for Belial, and covenant of God of peace for Israel, for all the appointed times" 4QM^a = 4Q491 11 ii 18).[63] Similarly, the *Hodayot* describe the transition from the distress of the epoch of wickedness to the eschatological epoch in the following terms:

26. ואין ינון ואנחה
ועולה [לא תהיה עוד]
27. ואמתכה תופיע לכבוד עד
ושלום עולום

There will be neither distress nor sighing
Iniquity [and fraud will exist no longer.]
But Your truth will be displayed
for endless glory and eternal peace. (1QH^a 11:26–27 [19:29–30])[64]

Thus, the motif of peace embedded in the sectarian writings expresses its ideology regarding the eternal reward expected for the righteous at the End of Days. This anticipation of a reward of eternal peace may also be connected to the Yaḥad's ideology of the New Covenant, which is described as an eternal covenant between God and Israel (cf. Jer 31:31; 32:40): "the covenant of God of peace for Israel, for all the appointed times" (see above; 4QM^a = 4Q491 11 ii 18).[65]

* * *

In concluding our investigation of the use and development of the motif of peace in prayers from Qumran, it becomes clear that the Priestly Blessing was the outstanding model for the development of

---

[63] The English translation follows García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 119. According to García Martínez, 1QM 17:7's parallel reading should be להאיר בשמחה ב[ריח י]שראל שלום וברכה לנורל אל, "He will illuminate the co[venant] of Israel with joy, peace and blessing to God's lot" (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 112, slightly modified). Y. Yadin suggested the reading ב[ית י]שראל for 1QM 17:7 (*The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* [Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957], 356 [Hebrew]).

[64] Text as in J. Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957), 167 (Hebrew), retaining the line numbers of the Sukenik edition. The English translation follows García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 354. The same idea appears in 4Q427 7 ii 2–7 (= 4QH^a) in another context. See E. Schuller, "427. 4QHodayot^a," DJD 29.97.

[65] See B. Nitzan, "The Concept of Covenant in Qumran Literature," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 27–31 January 1999* (ed. D. Goodblatt, et al.; STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill; 2001), 79–104, esp. 89–90.

this motif in regular blessings and prayers, both sectarian and non-sectarian. Its use in the daily prayers found at Qumran (4Q503) reflects non-sectarian Second Temple priestly liturgical usage when the blessing was pronounced for the sake of all Israel. The motif of peace, together with other motifs of the Priestly Blessing, was elaborated in this vein in later Jewish liturgy. By contrast, the use of this motif in the main annual sectarian ceremony (1QS col. 2) reflects the dualistic approach of a particularistic group.

Occasional prayers and poetry do not invoke the Priestly Blessing. The motif of peace is expressed freely in occasional prayers, expressing either a national and popular expectation for peace for all Israel and the national king in the present (4Q448, col. 2), or a hope for eternal peace to be granted to the Covenant community in the 'End of Days' (4QM^{a}; 1QH^{a}). The eternal aspect of eschatological peace, as expressed in the sectarian writings, may be linked to the idea of the eternal nature of the New Covenant.

THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD, QUMRAN RESEARCH, AND RABBINIC LITURGY: SOME CONTEXTUAL AND LINGUISTIC COMPARISONS

Stefan C. Reif
University of Cambridge

It is widely recognised that most proponents of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, at least in the first century of its existence, were at one time or another engaged in research on the history of Jewish liturgy. Although their interests in this connection ranged widely within the rabbinic tradition from texts to theology, from prose to poetry, and from the mystical to the mundane, there was also a preoccupation on the part of some scholars with the precise relationship between the earliest manifestations of rabbinic liturgy and the broader history and literature of the Jews during the Second Temple period. Tending as they did to see the religious histories of Christianity and rabbinic Judaism in diachronic terms, they combed the late books of the Hebrew Bible, the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and the literary sources of Hellenistic Judaism, to identify the material that could most closely be related to the earliest talmudic-midrashic traditions. While the Christian scholars tended to see the New Testament and the early Church as the faithful transmitters of major Second Temple ideas and practice, their Jewish counterparts preferred to locate such a continuation in the extensive literature of the talmudic-midrashic sources.[1]

---

[1] For bibliography, see J. Tabory, *Jewish Prayer and the Yearly Cycle: A List of Articles* (Supplement to *Kiryat Sefer* 64; Jerusalem: Jewish National and University Library, 1992–93), and a substantial collection of addenda to that publication that appeared together with his facsimile edition of the Hanau prayer-book of 1628, *Sidur Han'au 388 (mahadurah faksimilit): 'im pirke mavo ve-nispah bibliografi* (ed. J. Tabory and M. Rafeld; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1994). Tabory has also surveyed the field in a Hebrew article entitled "*Tefillah*," in supplementary volume 3 of the *Encyclopaedia Hebraica* (Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv: Sifriyat Po'alim, 1995), cols. 1061–68, and in his English article, "The Prayer Book (Siddur) as an Anthology of Judaism," *Prooftexts* 17 (1997): 115–32. See also R. Sarason's three articles: "On the Use of Method in the Modern Study of Jewish Liturgy," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice* (ed. W. S. Green; vol. 2; Brown Judaic Studies 9; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 97–172; "Recent Developments in the Study of Jewish Liturgy," in

This Jewish scholastic tendency in the field of liturgical research may be traced in the work of many scholars from Reform circles in mid-nineteenth-century Germany to modern Orthodox stalwarts in mid-twentieth-century Israel. It is perhaps best exemplified, however, in the work of an American liturgical specialist who ultimately headed the rabbinical school of the Conservative movement. Louis Finkelstein devoted much of his early research to the history of the traditional Hebrew prayers; it is now some seventy years since he produced detailed studies of the *Amidah* and the *Birkat Hamazon*, later supplemented by articles on the *Shema* and the *Hallel*. These studies, which appeared in the form of lengthy articles in scholarly periodicals, contained a mass of evidence from talmudic, geonic and midrashic literature, from Genizah and other manuscript folios (some of them containing unique material), from medieval halakhic compositions and liturgical commentaries, and from early printed editions.[2]

Finkelstein's analysis, though containing important theological, literary and historical elements, and making comparisons with Christian and Karaite traditions, was primarily textual, and he reached very precise conclusions about the origin and development of these central Jewish prayers. Having compared all the rites, versions and citations, and laying particular stress on what he had drawn from the Genizah sources, he felt able to eliminate what he regarded as later accretions and to present, in tabulated format, a text that could be defined as a pristine version originating in Judea in the Second

---

The Study of Ancient Judaism. 1. Mishnah, Midrash, Siddur (ed. J. Neusner; New York: Ktav, 1981), 180–87; "Religion and Worship: The Case of Judaism," in *Take Judaism for Example: Studies Toward the Comparison of Religions* (ed. J. Neusner; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 49–65. See also S. C. Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 1–21; "The Genizah and Jewish Liturgy," *Medieval Encounters* 5 (1991): 29–45; and, "The Importance of the Cairo Genizah for the Study of the History of Prayer," *Kenishta: Studies of the Synagogue World* (ed. J. Tabory; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 2001), 43–52 (Hebrew).

[2] L. Finkelstein, "The Development of the Amidah," *JQR* n.s. 16 (1925): 1–43 and 127–70; "The Birkat Ha-Mazon," *JQR* n.s. 19 (1928–29): 211–62; "La Kedouscha et les Benedictions du Schema," *REJ* 93 (1932): 1–26; and "The Origin of the Hallel," *HUCA* 32 (1950–51): 319–37. For recent assessments of Finkelstein as scholar and educator, see M. B. Greenbaum, "The Finkelstein Era," H. E. Goldberg, "Becoming History: Perspectives on the Seminary Faculty at Mid-Century," and B. R. Shargel, "The Texture of Seminary Life during the Finkelstein Era," in *The Making of an Institution of Higher Learning* (vol. 1 of *Tradition Renewed: A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary*; ed. J. Wertheimer; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1997), 161–232, 353–437 and 515–64.

Temple period, probably as early as pre-Maccabean times. In his view, the role of Rabban Gamliel in the second century of the current era had been to establish the authentic and authoritative nature of such a version and through his powerful leadership to transmit its purity to future generations. In the wake of Finkelstein's textual definitions, it became fairly common for general studies of Second Temple Judaism to cite his work among the most important studies of Jewish liturgy in that period.[3]

The notion that single and standard manifestations of Jewish thought, religious practice, sacred literature, popular language and liturgical rite existed in the Second Temple period, and that these may be traced in direct lines of evolution into the early Christian centuries, has been seriously challenged by numerous scholarly developments since the time of Finkelstein. The discovery, exploitation and publication of the Qumran corpus has undoubtedly made the most major impact and will shortly engage our closer attention. There have, however, also been other changes of outlook on the part of specialists in the period that have made their mark on the scientific understanding of Jewish liturgical history during the Second Temple era. In a brief paper that I delivered at the World Congress of Jewish Studies held in Jerusalem in 1993, I argued the need for a change in the methodology required to reach such a scientific understanding. It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that the broader Near Eastern background and the more specific Hellenistic culture have to be taken into account; that social, economic and political factors are now to be given more recognition than they once were; that the role of archaeological and inscriptional evidence is continuing to grow in significance; and that, above all, the definition of what constitutes history must be permitted to add a powerful voice to the discussion.[4]

More specifically, the views of Joseph Heinemann and Ezra Fleischer, diametrically opposed and mutually contradictory as they are in so many ways, nevertheless have in common that they force the liturgical

---

[3] See, for example, the revised English edition of E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC–AD 135)* (ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979), 2:456.

[4] S. C. Reif, "Jewish Liturgy in the Second Temple Period: Some Methodological Considerations," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, 1993* (ed. D. Assaf; Jerusalem: ha-Igud ha-ʿolami le-madaʿe ha-Yahadut, 1994), 1–8.

historian to think again about what preceded the tannaitic traditions in general and the achievements of Rabban Gamliel in particular. As far as Heinemann was concerned, there never was one original version. The Genizah texts, far from being distillable to one pure essence, should rather be analysed as testifying to the variety and complexity of content that characterised Jewish liturgy from its foundations during the Second Temple period. Such an inherent lack of textual consistency was more consonant with a proposed orality of transmission than with the notion of a standard formulation committed to writing. What the scholar could and should do was to employ the form-critical method to uncover the varied ritual, educational and individual contexts in which the different sets of prayers had their origins, and to identify the common themes and factors that run through the varied formulations.[5]

For his part, Fleischer saw the variegated nature of liturgical texts from the Genizah as testimony to the revolutionary impact of the liturgical poets on the central Jewish prayers in the geonic period, an impact that he regarded as having its origin in the mishnaic authorisation for textual innovation in the *Amidah*. The recitations and compositions of these poets spawned a host of novel versions of what had previously been the standard liturgy. That liturgy had been created virtually *de novo* by Rabban Gamliel in the second century, had existed in written form, and had throughout the talmudic period enjoyed a more authoritative status than any of the varied formulations that are cited from time to time by the other Rabbis.[6] What appears to be a central pillar in both historical reconstructions is the conviction that it is impossible to identify a standard *Amidah*-type or

[5] The original Hebrew edition, with the English title, *Prayer in the Period of the Tannaim and Amoraim: Its Nature and Its Patterns* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, Perry Foundation for Biblical Research, 1964 [Hebrew]), was updated by the author and translated into English by R. Sarason. It was published as *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (Studia Judaica 9; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977), with an introduction that offers a summary and justification of Heinemann's novel approach.

[6] E. Fleischer, "On the Beginnings of Obligatory Jewish Prayer," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 397–441 (Hebrew); "Rejoinder to Dr Reif's Remarks," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 683–88 (Hebrew). Compare also his *Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals as Portrayed in the Geniza Documents* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1988 [Hebrew]; "Annual and Triennial Reading of the Bible in the Old Synagogue," *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 25–43 (Hebrew); "The *Shemone Esre*—Its Character, Internal Order, Contents and Goals," *Tarbiz* 62 (1993): 179–223 (Hebrew); and "Le-Sidrey Ha-Tefillah Be-Vet Ha-Kenesset," *Asufot* 7 (1993): 217–60.

similar liturgical text that was broadly used in Jewish religious communities to meet a religious obligation in the final two or three centuries of the Second Temple period.

In the course of the last decade or two, the liturgical texts available from Qumran have increased considerably in number and variety and consequently represent the latest phase of the challenge to the concept of a "single and standard" liturgical core, existing from Second Temple times. The question that needs to be answered is whether this new evidence, and its close study and careful publication, has reinforced the conviction common to the Heinemann and Fleischer views; or whether it has, even in a limited fashion, moved more in the direction of justifying Finkelstein's presupposition that scholars could uncover standard liturgical texts dating from the pre-Christian period that were the undisputed ancestors of later Jewish and Christian worship.

Some ten years ago, when I was writing my general history of normative Hebrew prayer in the Jewish religious community, I decided not to give any more than brief attention to the Qumran evidence because I was unsure of the degree to which it could justifiably be regarded as directly pertinent to the topic.[7] Having looked at liturgical items such as the *Hodayot, Rule of the Blessings* (1QSb), *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and *Words of the Luminaries*, and the literature then available on them, I noted that these texts went beyond what was known from biblical, apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature. I hinted that this feature might lend some credence to the connection originally made by Kaufmann Kohler a century ago between the liturgy of the Essenes and that of the early Rabbis.[8] Such themes as the election of Israel, the centrality of Zion, the elimination of evil and the survival of the saints occurred at Qumran and in the relevant rabbinic texts, and there were possible Qumranic parallels with the later *Amidah, Vidduy* and *Taḥanun*. At the same time, the Qumran

---

[7] S. C. Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer*, 48–52, 55, 60, 66–69, 77–78, 82.

[8] K. Kohler, "Über die Ursprünge und Grundformen der synagogalen Liturgie: Eine Studie," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 37 (1893): 441–51 and 489–97. Compare also his further comments in his articles in *The Jewish Encyclopaedia* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906): "Benedictions" (3:8–12), "Didascalia" (4:588–94), and "Essenes" (5:224–32); and "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions," *HUCA* 1 (1924): 387–425, reprinted in *Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy*, (ed. J. J. Petuchowski; New York: Ktav, 1970), 52–90.

texts gave no clear indications about matters of recitation, participation and context, and I therefore offered the following tentative conclusions:

> Certainly, the Qumran scrolls provide the earliest testimony to liturgical formulations of a communal nature designated for particular occasions and conducted in a centre totally independent of Jerusalem and the Temple, making use of terminology and theological concepts that were later to become dominant in Jewish and, in some cases, Christian prayer . . .
>
> The question that has yet to be asked, let alone answered, is whether that process is to be understood as a unique feature of the way of life represented at Qumran, which was later adopted and adapted by the Rabbinic inheritors of Jewish religious practice, or as an example of popular liturgical piety that was common to various Pharisaic and Essene groups and subsequently survived in the Tannaitic traditions.[9]

Given that additional texts and more extensive studies of the subject are now available, the time has come to discuss the matter afresh and to offer a re-assessment of its current state.

The scholar who has been most prolific in comparing the liturgical texts from Qumran with those of rabbinic literature is undoubtedly Moshe Weinfeld, and his articles therefore represent a good starting point for this fresh analysis. Indeed, a mere glance at the titles of these scholarly papers and at their summaries and conclusions, some published before I completed the research for my volume and others at a later date, would seem to justify a conclusion that goes significantly beyond what I was then prepared to venture, and therefore to call for a more definitive acknowledgement of the Qumran corpus as the source and precedent for rabbinic liturgy. Weinfeld devotes considerable attention to such liturgical topics as the *Qedushah*, *Amidah*, *Birkat Hamazon* and morning benedictions, closely examining the relevant texts in both Qumranic and rabbinic literature and dealing with terminology, content and overall context. He identifies many individual words, in both verbal and nominal forms, and numerous short phrases that the two literatures have in common. He also finds similar theological themes such as creation and calendar, the closeness of the supplicant to God, and the removal of satanic power. He locates parallel uses of verses and of sections

[9] Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer*, 49–50 and 66.

of the Psalms, and he points to a number of instances in which links are made between the same two or three topics. For example, *Qedushah*, morning light and angels are found in close proximity in both sets of sources, as are repentance, knowledge of God and forgiveness. Another possible parallel obtains between sets of texts which link the joy of a wedding with the comforting of a mourner.[10]

From the point of view of subject matter, there can be no denying that there are similar theological themes, that one can point to parallel tendencies to deal with clusters of topics in contexts that are not dissimilar, and that the language used has its common factors. A number of criteria do, however, combine to call into question whether these basic similarities suffice to indicate that rabbinic liturgy is directly borrowed from Qumran. The precise word-order, the complete phraseology, and the syntax are by no means parallel, and there are differences between the two corpora in the liturgical use made of the language. The topics covered and the links made are among those that constituted the stuff of contemporary religious thinking and may therefore be theologically rather than liturgically meaningful. Many of the parallels have common precedents in the books of the Hebrew Bible, and this is not always clarified. In addition, Weinfeld permits himself to use rabbinic material in a chronologically indiscriminate manner, citing sources that range over many centuries and numerous communities, rather than limiting himself to items that may with some confidence be dated to the early Christian centuries.[11] It is true that, in the case of certain liturgical texts, limited

---

[10] M. Weinfeld, "Traces of *Qedushat Yozer* and *Pesukey De-Zimra* in the Qumran literature and in Ben-Sira," *Tarbiz* 45 (1975–76): 15–26 (Hebrew); "The Prayers for Knowledge, Repentance and Forgiveness in the 'Eighteen Benedictions'—Qumran Parallels, Biblical Antecedents and Basic Characteristics," *Tarbiz* 48 (1979): 186–200 (Hebrew); "On the Question of Morning Benedictions at Qumran," *Tarbiz* 51 (1982): 495–96 (Hebrew); "Grace after Meals at the Mourner's House in a Text from Qumran," *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 15–23 (Hebrew); "Grace after Meals in Qumran," *JBL* 111 (1992): 427–40; "Prayer and Liturgical Practice in the Qumran Sect," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 241–58; "The Angelic Song over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–90* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 131–57.

[11] In his article "Traces," for instance, he cites halakhic, liturgical, poetic and midrashic sources, all of which are many centuries later than Qumran in their literary form, without demonstrating why he regards them as incorporating earlier material; see nn. 7, 10, 22, 25, 55, 62 and 67 in that article.

linguistic and thematic similarities will be acceptable even to those who are more sceptical about their overall significance for making direct links between Qumran and the rabbinic synagogue and academy. The instance of the claimed parallel between 4Q434[a] and the post-prandial grace recited at the home of the mourner in the rabbinic tradition is, however, to all intents and purposes, somewhat speculative and far from convincing.[12]

Weinfeld's arguments in connection with that Qumran fragment, and indeed with regard to 4Q37 (4QDeut[j]) and 4Q41 (4QDeut[n]), led me to consider whether the use of current computer-based searches might not establish linguistic similarities that could conceivably strengthen his position. I therefore began to make use of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, edited by Timothy Lim, to comb the available Qumran sources for direct parallels to rabbinic texts, paying particular attention to the *Grace after Meals*.[13] To date, I have searched only for the major vocabulary and content that are characteristic of limited sections of the *Birkat Hamazon* in its various textual witnesses, but the results nevertheless seem worthy of consideration. Given the limited context here, I have been able to include only a few illustrations. In 4Q504, for example, we encounter notions such as the divine love of Israel, the election of Jerusalem, the special status of Zion, the uniqueness of the Davidic kingdom, God's great name, and the removal of satanic and evil power.[14] The roots אכל, שבע and ברך coincide in 4Q370, references to the exodus from Egypt and the feeding (כלכל) of the Jewish people occur in 4Q393, and the notion of a shortage of food, by way of the use of the verb חסר and the noun לחם is to be found in 4Q416–17.[15] The writer in

---

[12] In his articles on the *Grace after Meals* (see n. 10 above), for instance, Weinfeld has again correctly pointed to a number of similar themes, but he has neither taken sufficient account of the influence of biblical precedents nor justified the presupposition of so precise a liturgical context for these Qumranic fragments; see also n. 33 below for a reference to Falk's assessment of these similarities.

[13] *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* (ed. T. Lim, in consultation with P. Alexander; 3 disks; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press; Leiden: Brill; 1997). This was available to me at the library of Tyndale House in Cambridge and I welcome this opportunity of recording my gratitude to the President, Dr. Bruce Winter, and to the library staff there for their many kindnesses.

[14] For 4Q504 (4QDibHam[a]), see M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 137–68, and F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–98), 2:1009–19.

[15] For 4Q370 (*Admonition Based on the Flood*), 1:1–2, see C. Newsom's edition, in

4Q504 takes pride in the fact that his group is "called by God's name" and that same divine name is described as "the great name" in a number of Qumranic contexts.[16] If we move beyond the vocabulary and content of the *Grace*, we may note another interesting example. The Davidic occupation of the royal throne is described as eternal in 4Q252, echoing Deut 17:18 and 1 Kgs 2:45, as well as Dan 2:44 and 7:14, and finding a parallel in the third post-*haftarah* benediction dealing with the messianic age.[17]

The manner in which these and similar citations are reminiscent of rabbinic texts is undoubtedly intriguing, but we must be careful not to draw conclusions that go beyond the evidence before us. There are similar concepts and linguistic usages here, but there is very little that is actually identical, and the order of the phraseology and the syntactical structure are by no means parallel. The standardised phrasing and contexts of the rabbinic formulations appear to have no clear-cut precedents at Qumran. Both sets of texts have biblical precedents but they utilise these precedents in different ways, each opting for the kind of adjustments that take account of its own predilections. With regard to Israel, Jerusalem and the Temple, the religious groups that lie behind the various textual constructions have a variety of theological motivations for their preferences. One may even tentatively suggest that divine attributes such as טוב, חסד and רחמים are regarded at Qumran as the models for human piety and

---

Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2 (ed. M. Broshi et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 85–97; and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2:733. For 4Q393 (*Communal Confession, olim Liturgical Work*), see *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, (ed. B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg; 4 vols.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991–1996), 3:267. For 4Q416–17 (*Instruction*$^{b-c}$) 1 ii 23–24, see the same *Preliminary Edition*, 2:54–76; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 2:847–61; and J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, S.J., and T. Elgvin, eds., in consultation with J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Musar le-Mevin): 4Q415ff.* (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 73–210.

[16] See n. 14 above and 1QM (*War Scroll*) 11:2: E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1955), 1–19; and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1:113–45, especially 131.

[17] For 4Q252 (4QCommGenA) 5:1–4, see G. Brooke's edition, in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G. Brooke et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 185–207; and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1:501–505; see also the *haftarah* references in S. Baer, *Seder ʿAvodat Yisraʾel* (Rödelheim: J. Lehrberger, 1868), 227, and A. L. Gordon, *ʾOṣar Ha-Tefillot* (Wilna: Romm, 1914), 701–702.

idealistic behaviour while the stress in the rabbinic texts is more on the blessings these attributes convey upon Israel.[18]

At this point it is necessary to refer to comparative linguistic analyses of the texts from Qumran and from rabbinic sources and to assess the degree to which this type of analysis is relevant to the current discussion. Chaim Rabin published his analysis of Qumran Hebrew in English in 1965; its Hebrew version appeared in 1972. Rabin's reputation was such that his study is still often cited, and it has without question exercised a formative influence on subsequent approaches to the subject.[19] Rabin argued for the existence in Second Temple Palestine of "a literary language in which BH and MH elements coexisted upon a mainly MH grammatical foundation."[20] He suggested reasons why the authors of the texts found at Qumran consciously chose to move in the direction of a BH style while their later rabbinic counterparts reacted to this and related developments by committing themselves even more enthusiastically to the MH flavour of their own linguistic usage. For our purposes here, it is important to deal not so much with his overall linguistic theory as with what he has to say about the liturgical field. Adopting the view, particularly as earlier expressed by Talmon,[21] that the Qumran sect was familiar with the benedictions of the *Shema* and the *Amidah* "in a sequence not unlike that of the rabbinic version," Rabin concluded that "any-

---

[18] See the examples of such usage in 4Q266 (4QD[a]) 2 i 12 and 22, with text in García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1:582; 4Q521 (*Messianic Apocalypse*) 2 ii 11, *Study Edition*, 2:1044; 1QS (*Rule of the Community*) 4:3, *Study Edition*, 1:77; 1QH[a] (*Hodayot*[a]) 18:16 (= Sukenik X+frg. 30), *Study Edition* 1:186. See also these probably non-Qumranic texts: 4Q418 (*Instruction*[d]) 81 19, *Study Edition*, 2:872; 4Q504 (4QDibHam[a]) 4 5, *Study Edition*, 2:1010; 4Q506 (4QpapDibHam[c]) 131–32 11, *Study Edition*, 2:1020. For the corresponding rabbinic texts that I have compared, see Finkelstein, "The Birkat Ha-Mazon."

[19] C. Rabin, "The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew," in *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1965): 144–61, with a later Hebrew version published in *Kovetz Ma'amarim bi-Leshon Ḥazal* (ed. M. Bar-Asher; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, Faculty of Humanities, 1972), 355–82.

[20] "Historical Background," 156.

[21] S. Talmon, "The Order of Prayers of the Sect from the Judaean Desert," *Tarbiz* 29 (1959): 1–20 (Hebrew); "The 'Manual of Benedictions' of the Sect of the Judaean Desert," *RevQ* 2 (1960): 475–500. Talmon's work on this topic is summarized in the essay, "The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in the Light of the Qumran Literature," in his *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* (Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1989), 200–243.

thing characteristic of the prayers is therefore common inheritance of the Qumran Sect and of Pharisaism."[22]

At first glance, this conclusion appears to be at odds with our findings as described above and to require either a reconsideration of these or a challenge to the kind of view espoused by Rabin. A closer examination of his article does, however, reveal that he makes a number of additional points that indicate that he was proposing a more refined assessment of the situation. He alludes to the fact that the "common inheritance" appears to have included a store of expressions and some similar vocabulary, but he is at the same time cautious enough to disclaim any possibility of recovering the original linguistic form of such prayers. The Qumran texts adapted whatever they inherited with a view to matching it to their own style; the Rabbis remained loyal to an idiom of MH that was exclusively used for their prayers but fixed the precise textual formulation of the latter only in the post-talmudic period.[23] It is therefore clear that Rabin, even from the limited texts available to him thirty years ago, tended toward the view that commonality of subjects and vocabulary is not to be confused with identity of liturgical context, order and formulation.

The findings of another, later article of his are also worthy of consideration in the present context. There he argues that a better understanding of Jewish liturgical history is to be achieved by adopting aspects of the structuralist approach, by stressing synchronic as well as diachronic analysis, and by pointing to the legal and theological elements in the language of the prayers. What he presupposes is a long and complicated development of liturgical language from a format that may well have been originally oral, through a process of literary improvement and linguistic selection, towards the establishment of independent parameters, and towards a status that could even ultimately exercise a formative influence on the emergence of contemporary, spoken Hebrew.[24] Such views are by no means at odds with the notion that what had been liturgically expressed in

---

[22] Rabin, "Historical Background," 153.

[23] Rabin, "Historical Background," 153–56.

[24] C. Rabin, "The Linguistic Investigation of the Language of Jewish Prayer," in *Studies in Aggadah, Targum and Jewish Liturgy in Memory of Joseph Heinemann* (ed. J. J. Petuchowski and E. Fleischer; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1981), Hebrew section, 163–71.

varieties of language, structure and context in Second Temple times came to be formulated and utilised in a generally more standardised fashion in what became the authorised rabbinic traditions of subsequent periods.

No less relevant to this discussion are the views of Avi Hurvitz, a more contemporary specialist in the history of the Hebrew language in the Second Temple period. In a helpful overview of developments, Hurvitz has defined the language of the Qumran scrolls as a form of late biblical Hebrew and has drawn attention to the biblical elements in the Hebrew of rabbinic prayer. He has also contrasted the spontaneous and classical nature of the language used for prayer in the First Temple period with its later formulation, as, for instance, recorded in the book of Ezra, and he has noted linguistic developments in the direction of rabbinic compositions, as well as similarities between rabbinic and Qumranic usages. At the same time, however, he has pointed to the possibility that the commitment to biblical Hebrew may have been the result of a conscious mimicry and, even more significantly for the topic here being considered, has stressed that it is the roots of rabbinic liturgy that one can find in the Second Temple period and not the precise formulation of its actual prayers.[25]

Recognising the fact that my own perspective is firmly fixed in the historical study of rabbinic sources rather than in the literary analysis of the Judean scrolls, I am aware of the need to turn now to the work of a selection of current Qumran specialists and to factor into the equation how they have recently come to view the overall liturgical history of the Second Temple period from their own particular outlooks.[26]

---

[25] A. Hurvitz, *The Transition Period: A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and its Implications for the Dating of Psalms* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1972), especially 36–63 (Hebrew). See also E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). The late Shelomo Morag identified prominent grammatical traits in the language of the Dead Sea scrolls that he regarded as representative of an old dialectal variation that was preserved in a spoken (*not* literary) Hebrew of the Qumran period and was not directly related to biblical Hebrew. He did not, however, make any reference to the relationship between Qumran Hebrew and the language of rabbinic prayer. See his article, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," *VT* 38 (1988): 148–64.

[26] Among the earlier studies that laid the foundations for the later research discussed in more detail below were D. Flusser, "Psalms, Hymns and Prayers," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M. E. Stone; CRINT 2:2; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadel-

Bilhah Nitzan's study, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, appeared in English in 1994.[27] In that important and extensive treatment of the subject, Nitzan devoted some of the discussion to the relationship between Qumranic and rabbinic prayer. Although both are dependent on the same biblical sources, they each demonstrate unique characteristics. Blessings and prayers occur in both sets of texts but in each case with distinctive formulas. Although the two bodies of texts do share some ideas, it would be exaggerated to claim close and precise parallels of pattern. The priestly benediction has a much more central role in the arrangement of poetic and ceremonial compositions at Qumran, while the structure and use of the *Qedushah* is considerably less crystallised there than among the Rabbis. Among other specific features of the Judean scrolls, they supplement biblical content with apocalyptic material, they reformulate apocalyptic myths in the biblical style, and they express the sanctity of the Sabbath by the use of ritual poetry, specifically suited to that day and of a more elevated style than the weekday prose. What emerges from all this data is that both groups may be said to have fixed liturgy, but only the rabbinic variety is of a fully uniform nature. The Qumranic use of benedictions is not, therefore, to be seen as a precedent for the later rabbinic employment of this genre. More accurately, the liturgical developments at Qumran should be plotted at a point between the biblical beginning and the rabbinic succession that is close to the position occupied by the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature.[28]

---

phia: Fortress, 1984), 551–77; J. H. Charlesworth, "Jewish Hymns, Odes and Prayers (*c.* 167 BCE–135 CE)," in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (ed. R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 411–36; C. A. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), and "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman; Biblical and Judaic Studies 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns; 1990), 167–87; L. H. Schiffman, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy," in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (ed. L. I. Levine; Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987), 33–48; J. Maier, "Zu Kult und Liturgie der Qumrangemeinde," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 543–86.

[27] B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (tr. J. Chipman; STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994); published in Hebrew as *Tefillat Qumran Ve-Shiratah* (Biblical Encyclopedia Library 14; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University, 1996). Both publications were based on Nitzan's doctoral dissertation, "*Tefillat Qumran ve-Shiratah be-Ziqatan la-Miqra*" (Tel Aviv University, 1989).

[28] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, especially 13, 20–22, 31, 75–80, 111–16, 170–71, 200,

Some attention must also be given to the conclusions reached in studies recently penned by Eileen Schuller and Esther Chazon on the place of the Qumranic liturgical texts in the search for the origins of rabbinic prayer. Schuller has made it clear that the non-canonical psalms enjoyed a provenance that was both earlier and broader than that of Qumran, and that these psalms may well have been employed for liturgical purposes. She has demonstrated that although they make use of the more common biblical precedents in the formulation of the terms with which they describe themselves, they also contribute innovative developments to this whole process. Her analysis of the *Hodayot* has revealed that these hymns, more specifically, reflect the experiences and teachings of the Qumranic sect and exist in a variety of collections. Schuller has pointed to elements of Aramaic influence, and to words and expressions in the non-canonical psalms that have their equivalents in other Hebrew texts of the late Second Temple and early post-Destruction periods. She has also provided clear evidence that formulations and concepts known in tannaitic Judaism and early Christianity are already adumbrated in such psalms as that found in 4Q372 1, and she has stressed the importance of the Qumran scrolls for plotting the development of the use and formulation of the Jewish liturgical benediction.[29]

Perhaps the most important of Esther Chazon's many findings and conclusions is her overall assessment that although there are some sectarian liturgical elements at Qumran, a wealth of evidence now

---

225–26, 272, 317–18, 358 and 368; see also the review of Nitzan's volume by E. G. Chazon in *DSD* 2 (1995): 361–65.

[29] E. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); "Some Observations on Blessings of God," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. H. W. Attridge, J. J. Collins and T. H. Tobin; Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990), 133–43; "The Psalm of 4Q372 1 within the Context of Second Temple Prayer," *CBQ* 54 (1992): 67–79; "Prayer, Hymnic and Liturgical Texts from Qumran," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 153–71; "The Cave Four Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description," *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–50; "The Use of Biblical Terms as Designations for Non-Biblical Hymnic and Prayer Compositions," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 May, 1998* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 207–22.

indicates that many of the hymns and prayers found there represent the religious activities of the "common Judaism" of the Second Temple period. Although more work has to be done on explaining such phenomena as the occurrence of different prayers for the same occasion, it can no longer be doubted (even if she and others had some earlier hesitations) that communal prayer at fixed times predated the Rabbis of the Mishnah and that the content, language, form and function of rabbinic prayer cannot justifiably be regarded as totally innovative.[30] As Chazon herself puts it, daily prayers such as those found in 4Q503 and 4Q408 "were said by different Jewish groups in the late Second Temple period and were considered important enough to be incorporated into the liturgy that was institutionalized by the Rabbis in the aftermath of the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE."[31]

In his contribution to the third volume of the *Cambridge History of Judaism*, Daniel Falk has covered the topic of "Prayer in the Qumran Texts" and has expressed some cautious views concerning the historical link of Qumran prayer with rabbinic liturgy. He places the origins of Qumranic prayer texts in a variety of provenances, including the Temple, the priesthood, the levitical groups and the *maʿamadot* and describes how some prayers are linked to the calendar, some to special events, and some to penitential themes. He notes parallels of subject and language with rabbinic texts and identifies some particularly striking similarities between the *Festival Prayers* and the later synagogal liturgy. He is, however, convinced that we are dealing with independent exploitations of the biblical models and not a direct link between Qumran and the talmudic traditions.[32] He

---

[30] E. G. Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications," *DSD* 1 (1994): 265–84; "New Liturgical Manuscripts from Qumran," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, 1993*, Division A (ed. D. Assaf; Jerusalem: ha-Igud ha-ʿolami le-madaʿe ha-Yahadut, 1994), 207–14; with M. J. Bernstein, "An Introduction to Prayer at Qumran," in *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (ed. M. Kiley et al.; London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 9–13; "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:244–70; "The *Qedushah* Liturgy and its History in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *From Qumran to Cairo: Studies in the History of Prayer. Proceedings of the Research Group convened under the auspices of the Institute for Advanced Studies of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997* (ed. J. Tabory; Jerusalem: Orhot, 1999), 7–17.

[31] Chazon, "Hymns and Prayers," p. 257.

[32] D. K. Falk, "Prayer in the Qumran Texts," in *The Early Roman Period* (ed.

consequently rejects Weinfeld's view that the major rabbinic prayers have their prototypes among the Judean scrolls, preferring to argue that "the prayers found at Qumran belong to a broad stream of prayer tradition in which the Rabbis also stood."[33]

Being in the happy position of having more texts and interpretations now available to him, Falk has been able to devote a monograph to a close study of many daily, Sabbath, and festival prayers in the Dead Sea scrolls.[34] He sets out to identify where lines of continuity may be established in the history of Jewish prayer, and whether the traditions represented at Qumran are sectarian or of broader significance. Falk stresses here the importance of recognising that prayer in the Dead Sea scrolls is not a uniform phenomenon but has a variety of forms, functions and socio-liturgical settings that are perhaps being welded together at Qumran. The Temple appears to have stood at the centre of many of these liturgical traditions, which is why they appear in many variant types of Jewish literature emanating from the axial age. Jewish, and indeed Christian, institutionalised prayer had its origins, not directly in the Qumranic context, but in the "attraction of prayer to the Temple cult, rather than the need to provide a replacement for the sacrificial system."[35]

It remains only to offer a few brief conclusions for students of rabbinic liturgy who are anxious to know what relevant lessons may be learned from recent Qumran studies for their own historical reconstructions:

1. There is, in the broad context of Second Temple Judaism, clear evidence for the existence, at least among some groups, of a practice of reciting regular prayers at specific times, but there is no obvious consistency of text and context for these prayers.
2. Written texts from Qumran record such prayers, and they have elements in common with the rabbinic liturgy of the second Christian century. This by no means rules out the possibility that

---

W. Horbury, W. D. Davies and J. Sturdy; vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 852–76.

[33] Falk, "Prayer," 871.

[34] D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

[35] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers*, 254.

oral liturgical traditions also existed during that period, nor does it imply that early rabbinic prayer moved totally from orality to wholly fixed texts.

3. In various religious spheres, the Jews at Qumran and the Rabbis sometimes express themselves uniquely while at other times they follow well-established precedents. As far as liturgy is concerned, rabbinic prayer incorporates material broadly known to us from Qumran but imposes upon it a fresh order, style and distinctive formulation. This innovative aspect reflects the traditions of tannaitic Judaism and its own approach to the Hebrew language and to the biblical canon. The later development of rabbinic prayer also has dynamic characteristics and caution must be exercised in using post-talmudic and geonic texts for the reconstruction of earlier trends.
4. The breadth of the liturgical material found at Qumran clearly indicates that there was more than one provenance for the development of hymns and prayers during the Second Temple period. It is therefore likely that the Rabbis borrowed, directly or indirectly, from various contexts, among them the Temple, the priesthood, communal gatherings such as the *maʿamadot*, pietistic and mystical circles, and popular practice.[36]

If we are then to answer the question raised earlier in the context of the Finkelstein-Heinemann-Fleischer debate about the existence of standard liturgy, we may conclude that there was no standard set of common compositions widely employed by Jewry. There were, however, at the same time, texts that were undoubtedly used in certain Jewish circles as standard liturgy for specific occasions.

---

[36] See P. Schäfer, *Geniza-fragmente zur Hekhalot Literatur* (TSAJ 6; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1984); M. Bar-Ilan. *The Mysteries of Jewish Prayer and Hekhalot* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1987 [Hebrew]); M. D. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of* Maʿaseh Merkavah (TSAJ 28; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992); and R. Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines: Prayer and Sacred Liturgy in the Hekhalot Literature and its Relation to Temple Traditions," *Tarbiz* 64 (1995): 341–80 (Hebrew). I now welcome the opportunity, at the sub-editorial stage, of noting the publication of J. R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

This page intentionally left blank

COMMUNAL PRAYER AT QUMRAN AND AMONG THE RABBIS: CERTAINTIES AND UNCERTAINTIES

Richard S. Sarason
Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati

After more than half a century of scholarly inquiry, the Dead Sea scrolls remain a uniquely valuable and problematic corpus of literary evidence testifying to the nature and range of Judaic world-views and social systems in the late Hellenistic and Greco-Roman periods. They are unique in comprising our only first-hand, contemporary literary evidence from Greco-Roman Palestine.[1] They are problematic to the extent that they generate new historical questions and require us to reframe and refine older ones, but in many cases do not allow us to pose definitive answers to either.[2] This paper deals with the implications of this observation for the question of the existence and diffusion of regular, communal prayer among Jews in the Land of Israel before and after 70 CE, and the uses of both the Qumran and early rabbinic evidence, in particular, to address this question.[3] Methodologically speaking, we focus attention on what can

[1] We refer here, of course, not only to the scrolls from Khirbet Qumran, but also to the texts discovered since 1947 throughout the Dead Sea/Judean Desert region, at Masada, Wadi Murabaʿat, Naḥal Ḥever, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ṣeʾelim (Seiyal), Naḥal Mishmar, Wadi Ghweir, Wadi en-Nar, Wadi ed-Daliyeh, and Khirbet Mird. Our discussion, however, focuses on the scrolls from Qumran.

[2] Cf., for example, the recent remarks of S. Talmon, "The 'Dead Sea Scrolls' or 'The Community of the Renewed Covenant'?" in *The Echoes of Many Texts: Reflections on Jewish and Christian Traditions. Essays in Honor of Lou H. Silberman* (ed. W. G. Dever and J. E. Wright; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 144–45: "The widely entertained expectation that the scrolls, the only contemporary evidence from the turn of the era, would shed new light on historical events that then affected Judaism as a whole, did not materialize. The various attempts to identify the *yaḥad* with a specific faction in Judaism of that dark age of documentation, previously known from retrospective classical sources, has not produced satisfactory results. A shift of emphasis is needed."

[3] An extensive bibliography of both primary and secondary sources on the subject of Qumran prayer and prayer texts, and their wider implications, may be found in D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 266–83. Recent overviews may be found in E. G. Chazon,

be known with certainty from the evidence and what remains speculative, with greater or lesser degrees of probability. In thus framing the issue of the security of our historical knowledge, I do not mean to advocate a thoroughgoing Cartesian skepticism—but given the problematic nature of the evidence, with its multiplicity of often contradictory voices, I merely wish to underscore the extent to which our conclusions must be qualified. Speculation, however warranted, must be clearly labeled as such and not be allowed to slip into the realm of the demonstrated.

The Qumran evidence contributes powerfully to our impression of late Second Commonwealth Jewish religious culture as rich, complex, multivocal, and fractious.[4] Under these circumstances, without adequate corroboration we cannot speak innocently about Jewish communal prayer as a generalized, undifferentiated phenomenon, but must always be cognizant of the social, and even geographical, location of our surviving evidence. I will argue later that both the literary and archaeological evidence make this observation equally applicable to the post-70 period.

Ezra Fleischer has argued forcefully, on the basis of the entire corpus of evidence, that regular, obligatory communal prayer did not exist as a generalized phenomenon among Jews in the Land of Israel before 70 CE.[5] Phrased in this way, his claim is certainly cor-

---

"Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–99), 1.244–70; D. K. Falk, "Prayer in the Qumran Texts," in *The Early Roman Period* (ed. W. Horbury, W. D. Davies and J. Sturdy; vol. 3 of *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 852–76; E. M. Schuller, "Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts from Qumran," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 153–71; and J. R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000). See also the articles, "Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers," and "Words of the Luminaries" (both by E. G. Chazon), and "Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice" (by C. G. Newsom), in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:710–15, 989–90, 887–89.

[4] For a suggestive interpretation of this multivocality and its social implications, see A. I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

[5] E. Fleischer, "On the Beginnings of Obligatory Hebrew Prayer," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 397–441 (Hebrew); "The *Shemone Esre*: Its Character, Internal Order, Content and Goals," *Tarbiz* 62 (1993): 179–223 (Hebrew); "Reply to Stefan Reif," *Tarbiz*

rect. A weaker formulation would ask whether regular communal prayer was, perhaps, customary in some form at some synagogue gatherings on the Sabbath. Fleischer acknowledges the possibility of secondary, ritual elaborations of the primary activities of Torah reading and study that took place on these occasions, but nothing more than this.[6] The courtyards of the Jerusalem Temple during the same period were the locus for regular, individual prayer at the time of the sacrifices, but not for regular communal prayer (though, I would note, occasional communal liturgies such as *hosha'not* litanies for Sukkot might have developed there).[7] This same basic reading of the evidence has been put forward by Lee Levine[8] and Stefan Reif,[9] and—despite recent demurrals from Pieter van der Horst[10] and Donald

---

60 (1991): 683–88 (Hebrew); and "On the Origins of the *'Amidah*: Response to Ruth Langer," *Prooftexts* 20 (2000): 380–84. For reactions to Fleischer's article, see S. Reif, "Response to Ezra Fleischer's Article," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 677–81 (Hebrew); R. Kimelman, "The Literary Structure of the Amidah and the Rhetoric of Redemption," in Dever and Wright, *Echoes of Many Texts*, 171–218; R. Langer, "Revisiting Early Rabbinic Liturgy: The Recent Contributions of Ezra Fleischer," *Prooftexts* 19 (1999): 179–204, and "Considerations of Method: A Response to Ezra Fleischer," *Prooftexts* 20 (2000): 384–87; L. I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 153–59; and note the remarks of J. Tabory, "Introduction," in *From Qumran to Cairo: Studies in the History of Jewish Prayer* (ed. J. Tabory; Jerusalem: Orhot, 1999), English section, 6.

[6] Fleischer, "On the Beginnings," 412–13.

[7] Ibid., 416–17, 420, n. 51. Cf. J. Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (Studia Judaica 9; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), 123–55. Note the surmise of S. Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 85, that *hosha'not* and similar litanies might have been "introduced into the Temple in the first place under the pressure of the populace for recitations to be attached to the cultic service." This remains speculative.

[8] L. I. Levine, "The Second Temple Synagogue: The Formative Years," in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (ed. L. I. Levine; Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1984), 7–32, esp. 19–22; "The Nature and Origin of the Palestinian Synagogue Reconsidered," *JBL* 115 (1996): 425–48, esp. 431–32, 444–45; "The Development of Synagogue Liturgy in Late Antiquity," in *Galilee Through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures* (ed. E. M. Meyers; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 123–44, esp. 128–29. Levine's most extensive, and most nuanced, consideration of this issue is *The Ancient Synagogue*, 151–59. Both Levine and Fleischer point out that the first scholar forcefully to articulate this position was S. Zeitlin, "The Tefillah, the Shemoneh Esreh: An Historical Study of the First Canonization of the Hebrew Liturgy," *JQR* 54 (1964): 208–49 (= Zeitlin, *Studies in the Early History of Judaism* [4 vols.; New York: Ktav, 1973–78], 1.92–133).

[9] Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer*, 53–87.

[10] P. W. van der Horst, "Was the Synagogue a Place of Sabbath Worship before 70 CE?" in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period* (ed. S. Fine; London: Routledge, 1999), 18–43.

Binder[11]—I believe it is fundamentally sound. While essentially an argument from silence, in this case the silence of the sources is indeed deafening.

In the same vein, both Fleischer and Reif remark on the manner in which Josephus and Philo describe communal sunrise prayer among the Essenes and Therapeutae as if it were something unique, ethnographically exotic, and different from common practice.[12] The impression gleaned is that daily group prayer at fixed times determined by the course of the sun is a 'sectarian' phenomenon, in the broad sense of that word, the practice of pietist groups. This, obviously, is the context in which to locate the evidence for regular communal prayer and liturgies at Qumran. The purposes and functions of these activities are to be sought in the larger world-view of the group.

I wish to examine now what we know and do not know about communal prayer at Qumran, and what—with due qualifications—we may plausibly surmise. First, addressing the larger picture, it is clear from the sources that communal prayer at Qumran serves a cultic function, as a substitute for sacrifices (1QS 9:5).[13] Like the sacrifices, it also acts as a vehicle for effecting communal atonement, together with the other communal activities of the group. (I shall argue below, however, that these are not its sole functions.) The *Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat* liturgy enacts the community's conviction of their proximity to divine beings and their sense that they can participate in, or, minimally,

---

[11] D. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (SBLDS 169; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 404–15.

[12] Fleischer, "On the Beginnings," 19; Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer*, 47, 51. Fleischer conceptualizes Philo's Therapeutae and Josephus' Essenes as groups that separated themselves from the Temple (like the Qumran community) and, for this reason, developed communal prayer as a necessary alternative form of public liturgy.

[13] See, e.g., S. Talmon, "The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in Light of Qumran Literature," in his *The World of Qumran From Within: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 200–243. See also the reconsideration of this argument by D. K. Falk, "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 106–26. Falk suggests that, rather than (or in addition to) substituting for Temple sacrifices, communal prayer at Qumran would have served as a token of the Temple service, modeled on the piety of the individual private prayers that had been offered up "with the incense" in the Temple courtyard at the time of the sacrifices.

contemplate, the angelic liturgy and offerings in the heavenly Temple at the appropriate time on the Sabbath.[14] The various periodic liturgies that are to be performed at precise times according to the cosmic calendar as understood by the group—and to which we shall return in more detail presently—ritually enact and maintain the cosmic order, just as, in principle, did the sacrifices in the Temple.[15] It is noteworthy in this regard (and not surprising) that the liturgical times in the various Qumran texts correspond to the times of transition on the cosmic clock as envisioned at Qumran, rather than the times of the sacrifices in the metaphysically flawed Jerusalem Temple.[16] Finally, the daily penitential liturgy represented in *Dibre Hame'orot*, by virtue of its genre, would seem to function at Qumran as part of the activity of communal atonement.[17] As Rodney Alan Werline has recently suggested, penitential prayer at Qumran, including that found in *Dibre Hame'orot*, may also relate to the community's eschatological sensibilities and express their perception of urgent ongoing crisis, to which ongoing communal penitence is deemed the proper

---

[14] See the discussions of C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 17–21, 59–72, and "'He Has Established for Himself Priests': Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Sabbath *Shirot*," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 114–18 (and see below, n. 72); B. Nitzan, "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings from Qumran," *JQR* 85 (1994): 163–83, esp. 176–83, with the response of E. R. Wolfson, "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran," *JQR* 85 (1994): 185–202; and E. G. Chazon's article in this volume, "Human and Angelic Prayer in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 35–47."

[15] See on this topic E. G. Chazon, "When Did They Pray?: Times for Prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature," in *For A Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (ed. R. A. Argall, B. A. Bow, and R. A. Werline; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 42–51, and the literature cited there. See also F. H. Gorman, Jr., *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology* (JSOTSup 91; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 218–21. On a more primal understanding, the times of the daily *tamid*-offerings in the Temple would correspond simply to the regular daily mealtimes for the Deity and his worshippers. See, for example, M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 205–29, esp. 221–24.

[16] See, for example, the discussion of Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 47–50.

[17] See E. G. Chazon, "A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications: 'Words of the Luminaries' (4QDibHam)" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991), 69–80, 115 (Hebrew).

response.[18] Just as the communal liturgies are varied, so would be their purposes.

Indeed, the considerable variation among the Qumran periodic liturgies as well as the differences between the liturgical texts, on the one hand, and the descriptions of communal prayer times and activities in diverse Qumran texts, on the other, has led to the question of whether this is in fact a unified liturgical corpus at all.[19] Do the different texts and liturgies reflect different moments in the history of the Qumran community, including its pre-history? Were they all used in the same period? Are the texts and liturgies to be harmonized with each other or read discretely? Must we distinguish between the social locations of their use and of their origins? And if some of the liturgies should turn out to be pre-Qumranic or non-Qumranic in their origins, what does that imply about the social location of regular communal prayer before 70?[20] These are all crucial questions, which must be raised, but to which we likely can give no definitive answers.

Within this general framework, let me review some of the evidence and modestly attempt to advance our discussions:

(1) The periodic liturgies at Qumran are intimately bound to, and dramatically enact, that community's calendar. The cycles are diurnal, weekly, monthly, and annual-seasonal (including the division of the year into four quarters). The evidence regarding the diurnal cycle is not uniform. On the one hand, *4QDaily Prayers* gives us liturgies that are to be recited at sunrise and sunset on each day of a month, and which notably mark the phases of the moon.[21] It is the only

---

[18] R. A. Werline, *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (Early Judaism and its Literature 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), esp. 109–59, 194–95.

[19] See, e.g., Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 93 and passim.

[20] This last question has been raised with particular force by Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 115–16, and "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications," *DSD* 1 (1994): 265–84.

[21] See the discussions of J. Baumgarten, "4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 399–407; and M. G. Abegg, Jr., "Does Anyone Really Know What Time It Is?: A Reexamination of 4Q503 in Light of 4Q317," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Texts, Reformulated Issues, and Technological Innovations* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 396–406. See also the discussions of 4Q408 by A. Steudel, "4Q408: A Liturgy on Morning and Evening Prayer, Preliminary Edition," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 313–34; and Chazon, "When Did They Pray?" 46, and "The Function of the Qumran

Qumran liturgical text to specify the precise time for its recitation according to a diurnal clock. On the other hand, the so-called "Hymn on Occasions for Prayer" appended at 1QS 10:1–3, and a close parallel at 1QH^a 20:7–10 (Sukenik 12:4–7), list the diurnal times for prayer in a difficult style that has been construed variously as referring to six times in a twenty-four hour period (Talmon)[22] or to two (Schiffman, Nitzan, and Chazon).[23] Both Schiffman and Nitzan were influenced by the evidence of *4QDaily Prayers* in their interpretation of the hymns, and effectively harmonized the two sets of texts. But I think that an innocent reading of the passages in the two hymns favors Talmon's interpretation, and that the word תקופה refers to a separate period between the two extremes of beginning and end.[24]

Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 225.

[22] See the discussion of Talmon, "Emergence," 214–20, and Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 97, n. 59.

[23] So L. H. Schiffman, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy," in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, 33–48, esp. 35–40; B. Nitzan, "Fixed Prayer at Qumran and in Judaism," in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A: The Bible and Its World* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990), 111–18 (Hebrew), esp. 112 and n. 18 there; and Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 52–57. See also Chazon, "When Did They Pray?" 44.

[24] My colleague at HUC-JIR, Stephen A. Kaufman, whose expertise in Semitic languages and texts I esteem highly, concurs in this reading: "I don't see how the passage of 1QS can be understood in any other way than as [referring to] three times during the light and three times during darkness" (personal communication). In conversation after this paper was delivered at the Orion Center Symposium, Moshe Bernstein, of Yeshiva University, and Matthew Morgenstern, of Hebrew University, suggested that these passages in 1QS and 1QH^a perhaps might better be construed as rhetorical pleonasms rather than, following Talmon, as detailed calendars. That is to say, instead of spelling out specific prayer times, they should be understood as poetic expressions for praising God at *all* times (the equivalent of the stock phrases, "morning, noon, and night" [Ps 55:18] and, "when you lie down and when you get up" [Deut 6:7, 11:19]). This surely is the rhetorical sense of the whole (see, e.g., J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* [Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965], 204–5 [Hebrew]). However, I am inclined to read the phrases—even in this rhetorical context—as reflecting literal ritualizations (either practiced or exhorted), if only because of the tendency in late Second Commonwealth pietist literatures to literalize and ritualize scriptural metaphors (such as the treatment of Deut 6:4–9 reflected variously in Josephus [*Ant.* 4:212–13], early rabbinic literature, and at Qumran [indicated by the presence of *tefillin* and *mezuzot*]). This is admittedly an argument from broad cultural context and *mentalité*, by no means probative. But the terminology and rhetoric of 1QS 10:1–8 also suggest to me a more literal reading, beginning with the opening phrase, יברכנו עם קצים אש{ה}ר (חקק אל) חקקא, "he shall praise Him coincident with (עם) the fixed periods that

This interpretation would also accord with the division of the night into three parts in 1QS 6:6–8, where the 'Many' are required to stand watch for a third of every night, studying, expounding, and reciting benedictions. The evidence and vocabulary from *Serekh ha-Yaḥad* and the *Hodayot* are consistent. These two documents, of course, routinely are used to characterize what is uniquely sectarian in the Qumran corpus. This does not *ipso facto* mean that *4QDaily Prayers* originated outside of Qumran. Daniel Falk presents a plausible—though admittedly tentative—case, on stylistic grounds, for Qumran (i.e., *Yaḥad*) origin.[25] We may be witness here to diversity in the development of the community's practices; conversely, there may be no implied conflict at all between these two sets of texts, and we should understand *4QDaily Prayers* as simply a specialized liturgy for sunrise and sunset. We cannot know.

(2) A number of scholars have seen in 1QS 10:10 a reference to the twice-daily recitation of Deut 6:4–9.[26] The passage is far too brief and general in its language to allow of a definitive interpretation. It certainly indicates that the hymnist devotes himself day and night to the study of God's laws. It is only the presence at Qumran of *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, which derive from a hyper-literalist reading of

---

God has set." Bernstein has discussed the 1QS passage briefly in his treatment of the "Hymn on Occasions for Prayer" that immediately follows it: "Hymn on Occasions for Prayer (1QS 10:8b–17)," in *Prayer From Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (ed. M. Kiley et al.; London: Routledge, 1997), 33–42.

[25] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 22–29, and "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple," 111–13. But see also the discussion of Chazon, "Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts," 218, and n. 7 there.

[26] So already Talmon, "The 'Manual of Benedictions' of the Sect of the Judaean Desert," *RevQ* 2 (1959–60): 489–90 (and, without revision, in "Emergence," 226); M. Weinfeld, "Prayer and Liturgical Practice in the Qumran Sect," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 242–43; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 48, 113–15, and "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple," 115–25. Schiffman, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy," 39, is more cautious. While he views the benedictions in 4Q503 as "an expansion upon a precursor of the first benediction before the *Shema*[,] [w]e do not mean to assert that the passage proves the recitation of the *Shema* at this date." Bernstein, "Hymn on Occasions for Prayer," 36, n. 10, is noncommittal, but in private conversation doubts that 1QS 10:10 proves the recitation of the *Shema* at Qumran. Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran," 276–77, is methodologically cautious about making such determinations: "Proposals of this kind are, by their nature, difficult to prove and open to alternate interpretations. Moreover, caution must be exercised, especially in using external evidence to enhance internal analysis, so that we do not cross the boundary between informing a text and reading into it."

Deut 6:7–8 and 11:18–20, that allows the hypothesis of a similarly derived scriptural recitation to be maintained. In 1QS 10:10, too, it is not clear whether the activity mentioned takes place four times a day or twice a day. I think one could make a good case for literary parallelism here. (Should such parallelism be operative at the beginning of the Hymn, we would still have diurnal blessings recited *four* times in a full cycle, not twice.)

(3) We do not know precisely how these liturgies were recited or joined together. Lawrence Schiffman, commenting on *4QDaily Prayers*, remarks that "the liturgical materials found here are too short to have constituted the entire liturgy. They appear to have represented a small section of the worship service . . ."[27] There is no way to tell. It is noteworthy that each liturgy bears an integrity of its own, both of content and of calendrical function. Esther Chazon and Carol Newsom have stressed the unitary character of the longer liturgical compositions *Dibre Hame'orot* and *Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat*.[28] In both of these works, an extended narrative or description, of a unitary and progressive character, is parsed out among the several recitation-times of the liturgical cycle. The same holds true for the brief diurnal liturgy, *4QDaily Prayers* (better, "Daily Blessings," for that is what these are).[29] Here the brevity of the recitations emphasizes their formulaic content and function as time-markers for praising the divine Creator. Precisely because these various liturgies were written down and preserved as separate compositions in a way that emphasizes the immanent logic of each as a discrete cycle, we have no way of knowing if, or how, they were conjoined. (By analogy, the rabbinic recitation of the *Shema* and the *Amidah* prayer[30] are also separate

---

[27] Schiffman, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy," 39. See also Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 69, and 78, n. 69; and Falk, "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple," 117–25, who constructs a theoretical (and admittedly highly speculative) liturgical sequence of Qumran prayer texts on the basis of 1QS 10:9–14.

[28] Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 33–34, and "*4QDibHam*: Liturgy or Literature?" *RevQ* 15 (1991): 447–55; Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 5–21.

[29] See Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 21–57.

[30] The designation, "*Amidah*" (Standing [Prayer]), for this liturgy, while commonplace today, is an anachronism for late antiquity. The term appears for the first time in *Soferim* 16:9, and becomes standard usage among medieval Iberian Jews. The classical rabbinic designation for the statutory communal prayer is simply "*Hatefillah*" (Aramaic: *Ṣeluta'*), "the Prayer." See I. Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (trans. R. P. Scheindlin; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1993), 24; and I. Jacobson, *Netiv Binah* (5 vols.; Tel Aviv: Sinai, 1964–89), 1:261 (Hebrew).

liturgies, each with its own integrity. An extended rabbinic liturgy only began with their conjunction, sometime in the second or third century, for reasons of convenience.)[31]

In the case of *Dibre Hame'orot*, we do not even know when or how many times during the day the liturgy was recited. There is nothing intrinsic to the content which would indicate this.[32] Esther Chazon's suggestion that the title is an ellipsis for "prayers to be recited at the turning of the luminaries" is plausible;[33] whether this indicates once or twice a day is uncertain.

In the case of *4QDaily Prayers* and *Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat*, the liturgical cycles, while integral in their content, do not extend as far as we would expect. In both of these liturgies, the texts are written out for specific dates. *4QDaily Prayers* gives us a monthly cycle for a single, specific month (either the first or the seventh according to the Qumran solar calendar).[34] What about the remaining months of the year? Is the text intended to be exemplary? Were there other texts for the other monthly patterns?[35] The same issue pertains to *Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat*, which gives us a Sabbath cycle for the first quarter of the year. Was the cycle supposed to be repeated during each of the three other quarters?[36] Were there separate cycles for the other

---

[31] Cf. *t. Ber.* 1:2; *y. Ber.* 1:1 (2d) and 1:2 (3a); *b. Ber.* 9b, 26a, 30a, 42a, on the requirement to juxtapose without any interruption the recitation of *Shema* with the praying of the *Amidah* in the morning and, later, in the evening. See the discussion of R. Langer, *To Worship God Properly: Tensions Between Liturgical Custom and Halakhah in Judaism* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1998), 17; she notes that what began as the pious custom of individuals became normative practice only in the mid-to-late third century.

[32] Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 89–90.

[33] Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 68, and "On the Special Character of Sabbath Prayer: New Data from Qumran," *Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy* 5 (1992–93): 13–14, n. 3.

[34] See Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 49–50. Chazon, "Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts," 219–220, maintains on thematic grounds that the preserved text refers to the first month (Nisan), while Abegg, "Does Anyone Really Know What Time It Is?" 404–406, argues that the Qumran community believed that the moon was created full, so that the referent must be the seventh month (Tishre).

[35] See the discussion of Chazon, "Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts," 217–25, especially 224.

[36] Newsom, "'He Has Established for Himself Priests,'" 102, concludes on the basis of "indirect evidence from the content and literary structure of the text that these thirteen songs were not repeated quarterly to form a yearly cycle but were unique to the first quarter of the year." Her reasoning is elaborated at 109–10. See also Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 19.

quarters (there is no evidence to suggest that), or were there no other recitations during those quarters?[37] We do not know.

As to the mode of recitation, some of the texts themselves give us indicators. The brief, formulaic *Daily Prayers* are to be recited together by the community (as indicated by the repeated instruction, יברכו וענו ואמרו). Here, form and function cohere nicely. In the case of the lengthy penitential prayers in *Dibre Hame'orot*, on the other hand, no speaker is indicated, but each day's prayer concludes with a benedictory formula, followed by 'Amen! Amen!' Chazon plausibly understands this is as a bona fide congregational response, rather than simply a literary-rhetorical formula.[38] One would assume consequently that the prayer was recited or led by an individual. The more lengthy, baroque descriptions of the celestial worship in *Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat* are presumably recited by the *Maskil*, since each song begins with the superscription, למשכיל.[39] There is no communal response (such as 'Amen') indicated at the end of any of the Songs, presumably because none is called for; these are not prayers or blessings uttered by humans, but descriptions of the angelic liturgy.

It is noteworthy that we find at Qumran composed, written liturgies, each with its own literary integrity. This is particularly noticeable with regard to the longer liturgies, *Dibre Hame'orot* and *Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat.* All the liturgies exist in multiple copies; the largest number of copies of any liturgy is nine (the Sabbath *Shirot*, with a tenth copy found at Masada).[40] In the case of the *Festival Prayers*, one of the manuscripts (4Q505 + 509) has other texts written later on the verso, including another copy of *Dibre Hame'orot.*[41] We cannot

---

[37] See Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 19, and "'He Has Established for Himself Priests'"; J. Maier, "*Shire 'Olat hash-Shabbat*: Some Observations on their Calendrical Implications and on their Style," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 2:543–60.

[38] Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 25, 102; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 84–85.

[39] See Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 3–4, 96, and "'He Has Established for Himself Priests,'" 104; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 284–85.

[40] The presence of this text also at Masada allows for the possibility of its non-Qumranic origin. The evidence is not probative, however, since the text could have arrived with a refugee from Qumran; see below, n. 47. Minimally, the discovery of the Masada copy, together with other scrolls, in proximity to the synagogue there suggests the possible *use* of this liturgy outside of Qumran.

[41] See Falk's discussion, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 59–60, 156–62.

know for certain how the written texts were actually used, but we must hold out the possibility that liturgies were recited from written copies; certainly written copies were consulted. Suffice it to say, the presence at Qumran of written liturgies whose wording is fixed says nothing about the issue of original fixity in the wording of rabbinic liturgies after 70, to which we shall return later.

4) Finally, we come to the thorny issue of provenance. The presence of these liturgies at Qumran plausibly suggests that they were used by the community. But were they composed in the community? We cannot know for certain. All of the discussions of this issue are, appropriately, couched in the language of probability. The presence in any text of assured Qumranic sectarian terminology and ideology, or the presence of language that is shared with other assured Qumran texts, is a reasonable tool for determining Qumran provenance. But in the case of texts that do not display any "sectually explicit" language (in Carol Newsom's felicitous phrase),[42] the determination is more difficult. So much the more so is this true for liturgical texts, as both Newsom and Eileen Schuller have pointed out, since such texts tend to use stock language.[43] Daniel Falk has cautiously argued for the Qumran provenance of *4QDaily Prayers* on the basis of shared formal traits with assured Qumran texts.[44] Similar criteria were employed by both Newsom and Falk to suggest the Qumran provenance of *Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat*.[45] Although Newsom subsequently changed her mind,[46] I find Falk's analysis convincing. The presence of a copy of the text at Masada unfortunately is not probative for non-Qumranic origin, since it could have been brought there by refugees from Qumran, as both Yadin and Talmon have argued.[47] The case of *Dibre Hame'orot* is the most difficult. Israel Knohl

---

[42] Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman; Biblical and Judaic Studies 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87.

[43] Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit,'" 175–76; E. Schuller, "Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts," 153–71, esp. 169–70.

[44] See n. 25 above.

[45] Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 1–4; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 126–30.

[46] Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit,'" 182–85.

[47] Y. Yadin, "The Excavations at Masada—1963/64: Preliminary Report," *IEJ* 15 (1965): 105–108; C. Newsom and Y. Yadin, "The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," *IEJ* 34 (1984): 77–88; S. Talmon, "Masada 1045–1350 and 1375: Fragments of a Genesis Apocryphon," *IEJ* 46 (1996): 248–55, esp. 255, and "A Masada Fragment of Samaritan Origin," *IEJ* 47 (1997): 221–32,

has argued for the logical inappropriateness of petitionary prayer at Qumran on the basis of the group's doctrine of predestination. Acknowledging that *Dibre Hame'orot* was likely used at Qumran, he admits that "the religious norms here deviated from the strict and rigid theological principles."[48] This would be an instance of what Albert Baumgarten elsewhere calls "inelegant landings,"[49] where people are not rigidly consistent in their behavior. But one might also argue, given the acknowledged function of prayer at Qumran to atone on Israel's behalf, that penitential prayer—long associated with atonement—serves precisely this function on a daily basis and is thus not inconsistent with the group's self-understanding.[50]

More crucial are the arguments advanced by Esther Chazon for the pre-Qumranic origin of this liturgy.[51] Beyond the absence of explicit Qumranic terminology, the early dating, on paleographic grounds, of the manuscript 4Q504 to the mid-second century BCE is the strongest evidence for pre-Qumranic origin, though, as Chazon herself notes, it is not absolutely determinative. Falk is certainly right to stress the similarity of this text, on formal and generic grounds, to the *Festival Prayers*.[52] What we do not know is whether the formulaic use of זכור אדוני כיא at the beginning of each supplication

---

esp. 230–32. Hanan Eshel calls into question Talmon's conclusions in the latter article; see Eshel, "The Prayer of Joseph, A Papyrus from Masada, and the Samaritan Temple on ΑΡΓΑΡΙΖΙΝ," *Zion* 56 (1991): 134–36 (Hebrew). See also 129, n. 9, where Eshel argues that the presence at Masada of texts similar to those at Qumran suggests instead that many of the Qumran texts are not unique to the sect, but circulated more widely among Jews in the Land of Israel during this period. He would view *Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat* as one of these texts, since the calendar on which it is based is also known outside of Qumran, in *Jubilees* and the Enoch literature. I thank Prof. Eshel for bringing this article to my attention at the Orion Center Symposium. See also E. Eshel, "Prayer in Qumran and the Synagogue," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 327.

[48] I. Knohl, "Between Voice and Silence: The Relationship Between Prayer and Temple Cult," *JBL* 115 (1996): 30.

[49] A. Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 12 n. 30; 15 n. 40.

[50] Falk, "Prayer in the Qumran Texts," 871–73, also proposes this interpretation. See further Werline, cited in n. 18 above; and E. Schuller, "Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins and R. A. Kugler; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 29–45.

[51] Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 81–98, and "Is *Divrei Hame'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" in Dimant and Rappaport, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 3–17.

[52] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 28, 61–63 (and n. 5 there), 66, 182.

and אמן אמן . . . ברוך אדוני אשר at its end is more widely typical of the genre of penitential prayer (there is no evidence for these formulae in the penitential prayers preserved elsewhere in Second Commonwealth literature), or whether this usage represents the specific formalization of a particular group from which both liturgies must be deemed to originate. I am inclined to favor the latter possibility, as does Falk, and my reasoning is analogical. I have argued elsewhere that what identifies rabbinic prayers as rabbinic is not their content, but their specific, distinctive formalizations (i.e., the formulation of prayers as benedictions which begin with the liturgical *berakhah* formula and conclude with a *ḥatimah*).[53] It appears that we have an analogously distinctive formalization in the several penitential liturgies at Qumran, which would point to a common social origin for *Dibre Hame'orot* and the *Festival Prayers*. Newsom and Falk have suggested a non-Qumranic origin for the latter liturgy on the basis of calendrical considerations: the scroll apparently begins with the autumn new year festival, while the Qumran calendar began in the spring.[54] But Falk concedes that this is not certain, because some of the prayers for the festivals in 4Q509 appear to be out of order.[55] The conclusion is that the social origin of these two liturgies is uncertain. There is a strong likelihood of pre-Qumranic origin, but this cannot be proven definitively.

Allowing, however, for the possibility of pre-Qumranic origin (based on the paleographical dating of 4Q504), we would still have to ask about the probable social location of these prayers. Our responses can only be speculative. Falk suggests that both originated in Levitical circles "in a context associated with the Temple."[56] Knohl and Chazon, on the other hand, favor as a location "the circle in which the book of *Jubilees* was written."[57] I would agree with Knohl and Chazon, for the following reason: A fixed communal liturgy requires a well-defined group. Penitential prayers are attested in Second Commonwealth literature as having been recited communally or on

---

[53] R. S. Sarason, "The 'Intersections' of Qumran and Rabbinic Judaism: The Case of Prayer Texts and Liturgies," *DSD* 8 (2001): 169–81.

[54] Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature," 177–78; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 157–82.

[55] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 158–60.

[56] Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 91–92, 215; and "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple," 109–11.

[57] Knohl, "Between Voice and Silence," 30; Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications," 265–84.

behalf of the community in times of distress, and as the pious customs of individuals, also in times of distress. Daily communal recitation of such prayers would appear to be an act of hyper-piety among people who perceive an ongoing need for penitence and confession in a time of ongoing distress, as Werline has suggested. To me, this seems to fit specifically the situation of 'sectarian' or 'pietist' groupings (again, in the larger sense of the words) in the period in question. So even if some of the Qumran liturgies turn out to be pre-Qumranic, or contemporary non-Qumranic, in origin, they do not necessarily attest to a common, widely diffused custom of daily communal prayer before 70. Specific social location here must be the determining factor (and about this we can only conjecture).

Social location remains a determining factor when we take up the question of regular communal prayer after 70 CE as well. Rabbinic literature attests, first and foremost, to the culture, practices, and convictions of the Rabbis themselves. The Mishnah, like any other prescriptive legal text, describes the contours of an ideal society.[58] It adumbrates the rabbinic understanding of how Israelite society should function under the aegis of God's revealed Torah. Social history can be teased out of these texts only with difficulty and great caution. It is fair to assume that the rabbinic liturgical rubrics and the rules governing them were observed and viewed as normative within the rabbinic movement itself (though subject even here to local variation). It is not at all apparent to what extent, when, and where these practices were observed outside the rabbinic community. It is fairly clear from the full range of the evidence that the rabbinization of the Jewish community of the Land of Israel proceeded in fits and starts, with more evidence for rabbinic influence in general after 200 CE than before, and that local differences loomed large in this regard. Locales with a significant rabbinic population would have been more subject to rabbinic influence than those without such a population. The studies of Lee Levine, Stuart Miller, and Shaye Cohen, among others, have argued—I believe, convincingly—for such a picture.[59]

---

[58] On the ideal character of mishnaic legislation and society, see, from different starting points, J. Neusner, *Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 27–28, 47, 230–37; B. Z. Wacholder, *Messianism and Mishnah: Time and Place in the Early Halakhah* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1979).

[59] L. I. Levine, *The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1989);

While most of the tannaitic references to the synagogue have to do with the reading of Scripture and various communal functions continuous with the pre-70 period,[60] the sources do assume that the public recitation of *Shema* and praying of the *Amidah* took place there,[61] although these activities were not confined exclusively to the synagogue or to public recitation. We do not know whether the Rabbis bore primary responsibility for the diffusion and institutionalization of public prayer in synagogues after 70, or whether this was a process with a dynamic and logic of its own in the aftermath of the destruction of the Temple, or even whether these two alternatives pose a false dichotomy. Certainly, if we can trust those sources that imply that specifically rabbinic liturgical rubrics and formulae were recited in synagogues, then the former was the case. Again, it is likely that rabbinic influence in this regard would have been primarily local, varying from place to place and among regions, and that the process would have extended over a period of time; a century and a quarter, after all, elapsed between the destruction of the Temple and the editing of the Mishnah.[62] The critical role of the prayer leader, then,

---

"The Sages and the Synagogue in Late Antiquity: The Evidence of the Galilee," in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (ed. L. I. Levine; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 201–22; "Development of Synagogue Liturgy," 123–44; "The Patriarchate and the Ancient Synagogue," in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue*, 87–100; *The Ancient Synagogue*, 440–70; S. S. Miller, "The Rabbis and the Non-Existent Monolithic Synagogue," in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue*, 57–90; Shaye J. D. Cohen, "Epigraphical Rabbis," *JQR* 72 (1981): 1–17; "Pagan and Christian Evidence on the Ancient Synagogue," in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, 159–81; "The Place of the Rabbi in Jewish Society of the Second Century," in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, 157–74; "Were Pharisees and Rabbis the Leaders of Communal Prayer and Torah Study in Late Antiquity?: The Evidence of the New Testament, Josephus, and the Church Fathers," in Dever and Wright, *Echoes of Many Texts*, 99–114.

[60] See Levine, "Nature and Origin," 444; *The Ancient Synagogue*, 177–90. Most of the early rabbinic evidence for what transpired in synagogues is found in *m. Meg.* 3–4, and the corresponding Tosefta materials. See also C. Y. Kasovsky, *Thesaurus Mishnae* (4 vols.; 2nd ed.; Tel Aviv: Massadah, 1967), 1.366–67, s.v. *bet haknesset* (and related entries); C. Y. Kasovsky and M. Kasovsky, *Thesaurus Thosephthae* (6 vols.; Jerusalem: Hebrew Press; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1932–61), 2.102, s.v. *bet haknesset* (and related entries).

[61] See *m. Bik.* 1:4; *t. Ber.* 2:4 = *t. Meg.* 2:3; *t. Suk.* 2:10; *t. Sot.* 6:3; and cf. *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael*, *Baḥodesh* 11 (ed. H. S. Horovitz and I. A. Rabin [Frankfurt: Kauffman, 1931], 243); *Sifre Deut.* 306:3 (ed. L. Finkelstein [Berlin: Jüdischer Kulturbund in Deutschland, 1939; repr. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969], 342); and *m. Ber.* 7:1. In the latter two sources it is not clear whether the *Barekhu* invitational formula in question is recited before the Torah reading or before the recitation of the *Shema*.

[62] See now the exhaustive discussion of these issues by L. I. Levine, *The Ancient*

would have been at least two-fold: on the one hand, it would carry forward the well-attested pre-70 role of intercession before God on behalf of the community (as indicated by the term שליח ציבור), which the congregation would affirm by a response formula; on the other hand, it would be didactic, modeling proper (rabbinic) prayer for each individual, and fulfilling for both the community and the individual their (rabbinic) obligation to pray (cf. *t. Rosh HaSh.* 4:18).[63]

We do not know precisely the basis for the rabbinic custom of reciting the *Amidah* three times a day. It could rest on the Rabbis' determination that the day is divided into three parts according to the movement of the sun (as the night is divided into three watches).[64] If so, the rabbinic custom might be based on the same logic as the six prayer-times at Qumran, following Talmon's reading of 1QS 10:1–3. Or, this custom might represent a conflation of a diurnal cycle (sunrise-sunset) with the Temple calendar as it stood in the first century, when the evening sacrifice was offered in the late afternoon before sunset. In any case, there is a biblical model for thrice-daily prayer in the pious custom (of individuals) articulated in Dan 6:10 and Ps 55:18.[65]

Synagogue, 440–70. In this context, Levine deals primarily with the greater quantity of evidence from the third through fifth centuries.

[63] G. J. Blidstein, "The *Sheliach Zibbur*," in Tabory, *From Qumran to Cairo*, Hebrew section, 39–73, nicely documents these two phenomenologically distinct aspects of the role of prayer leader (literally, "emissary/agent of the congregation").

[64] Such, indeed, is one of the (late) explanations given at *y. Ber.* 4:1 (7a–7b): "From whence did they [i.e., the Sages] learn [that there are to be] three Prayers [daily]? R. Samuel b. Naḥmani said, 'Corresponding to the three times when the day changes for all created beings.'" From a phenomenological perspective alone, I believe this to be the most likely explanation.

[65] E. Chazon, "When Did They Pray?" 51, and n. 38 there, would read *m. Ber.* 4:1 and *t. Ber.* 3:1 as evidence for an early *rabbinic* custom of twice-daily prayer, later superseded by the thrice-daily custom. I find this reading problematic. *T. Ber.* 3:1 is part of an integral unit, 3:1–3, that relates to *m. Ber.* 4:1. The issue there, as clarified by context in both texts (but particularly in the Tosefta), is the prescribed *times* for prayer, and not whether or not the particular prayer is deemed mandatory. *Qeva'* in this context refers solely to fixed prayer-times (so also I. Ta-Shma, "The Evening Prayer—Permission or Obligation?" in Tabory, *From Qumran to Cairo*, Hebrew section, 132, n. 2). Context strongly suggests that the reason for the determination that the evening prayer does not have a fixed time is that this prayer does not correspond to an offering in the Temple. (Note as well in this regard the disputing opinion of R. Eleazar b. Yose, *t. Ber.* 3:2, that the evening prayer should be recited at the time of the closing of the Temple gates.) It is only later, in the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Ber.* 27b), that the mishnaic usage is (programmatically) deemed to be ambiguous and to refer instead to the question of the obligatory nature of the evening *Amidah*. To be sure, the Talmud refers there to a

As regards the question of the degree of original formalization in the wording of the prayers, I believe that an innocent reading of the sources (certainly the tannaitic ones) points to only partial formalization, unlike the apparent situation at Qumran. Beyond the detailing of liturgical structures, tannaitic sources, as is well known, spell out opening formulae and closing formulae (*ḥatimot*). They also enumerate topics, or 'talking points' to be included within some of the more thematically complex benedictions, but nothing more. The two crucial texts here, in my opinion, are both in *t. Berakhot*: 2:1, on the topics that one must include in the benediction אמת ויציב, followed by a specification of that benediction's closing formula, צור ישראל וגואלו (cf. *y.Ber.* 1:5, 3d); and 3:25, on how one combines similar topics so as to maintain the total number of eighteen benedictions in the weekday *Amidah*. The very articulation of these rules in this fashion presupposes some flexibility in the formulation of *berakhot*.[66]

But that flexibility is relative, not absolute, because the characteristic language of Hebrew prayer is heavily formulaic and stereotyped, as Joseph Heinemann and others have pointed out.[67] The

---

tannaitic dispute between R. Gamaliel and R. Joshua on this issue, also cited in this context at *y. Ber.* 4:1 (7a–7b). The reasoning behind this dispute is never spelled out in the *baraita*, though it might relate again to the (lack of) correspondence to sacrificial activity in the Temple. In any event, only this *baraita* provides possible tannaitic support for Chazon's claim. Otherwise the model of thrice-daily prayer is taken for granted in the tannaitic sources; the problem is to square this model with that of the twice-daily offerings in the Temple, once it has been asserted that the daily recitations of the *Amidah* and their times correspond to the daily Temple offerings. Given this difficulty, the initial rationale for thrice-daily prayer would appear to be something other than its correspondence with cultic activity (see the preceding note). See also Ta-Shma's full discussion of the status of the evening prayer in the article cited above.

[66] I construe these texts differently from Fleischer, "On the Beginnings," 436–37, n. 101 (on *t. Ber.* 3:25), and more in line with Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud*, 51–52 (but see also the treatment of *t. Ber.* 3:25 by U. Ehrlich, "On the Early Wording of the *Boneh Yerushalayim* and 'David' Benedictions in the *Tefillah*," *Pe'amim: Studies in Oriental Jewry* 78 [1999]: 16–43 [Hebrew], who supports Fleischer's analysis). To be sure, one might distinguish sharply between the type of information conveyed in *t. Ber.* 2:1 and in 3:25. The former passage, which discusses the content and phrasing of a benediction, pertains specifically to the "recitation of *Shema*" rubric, while the latter, which pertains to the *Amidah*, discusses the combination of themes so as to yield the requisite eighteen benedictions, but not their wording. I am less inclined to see this as a significant distinction, since the combination of themes or phrases in a single benediction will still result in some alteration of wording.

[67] See Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud*, 37–76; Reif, *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer*, 75–87; and the observations of Schuller and Newsom about the formulaic charac-

models of scriptural and Second Commonwealth prayers, and the ongoing use and development of these models in a living prayer tradition (however circumscribed) before 70, would not require a great deal of spontaneous ingenuity on the part of a learned master or his disciples. One would simply manipulate the stock vocabulary and idioms. Indeed, the very formalization of the weekday petitionary sequence as a series of eighteen, relatively short, benedictions, each with its own distinct topic—eighteen 'talking points' or 'bullets,' if you will—and its thrice-daily repetition, would facilitate the individual's memorization of the sequence and formulation of those parts which were not fixed. (Contrast this with the lengthy penitential cycle in *Dibre Hame'orot* at Qumran which is spread out over six days of the week and involves much variation.)

Within the rabbinic movement, then, the ideal of partially open-ended prayer would not be unrealistic. At the same time, the psychological, social, and ritual forces pushing toward repetition and routinization are easily understandable. A particularly apt and effective formula (like אבינו מלכנו, attributed to Akiva; *b. Ta'an.* 25b) would be repeated. Familiarity, we know, can breed comfort as well as contempt, while improvisation, as R. Zeira points out (*y. Ber.* 4:4, 8a), can breed confusion and dismay.[68] To the extent that liturgical prayer is conceived as a ritual activity whose purpose, as ritual, is to enact the divine cosmic order, it will tend intrinsically to become more formalized. So the tension in rabbinic prayer between spontaneity and heartfelt engagement, on the one hand, and routinization and

---

ter of liturgical language cited above, n. 43. Broadly relevant here also are Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue*, 501–60, and Langer, *To Worship God Properly*, 1–40.

[68] The cautionary, but elliptical, dictum attributed in *m. Ber.* 4:4 to R. Eliezer, העושה תפילתו קבע אין תפילתו תחנונים ("If one makes his Prayer fixed, it is not [deemed to be genuine] supplication"), and in *m. Avot* 2:18 to R. Simeon, אל תעש תפילתך קבע אלא רחמים ותחנונים לפני המקום ("Do not make your prayer fixed, but rather a plea for mercy and supplication before God") is construed at *y. Ber.* 4:4 (8a) as referring to either the manner of recitation, "So long as he does not recite it in the manner of one who reads a letter" (ובלבד שלא יהא כקורא באיגרת), or the content/formulation, "One must include something fresh in it every day" (צריך לחדש בה דבר בכל יום). The dictum is similarly construed at *b. Ber.* 29b: (1) "Anyone who recites his Prayer as if it were a burden to him" (כל שתפילתו דומה עליו כמשוי); (2) "Whoever does not recite it in the manner of a supplication" (כל מי שאינו אומרה בלשון תחנונים); and (3) "Whoever is not able to insert something fresh into it" (כל שאינו יכול לחדש בה דבר). In both Talmuds, R. Zeira is represented as being anxious about including something new each time: "Whenever I do this I make mistakes" (*y. Ber.* 4:4); "I can include something fresh, but I am afraid to do so lest I become confused" (*b. Ber.* 29b).

repetition, on the other, exists from the very outset and is, I would maintain, endemic to the very enterprise. Alternative formulations of prayers are cited in the Babylonian Talmud for the purpose of either deciding between them (e.g., אהבה רבה vs. אהבת עולם to begin the second benediction before the *Shema*; the Rabbis rule that we should follow the biblical pattern [*b. Ber.* 11b]), or of harmonizing them (e.g., רופא כל בשר vs. מפליא לעשות as the *ḥatimah* for one of the morning benedictions; the Rabbis decide that we should combine them [*b. Ber.* 60b]). We also find citations of fixed formulations from the bodies of benedictions (e.g., גולל אור מפני חושך וחושך מפני אור in the first benediction before the evening *Shema*; *b. Ber.* 11b). Fixity is certainly to be found by the amoraic period, but probably not universally nor uniformly in all places. It would, no doubt, be easier to spread a fully formulated liturgy beyond the confines of the rabbinic movement, as Fleischer has maintained, but the true liturgical *virtuosi*, the rabbinic masters themselves, would likely be able to improvise according to all the fine points of rabbinic liturgical etiquette.[69] I would argue, then, that notwithstanding the obvious differences from the pre-70 period, the situation of regular communal prayer after 70 CE remains complex and multifaceted.

Finally, I would briefly like to address the issue of whether there is a common, living tradition of prayer that, in a broad sense, unites the Qumran and rabbinic liturgies. In a word, and with due qualification, I would answer in the affirmative.[70] There was cer-

---

[69] Note the rabbinic dictum, מברכות של אדם ניכר אם בור הוא [ו]אם תלמיד חכם הוא, "From a man's benedictions (i.e., from the manner in which he formulates his benedictions), one can discern whether he is a boor or the disciple of a sage" (*t. Ber.* 1:6, and with slight verbal variations at *y. Ber.* 1:8, 3c, and *b. Ber.* 50a). In the Tosefta and Yerushalmi contexts, the dictum refers to the form of benedictions—extended or brief—rather than their precise wording. In the Babylonian Talmud, however, the dictum is severed from its earlier context and applied to the issue of precise formulation of benedictions (specifically, the *zimmun*, or invitational formula that precedes the group blessing after a meal). Fleischer, "On the Beginnings," 429, n. 78, correctly points out that the context of this dictum does not pertain explicitly to the benedictions of the daily *Amidah*, but rather to the occasional benedictions. In the Tosefta tradition, all the examples of short benedictions indeed are occasional benedictions, but all the examples of long benedictions are those of the *Amidah* on special occasions: fast days, Rosh Hashanah, and Yom Kippur. The tradition is cited in the context of a discussion of the benedictions that surround the recitation of *Shema*.

[70] Esther Chazon well articulates the implications of this question. See "Prayers

tainly no direct contact or influence between the two communities, and we do not know whether the Pharisees before 70 engaged in communal prayer among themselves (Levine considers this a possibility if the dispute between the Houses of Shammai and Hillel at *t. Rosh HaSh.* 2:17, about the number of benedictions to be recited if Rosh Hashanah or a festival falls on the Sabbath, is historical).[71] Many of the linguistic, stylistic, and thematic parallels between Qumran prayers and rabbinic prayers can be traced to biblical antecedents. Still, not everything can be accounted for on the grounds of shared literary models. The ecstatic hymnic style used to describe the angelic liturgy in *Shirot ʿOlat HaShabbat* and the rabbinic *Qedushot*, both of which bear some affinities to, but are not identical with, the *Hekhalot* literature, is not solely derivable from biblical models. The accounts of the angelic liturgy in the Enochic literature and in the *Apocryphon of Levi* share in this tradition. While Johann Maier's suggestion that the Sabbath *Shirot* derive from an esoteric priestly tradition connected to the Jerusalem Temple has been criticized as highly speculative,[72] something was clearly 'in the air' here, perhaps among the various pietist groups of the period, priestly pietists among them. These liturgies certainly belong to the same genre.[73]

So, too, there surely was a living tradition of penitential prayer (though there is no evidence of such practice widely on a daily basis) during the Second Commonwealth period that fed the penitential liturgies at Qumran and among the Rabbis. (The rabbinic *Amidah*

---

from Qumran," 277–84, and "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 249, 257–58.

[71] Levine, "The Development of the Synagogue Liturgy," 129; *The Ancient Synagogue*, 156, 512.

[72] J. Maier, "Zu Kult und Liturgie des Qumrangemeinde," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 543–66, 572–74, 584–85; and "Shire ʿOlat hash-Shabbat: Some Observations," 559–60. Criticism: Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 65–72; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 130 n. 24. But see Newsom, "'He Has Established for Himself Priests,'" 114–18, who, building on Maier's analysis, suggests that the invocation and experience of the heavenly priesthood and its service in the Sabbath *Shirot* might serve to validate the claims of the Qumran priesthood in the wake of their prolonged absence from the Temple and, in response to the inadequacy of the human cult, "to authenticate and reward human worship while at the same time allowing for a proleptic transcendence of its limits" (117).

[73] See most recently on this topic E. G. Chazon, "The *Qedushah* Liturgy and its History in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *From Qumran to Cairo*, English section, 7–17; and M. D. Swarz, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Later Jewish Magic and Mysticism," *DSD* 8 (2001): 182–93.

only mutedly belongs to this tradition; it is evidenced more fully in the private prayers of the Rabbis and in the later *Taḥanun* liturgies.)[74]

Esther Chazon has called attention to a linguistic usage—לטעת . . . תורה ב—that appears in both *Dibre Hame'orot* and rabbinic benedictions, but has no biblical basis.[75] Clearly this derives from a common linguistic background. Some of the other parallels she notes—the avoidance of petitionary prayer on the Sabbath and the offering in its stead of hymns to God the Creator, the prayer on the festivals for remembrance before God and ingathering of the exiles[76]—could perhaps be understood as similar interpretations of biblical Sabbath and festival prescriptions, but might equally reflect a living tradition of prayer genres for Sabbaths and festivals, possibly recited around the scriptural readings in the synagogue (on the analogy of the rabbinic benedictions that follow the *haftarah* reading today).

It is also possible that some of these similarities are to be attributed to the shared pietist 'sectarian' background (in the larger sense) that characterizes both the Qumran group and the Pharisees before 70. Albert Baumgarten, in his suggestive volume on the flourishing of Jewish sects in the Maccabean era, has remarked astutely that the cultural commonalities and shared issues addressed among these groups ultimately are more striking than their differences.[77] The same might apply to their cultivation of prayer and prayer language. But these remarks remain purely speculative.

There is much that we wish to know about the origins and development of institutionalized prayer among the Jews of the Land of Israel both before and after 70. We sense a larger common background, but the details elude us. The evidence that we possess is partial and socially located; the medium is never neutral. Still, if we proceed with caution, self-awareness, and refinement, we may be fortunate enough to illuminate, however provisionally, small corners of the darkness.

---

[74] Cf. M. Weinfeld, "The Prayers for Knowledge, Repentance, and Forgiveness in the 'Eighteen Benedictions': Qumran Parallels, Biblical Antecedents, and Basic Characteristics," *Tarbiz* 48 (1979): 186–200 (Hebrew).

[75] Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 104–106.

[76] Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 103–14, summarized on 115–16; "Prayers from Qumran," 277–79. On the latter parallel, see also Schiffman, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy," 41–42.

[77] Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 55–58.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FUNCTION AND USE OF POETICAL TEXTS AMONG THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Eileen M. Schuller
McMaster University

The title of this conference, "Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," suggests that there are two types of material, prayer and poetry, that are to be considered in conjunction with liturgy in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[1] In this paper I will focus on the second of these categories, poetry, and ask a specific question: did the poetical compositions that are found among the Dead Sea Scrolls have a liturgical function? That is, do we have evidence that poetry, or at least some poetry, had a place in public, communal worship and thus should be considered—along with prayer—as a component of the liturgy? To date, much more attention has been given to the use and function of the various collections of prayers than to the use and function of the individual poetical texts. This paper is an exploratory attempt to formulate the right questions, to draw together certain passages that speak to the matter directly or indirectly, and to suggest some avenues for further study.

It is instructive to reflect briefly on current scholarly discussion about the more extensively studied category of 'prayer' before we move to the more difficult topic of 'poetry.' Scholars now recognize

---

[1] The terms 'prayer' and 'poetry' are used in a variety of ways by scholars. Sometimes the distinction is formal, so that prayer is a text in prose, as opposed to poetry. Or, the distinction is made on the basis of content, so that prayer is a text with petition. Or, prayer is any text addressed to God in the second person, whether in prose or poetry.

It is equally difficult to define precisely what poetry is, particularly given the changing conventions of prosody and poetics in the Second Temple period. For the purposes of this paper, I include as poetry the biblical Psalter, other compositions that are clearly modeled on the biblical psalms (e.g., *Barkhi Nafshi* [4Q434–438]), the pseudepigraphic collection of 4Q380/381, the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (*Hodayot*), the poem that concludes the *Rule of the Community* in most copies (1QS 10:5–11:20), poems in the *War Scroll* (1QM 10–14) and numerous fragmentary compositions that have been labeled 'poem/hymn/psalm' by the editors in the *editio princeps*. Although there are clearly poetic elements in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (see S. Segert, "Observations on Poetic Structures in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," *RevQ* 13 [1988]: 215–23), this composition above all illustrates the difficulties of categorization.

that the Judean caves have supplied us with the only written collections of established prayer texts from the period before the destruction of the Temple. The corpus contains: prayers for morning and evening of each day of the month (*Daily Prayers*, 4Q503); prayers for each day of the week (*Words of the Luminaries*, 4Q504, 506); prayers for the Festivals (*Festival Prayers*, 4Q507–509, 1Q34, 1Q34bis); prayers for the Sabbath (*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 4Q400–407, 11Q17, Maslk).[2] The prayers in each specific collection have their own distinctive structure, content, and theological perspective and were composed by different circles at different times.[3] Yet all share certain features that point to a public and communal *Sitz im Leben*, that is, to liturgical usage. In studying these texts over the last twenty years,[4] scholars have come to general agreement on criteria for recognizing liturgical texts: the individual prayers are relatively short;[5] they contain set formulae, particularly at the opening and conclusion;[6] they employ rubrics or titles specifying when the prayers are to be recited, and sometimes by whom;[7] they utilize a dialogical element implying two or more voices;[8] they are formulated in the first person plural; their content is communal and/or cosmological (not individualistic and specific).

---

[2] Depending on how one categorizes and defines, other liturgical material might also be included in this list: the words of confession and blessings and curses to be recited at the annual Covenant Renewal ceremony, 1QS 1:21–2:10; the blessing recited by the priest when a member is expelled, 4Q266 11 9–14; blessings for an unspecified celebratory occasion, 4Q502; blessings for purification, 4Q512, 4Q414.

[3] For a detailed study of each of these collections and for full bibliography, see D. K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

[4] See especially the important early work of E. G. Chazon, "4Q*DibHam*: Liturgy or Literature?" *RevQ* 15 (1992): 447–55; also, B. Nitzan, "Fixed Prayer in Qumran," in her *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 47–88.

[5] Some of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* are quite long; again this points to their liminal position between prose and poetry.

[6] For instance, ברוך אל ישראל as an opening formula in *Daily Prayers*; זכור אדוני in *Words of the Luminaries* and *Festival Prayers*. In the concluding benedictions of all three major collections there seems to be some variety in formulation. Although the preserved material is very fragmentary and many of the formulations need to be partially reconstructed, it is obvious that there is a structured pattern.

[7] For example, "When the sun goes forth to shine on the earth, they shall bless and recite and say . . ." (4Q503); "[Prayer for the] fourth [da]y" (4Q504 3 ii 5); "Of/for the *Maskil*. Song of the eighth Sabbath sacrifice on the t[wenty-]third of the second month" (4Q403 1 ii 18).

[8] Closing responses, particularly "Amen, Amen," in *Words of the Luminaries* and *Festival Prayers*; "Peace be upon you, Israel" in *Daily Prayers*.

The fact that the Qumran caves contain multiple copies of these written prayer collections correlates with expository statements about religious practice found both in the Scrolls themselves and in the descriptions of the Essenes in the Greek sources. Thus, scholars have concluded that the community that produced the Scrolls engaged in some sort of daily, public, communal, non-sacrificial religious activity. In his comprehensive survey article in this volume, Richard Sarason attempts to articulate both the certainties and the uncertainties concerning communal prayer at Qumran.[9] He concludes, first of all, that scholars generally agree that public communal prayer did occur, and that "communal prayer at Qumran serves a cultic function, as a substitute for sacrifices."[10] Furthermore, it is generally accepted that we do not know enough about the precise details of this communal prayer to be able to reconstruct a full order of service for the daily, Sabbath and festival liturgies, nor for special liturgies such as entrance into the Covenant. Thirdly, on the question of whether such liturgical practice was distinctive to the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls or whether at least certain components were to be found as well in other types of Second Temple Judaism, the debate continues, unresolved.[11]

When we expand the parameters of the discussion to include the place of poetry, songs and psalms in the reconstruction of the liturgical life of the Qumran community, we find even fewer certainties and less consensus. Thus the question of this paper—did the daily, Sabbath, and festival liturgies include the singing of poetic texts (with or without musical accompaniment), or should we be reconstructing a shorter, simpler, more austere service that included basically only the prayers mentioned above?

Both later liturgical developments and internal evidence from the Scrolls provide some initial justification for pursuing a liturgical paradigm that includes both prose prayers and poetic compositions. Over the centuries the daily service of prayer came to include considerable poetry, both biblical psalms and newly composed *piyyutim*.

---

[9] R. Sarason, "Communal Prayer at Qumran and among the Rabbis: Certainties and Uncertainties, pp. 151–72."

[10] Sarason, "Communal Prayer," 154.

[11] For a helpful summary of the issue within the context of later synagogue developments, and in particular the arguments of Ezra Fleischer, see R. Langer, "Revisiting Early Rabbinic Liturgy: The Recent Contributions of Ezra Fleischer," *Prooftexts* 19 (1999): 179–94, and the ongoing discussion of Langer and Fleischer, "Controversy," *Prooftexts* 20 (2000): 380–87.

Although such post-70 CE developments cannot be read back into the period that we are examining, they can serve to indicate that there is no inherent implausibility or contradiction in the combination. More significantly, the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves contain some poetry that shares certain of the markers, noted previously, that have been held to identify a liturgical *Sitz im Leben* for the prayer collections. For instance, in *Words of the Luminaries*, the texts for the Sabbath, with their short, parallel lines, are treated by most commentators as poetry (in contrast to the more expansive, narrative prose style of the prayers for the other days of the week). These poems are introduced with a rubric and title, "Praises (Song) for the Sabbath" (הודות (שיר) ביום השבת, 4Q504 1–2 vii 4);[12] the plural imperative summons to praise (הודו) presupposes communal rather than private use; and the content of the praise is cosmological. Thus, at least within this collection of prayers,[13] on the Sabbath seven short poetic hymns or seven stanzas of a hymn replace the prose petitions of the other days of the week.[14]

It is harder to know whether certain other indicators can be taken as genuine markers of liturgical usage, and a degree of caution is in order. For example, some of the poems are given biblical designations, שיר, מזמור, תהלה, but this does not necessarily tell us anything about usage. At the first Orion Conference in 1996, I presented a close study of these designations that yielded meager results. I was forced to conclude that many of these designations represent simply a reuse of biblical terms, whose precise sense and distinctions are largely lost to us, and may indeed have already become unknown by the Hellenistic period.[15] Similarly it is unlikely that the appearance of סלה at the conclusion of certain non-canonical psalms (e.g., 4Q381 21 2, 24 3, 33 6) attests to some liturgical movement or

---

[12] The traces of the letters שיר are written superlinearly, as recognized by É. Puech, "Recensions: Qumrân Grotte 4, III (4Q482–520)," *RB* 95 (1988): 409.

[13] In contrast, in the collection *Daily Prayers* (4Q503 37–38, 24–25, 40–41), there does not seem to be any formal differentiation for the Sabbath prayers.

[14] See the discussion of E. G. Chazon, "On the Special Character of Sabbath Prayer: New Data from Qumran," *Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy* 15 (1992–93): 16–18.

[15] E. Schuller, "The Use of Biblical Terms as Designations for Non-Biblical Hymnic and Prayer Compositions," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 May, 1996* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 207–22.

refrain, even if this elusive term might have had some such meaning in Temple liturgy.[16]

In the past, discussion of the use and function of poetic material has tended to focus largely on the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (*Hodayot*), specifically 1QH[a], which was the first substantial collection of sectarian poetry to be published.[17] Much less attention has been given to the function of the smaller poetic collections that were subsequently published. For example, in their edition of *Barkhi Nafshi* (4Q434–438), Moshe Weinfeld and David Seely do not attempt to propose any specific *Sitz im Leben* for these psalms; they simply do not raise the question.[18] Chazon, in her review of my edition of 4Q380 and 381 rightly notes that "unfortunately" I did not explore "the question of the function of the individual psalms and the collection as a whole."[19] I readily acknowledge the omission and admit that I do not have a convincing proposal to put forth. Likewise the editors of the considerable number of recently published poetic/hymnic texts (e.g., 4Q411 *Sapiential Hymns*, 4Q426 *Sapiential-Hymnic*; 4Q527, 528, 579, *Hymnic Work*) have not ventured to speculate on possible usage, though in these cases, the very fragmentary nature of the material may explain the omission.

To return to the *Hodayot*—although this is not the place to undertake a complete survey and review of past discussions on their use and function, my impression is that lately most scholars have opted for a non-cultic venue. Schiffman's conclusion seems typical:

> It is tempting to regard the *Thanksgiving Scroll* as a series of hymns for public worship. But we have no evidence that this material was in fact liturgical. These poems are individual plaints, perhaps composed by a leader of the sect—some scholars claim by the Teacher of Righteousness himself—concentrating on serious matters of theology and belief. The *Thanksgiving Hymns* were certainly not part of a regular order of prayers. Rather, they belong to a genre of devotional, introspective poetry.[20]

---

[16] See the fuller discussion in Schuller, "Selah," *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 44–46.

[17] E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1954 [Hebrew], 1955 [English]).

[18] M. Weinfeld and D. Seely, "4QBarkhi Nafshi[a–c]: Introduction," *Qumran Cave 4.X: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. G. Chazon et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 255–334.

[19] E. G. Chazon, review of *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*, in *DSD* 6 (1999): 350.

[20] L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 301.

Likewise, Chazon contrasts "regular communal prayer at fixed times of the day, week and year" with "private devotion as represented by some of the *Hodayot* and other hymns and psalms."[21] In structuring her book, Bilhah Nitzan sets up a fundamental dichotomy, a "confrontation" as she terms it, between prayer texts that "were designated for ceremonial and ritual recitation within the circles of the sect" and the *Hodayot* which are "first and foremost the literary expression of a member of the sect."[22]

In contrast, the argument for understanding the *Hodayot* as poems to be used in liturgy was put forth some years ago by Svend Holm-Nielsen; he presented the *Hodayot* as "a collection of psalms which could be used at the cultic ceremonies of the community . . . examples of the community's liturgical prayers and songs of praise."[23] Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn showed more specifically how the key formal elements of the Hymns of the Community, "the soteriological confession" and the "reflection on the human condition," could be situated within the ceremony of entrance into the community and/or the annual ceremony for renewal of the covenant.[24]

The question of the function of the *Hodayot* did not receive much detailed attention in subsequent decades, in part because no new data were forthcoming. Some years ago, Moshe Weinfeld pointed to thematic links between the traditional *Birkhot Hashaḥar* and the *Hodayot* (as well as other Qumran poetry such as the *Plea for Deliverance* in 11QPs^{a} 19:1–18 and *Apostrophe to Zion* 11QPs^{a} 22:1–15). He suggested that such poetry would "belong to the morning prayers of the Qumran sect," but we are still awaiting the promised development of this thesis.[25] With the recent publication of the Cave 4 manuscripts of

---

[21] E. G. Chazon, "The Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; exec. ed. G. Marquis; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 218.

[22] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 323; note the title of Section III, "The Thanksgiving Scroll (1QH) and Prayer Texts (A Confrontation)."

[23] S. Holm-Nielsen, "For What Purpose were the Hodayot Written?" in his *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 348.

[24] H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und Gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkundigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

[25] M. Weinfeld develops these ideas briefly in the context of a book review, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 41 (1984): 712–13, then somewhat more fully in his article, "The Morning Prayers (Birkhoth Hashachar) in Qumran and in the Conventional Jewish

the *Hodayot*, some additional material has become available which once again brings the question of function to the fore.[26] In certain poems, there are elements that may point to liturgical usage, in particular the extended series of imperative calls to praise in 4QH[a] 7 i 13–18 // 4QH[e] 2 and the use of the first person plural in 4QH[a] 7 ii 14–21 (also in 4QH[a] 8 i 6–12 // 1QH[a] 10:11–20); in addition, there are a few temporal expressions that *may* serve to indicate the times to use these poems (e.g., from]לנשף מ in 4QH[b] 20 4).[27] Given that differing collections of these poems were in use at the same time, I tentatively suggested in the *editio princeps* that some collections—4QH[a] and perhaps 4QH[e]—seem to have more liturgical features,[28] but a full study of the matter remains for the future.

Although much more work still needs to be done along these lines, I want to shift the focus in this paper away from any specific text and approach the question from a somewhat different perspective. First of all, if we look at statements *about* worship (as opposed to texts per se), are there passages that support, or at least allow for, the use of poetry and the singing of psalms and hymns? Secondly, what can be known about the usage of the largest body of poetry, the biblical Psalter, in contexts apart from the Jerusalem Temple?[29] And thirdly, and even more speculatively, are there basic presumptions about the nature of the community of the Scrolls and its place on the 'map' of Second Temple Judaism and within the Greco-Roman world that can be factored into our reconstruction of liturgical practice? The following discussion is only preliminary, but hopefully these explorations will point to new ways of thinking about the issue.

Liturgy," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 481–94; at the very end of this article he promises a more extended study of the *Hodayot*.

[26] E. Schuller, "4QHodayot 427–432," DJD 29.69–232.

[27] Although this is not a standard biblical phrase, it may be a general expression of continual praise of God (perhaps reconstructing [לנשף ל[ערב אברכה שמכה, see DJD 29.157), rather than a concrete indication of when these psalms are to be recited.

[28] Schuller, DJD 29.74–75.

[29] For the purposes of this paper and because of the specific nature of the question that is being addressed, it is not necessary to enter into the complex problems of the various Psalters attested at Qumran nor of their canonical status. For discussion of these issues, see P. W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

I. *Statements About Worship*

In light of our specific question, it is instructive to return to some of the well-known statements about liturgical practice. The so-called Hymn of the Appointed Times, preserved at the conclusion of the *Rule of the Community* (1QS 10:5–11:22), has often been taken as a starting point for reconstructing the elements of the daily liturgy[30] (though there is an inherent problematic in attempting to make a poetic text function as a cultic calendar). The hymn contains allusions to blessings ("When I first put forth my hands and my feet, I will bless his name" [1QS 10:13]); more specifically, to blessings recited communally ("I will bless him with the offering of the utterance of my lips from within a congregation of men" [1QS 10:14]); to the recitation of the *Shema*, the Decalogue, and Grace After Meals; to confession of sin and acknowledgement of God's justice.

1QS 10:9 introduces the terminology of music:

> I will sing with knowledge (אזמרה בדעת)
> and all my music will be for the glory of God;
> I will play my lyre (אכה נבלי)[31] for the measure of his holiness,
> and the flute of my lips I will raise as the cord (קו) of his judgment.[32]

This section has sometimes been taken as concrete evidence that songs and musical instruments formed part of the liturgical complex.[33] On the basis of these lines, Falk includes "songs about God's holiness and justice" in his overall reconstruction of the daily liturgy, and Talmon places "hymns of praise" at the beginning of his reconstructed *Manual of Benedictions* (although he does not explicitly make the link to 1QS 10:9). But the majority of interpreters have seen in such language primarily a reuse of standard biblical phraseology,

---

[30] For example, M. Weise, *Kultzeiten und kultisher Bundesschluss in der 'Ordensregel' vom Toten Meer* (Studia Post-Biblica 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 3–60; S. Talmon, "The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel," in his *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 212–31.

[31] Reading אכה with 4QS^{d} and 4QS^{f}, rather than וכנור as in 1QS.

[32] The translation is taken from Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayer*, 108, n. 37, and attempts to capture the multi-dimensions of קו.

[33] For an early compilation and somewhat literalistic reading of terminology about music and instruments, see S. J. Scorza, "Praise and Music in the Qumran Community," *The Reformed Journal* 11 (1958): 32–36.

now interpreted metaphorically, rather than a reflection of actual musical practice. In biblical usage זמר is used with ב and the instrument played (cf. בכנור, Pss 71:22, 98:5, 147:7; בתוף, Ps 149:3; בנבל Pss 33:2, 144:9); in 1QS 10:9, it is knowledge that functions as the poet's instrument (בדעת), while his lips serve as the flute.[34] Similarly, most of the scattered references to singing and musical instruments in the *Hodayot* (especially 1QH[a] 19:7–8 [11:4–5])[35] draw on biblical language and can be read metaphorically, and the mention of musical instruments in the *War Scroll* occurs within a distinctive eschatological framework.

When we turn to statements about the worship practices of the Essenes in Philo and Josephus, we likewise find considerable ambiguity in much of the terminology. In no place is there an explicit statement that the Essenes sang songs, recited poetry or played musical instruments. Only blessings are associated with their meals (*War* 2.121, cf. 1QS 6:6, 1QSa 2:16–22), in contrast to Philo's elaborate description of the singing of hymns by the Therapeutae (*De vita cont.* 80–89). According to Josephus (*War* 2.128), the particular form of piety of the Essenes (εὐσεβεῖς ἰδίως) was exhibited in their ancestral prayers (πατρίους τίνας εὐχάς) before sunrise. It is usually assumed that these were short blessings and petitions such as those preserved in *Daily Prayers* (4Q503) and *Words of the Luminaries* (4Q504), but it is just possible that psalms and hymns could have been included in the terminology of 'prayers' (εὐχάς). Although Josephus generally designates the scriptural psalms as ὕμνοι and ᾠδαί, and calls the songs composed by Moses ᾠδαί,[36] εὐχή is a comprehensive generic term and may have included poetry; certainly in the Septuagint it frequently translates תהלה in reference to both prose prayers and psalms.

The complexity of using specific terminology to draw precise conclusions about practice is illustrated when we turn to the corresponding

---

[34] See, for example, E. Werner, "Musical Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Musical Quarterly* 43 (1957): 26–27; A. R. C. Leaney *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London: SCM, 1966), 145.

[35] For 1QH[a], the columns and lines are given according to the reconstructed scroll (see H. Stegemann, "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot," in Schiffman et al., *Fifty Years After*, 272–84), with the columns and lines from the *editio princeps* of Sukenik in brackets.

[36] Cf. his description of David's compositions in *Ant.* 7.305, 7.364, 20.216, *Wars* 2.321; and his descriptions of the ᾠδαί, the poetic compositions in hexameter verse that Moses composed after crossing the Sea (*Ant.* 2.346) and on the plains of Moab (*Ant.* 4.303).

statement about the Essenes in Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9:21: "they pray (εὐχόμενοι) from early dawn, not speaking a word until they have praised God in a hymn" (εἰ μὴ τὸν Θεὸν ὑμνήσωσι). From this statement, Falk concluded that Hippolytus intended to specify that "the Essenes began each morning with prayer and hymns,"[37] but this may be treating the vocabulary too technically. Note that in Hippolytus's description of the morning meal, before the meal the priest prays (ἐπεύξεται) and blesses (εὐλογῶν); after the meal he prays as at the beginning (ἐπεύχεται). This whole section is then rounded off with the statement, "as at the beginning so at the conclusion of their meal they hymn God" (ὑμνοῦσι τὸν Θεόν).[38] Although much more close vocabulary study of individual authors and of the Greco-Latin corpus as a whole remains to be done, it seems that terms such as *psalmoi, hymnoi, odai, euchai* were used almost interchangeably by both Jewish and Christian authors. Thus, vocabulary alone cannot be taken as a sure guide as to whether the reference was to prose prayers or poetry or whether the intent was at all to distinguish between them.[39]

Another passage that bears reexamination if we are seeking a *Sitz im Leben* for at least some of the poetic materials preserved in the Scrolls is the description in 1QS 6:7–8a of the nightly gatherings of the community for common study for one third of each night.[40] Three activities are specified for the Many: to read the book (לקרא בספר), to study the communal law (לדרוש משפט) and to bless together (לברך ביחד). The last phrase has received less attention than the other two, and it has been variously translated as 'pray/bless/praise together/worship together.' Leaney, for example, talks of "prescribed prayers" that opened and closed the watch of the night,[41] and many

---

[37] Falk, Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers, 119, n. 73.

[38] *Refutatio ad omnium haeresium* (ed. M. Marcovich; Patristische Texte und Studien 25; Berlin and New York: De Gruyter), 366; Translation adapted from that of J. H. Macmahon, *ANF* (ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, rev. A. C. Coxe; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 5:134.

[39] See the conclusions of A. A. R. Bastiaensen, "*Psalmi, hymni* and *cantica* in early Jewish-Christian tradition," *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989): 15–26, and the bibliography cited there.

[40] The Hebrew phrasing is at best imprecise, but this seems to be the meaning intended, rather than that one-third of the community studied for the whole night. Although Josephus does not mention prayer during the night, the Slavonic version of *Ant.* 2.128 adds, "they rest a little at night; they rise for singing, praising God and praying." This may well be a Christian monastic interpolation but it is not contrary to the nightly vigils of 1QS.

[41] Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran*, 185.

commentators seem to assume some series of blessings (taking *lebarek* in a more technical sense). Fraade raises the possibility that the phrase points to "the recitation of blessings (or perhaps psalms)."[42] Many years ago Delcor had suggested that these nightly sessions of study were the *Sitz im Leben* for the *Hodayot*.[43] His suggestion has not been widely taken up, perhaps because there is so little specified in the content of the *Hodayot* about reading and interpretation; but poems that were associated at some level with the Teacher of Righteousness could well have found a place when the community gathered to continue in its own day the interpretative process begun by the Teacher.

Our search for statements about worship that give explicit evidence for the singing of psalms and hymns has not been very productive, though neither have we found any explicit statements that render such a usage of poetic texts impossible or implausible. Our attention has, at least by implication and interest, been focused on sectarian texts such as the *Hodayot*, but similar questions can be raised about how the biblical Psalter was being used in contexts apart from the Temple.

II. *The Use of the Biblical Psalms*

The large number of psalm manuscripts found in the caves has attracted particular attention. According to a recent compilation of Peter Flint, there are a total of forty manuscripts, thirty-seven from Qumran, two from Masada, and one from Naḥal Ḥever.[44] Even if a few individual manuscripts might be classified differently,[45] there

---

[42] S. Fraade, "Interpretative Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 57.

[43] M. Delcor, "Littérature Essénienne," in *Qumran et Découvertes au Désert de Juda, Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1979), 51:828–64, 897–960.

[44] Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 31–47, lists the manuscripts; he makes minor adjustments to this list (including raising the number of manuscripts at Qumran from thirty-six to thirty-seven) in "Contribution of the Cave 4 Psalms Scrolls to the Psalms Debate," *DSD* 5 (1998): 321–24. According to the recent *editio princeps* of the Cave 4 Psalms manuscripts, the number of Qumran copies should be raised by yet one more, because the fragments of 4QPs^{s} have now been allotted to two manuscripts, 4QPs^{s} and 4QPs^{t}; see P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and P. W. Flint, "98b. 4QPs^{s}," *Qumran Cave 4: XI, Psalms to Chronicles* (ed. E. Ulrich et al., DJD 16; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).

[45] Flint interprets "Psalms Scrolls" in the broadest possible sense. Manuscripts

are still more copies of the Psalter than of any other biblical book. VanderKam explains the large number in this way: "The numbers alone give a fairly reliable impression of where the Qumran group placed its emphases. The Psalms could be used for a variety of reasons: for worship, meditation, and prooftexting."[46]

By "prooftexting," VanderKam refers to the use of the Psalms as a book to be studied, a work of prophecy to be interpreted like the other prophetic books. This is evidenced in the *pesharim* on the Psalms (1QpPs, 4QpPs^{a}, 4QpPs^{b}) and the inclusion of psalms in certain thematic *pesharim* (4Q174/177, 11QMelch). This understanding of psalms as texts to be studied is reflected also in 4QMMT, which advocates careful study (להבין) of "the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (the writings of) David."[47]

That the Psalms were also used for meditation (VanderKam's second use) is harder either to prove or disprove from manuscript evidence. We cannot know whether much of the Psalter would have been memorized, so that those who recited or sang the psalms or meditated on them in silence were not dependent on copies. It has sometimes been suggested that certain of the small scrolls found at Qumran containing prayer texts (e.g., the 13 cm-high scroll of *Words of the Luminaries* [4Q504]; the similar-sized copies of the *Hodayot* [4Q429] and *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* [4QShir^{a}]) might have been written as 'personal' copies.[48] If some of the fragmentary psalms scrolls could be similarly reconstructed, these might also be evidence of private copies for personal meditation. Similarly if 4QPs^{g} and 4QPs^{h} (also 5QPs) contained only Ps 119, these copies may have been written to facilitate individual meditation on this long psalm.[49] In considering Second Temple Judaism more generally, various types of evidence can be advanced to demonstrate that the psalms were used devotionally as expressions of personal piety: examples of indi-

---

such as 11Q11 (*apocryphal Psalms*), copies of only Psalm 119 (4QPs^{g}, 4QPs^{h}, 5QPs). or 4Q522 (even though it contains Psalm 122) are hardly to be counted as copies of the biblical Psalter per se.

[46] J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 31–32.

[47] 4QMMT Composite text C 10–11, as presented by E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4: V, Miqṣat Maʿase ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 58–59.

[48] See Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers*, 85 n. 142, 87 n. 151.

[49] P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and P. W. Flint, "Two Manuscripts of Psalm 119 from Qumran Cave 4," *RevQ* 16 (1995): 477–86; they repeat this proposal in the DJD edition, "89. 4QPs^{g}?," DJD 16.153.

viduals praying the psalms in specific personal situations of need (Jonah in the belly of the whale; Jesus on the cross); the father who teaches the Songs of David to his children (4 Macc 18:15); the arrangement of the Psalter according to a concatenation of catchwords to facilitate the recitation and meditation upon the psalms *seriatim*.[50] If Jews in general—so the argument goes—used the psalms for meditation and private devotion, we can assume that the pious people of the Qumran community did so too.

VanderKam lists a third usage of the psalms, "for worship," but passages giving clear and explicit attestation to this practice are surprisingly elusive. Often in the secondary literature a liturgical use of the psalms is simply asserted or deduced on the basis of a particular view of the community. For example Schiffman concludes that, "it is most probable that the psalms played a prominent part in Qumran liturgy. This is exactly what one would expect of a group whose origins were in Temple priesthood."[51] In semi-popular reconstructions where the community at Qumran is depicted (more or less explicitly) as the precursor of Christian monasticism, it is sometimes assumed that they spent their days saying the psalms, much like monks reciting the Divine Office.[52]

In terms of manuscript evidence for liturgical usage of the biblical psalms, one might point to 2Q14 where the first two lines containing Ps 103:1–4 were written in red ink. A similiar usage of red ink is to found in 4QNum^{b}; the editor of that manuscript put forth the case that "red-writing served to introduce pericopes for liturgical reading."[53] Furthermore, it is generally agreed that some features of the specific collection and arrangement of psalms in 11QPs^{a}, 11QPs^{b} and 4QPs^{e} reflect liturgical concerns (e.g., the refrain in

---

[50] E. Zenger and F. L. Hossfeld, *Die Psalmen I* (Neue Echter Bibel 19; Wurzburg: Echter, 1993).

[51] L. Schiffman, "Halakhah and Sectarianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 142.

[52] It is interesting to note that back in the 1930s, K. Kohler had already raised the possibility that the Psalter was used in a distinctive way by the Essenes. Kohler suggested that the reference in *b. Shabb.* 118b to "those who finish the Hallel every day" (מגומרי הלל בכל יום) referred to the Essenes who customarily recited the whole book of psalms (Hallel in that sense) daily ("The Psalms in the Liturgy," in *Studies, Addresses and Personal Papers* [New York: Alumni Association of the Hebrew Union College, 1931], 142).

[53] N. Jastram,"4QLev-Num^{a}," in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (ed. E. Ulrich et al.; DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 170–71.

Psalm 145; the ordering of Psalms 135 + 136 + Catena + 145; the collation of Psalms 149 + 150 + *Hymn to the Creator*), but whether such 'liturgical grouping' is to be attributed to Temple usage, the Qumran community per se, or broader Jewish circles that used the solar calendar is a matter of ongoing debate.[54] Indeed, in the long-standing debate about whether 11QPs[a] was a variant 'biblical' Psalter or an "incipient prayer-book,"[55] those who advocate the latter implicitly presume the existence of a worship context that incorporated biblical and extra-biblical psalms.

The question of whether the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls used the psalms in communal worship outside the Temple is related, at least to some extent, to the question of what any group of Jews did when they gathered on the Sabbath, specifically of whether there was any fixed liturgy beyond the reading and explication of Torah while the Temple service was still in existence.[56] The specific issue of psalmody in the synagogue has generated a vast body of literature. The question has been studied independently from the perspectives of musicology, the historical development of the Siddur, and the development of Christian church music; a full survey of this scholarship, its presuppositions, and its very divergent conclusions would demand another paper. The emerging consensus, however, seems to be that psalmody, and certainly the use of psalms in any set order or number, came into the synagogue service at a relatively late stage. The earlier observation of Rabinowitz, that "there can be no question that during the whole period of the Talmud, with one exception, the Psalms had no place at all in public worship . . . the public liturgy during the period of the Talmud was completely 'psalmless',"[57] has been substantiated by Lawrence Hoffman in his careful historical-critical study of the final stages of the synagogue service.

---

[54] For a survey of the scholarly discussion and extensive bibliography, see Flint, "Structure and Provenance of 11QPs[a]," *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 171–201.

[55] To use the terminology of S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emsa Pasuq and 11QPs[a]," *Textus* 5 (1966): 13. The language of "prayerbook" was also introduced by M. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs[a]). A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33.

[56] See the discussion in Sarason, "Communal Prayer," and the bibliography given there and in n. 11 above. Also, D. D. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*, (SBLDS 169; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 404–15.

[57] L. I. Rabinowitz, "The Psalms in Jewish Liturgy," *Historia Judaica* 6 (1944): 110–11. The exception that he refers to was the Hallel.

Hoffman demonstrates that well into the geonic period there was wide-ranging variety in the number and content of the *pesukei dez-imrah*.[58] Such studies have had considerable influence among musicologists. Earlier studies, typified by the writings of Eric Werner,[59] had argued that the psalms were used extensively in the synagogue in the pre-70 period, so that even the melodies of the Temple singers were passed on via the synagogue to the early Christian church, and the monastic office directly carried on synagogue practice.[60] In contrast, many musicologists now accept that "the evidence against psalmody in the synagogue at the time of Jesus appears overwhelming."[61] Indeed the claim that the singing of psalms existed in pre-70 synagogues seems now to be made most often by New Testament scholars, often based on a somewhat simplistic retrojection from Paul's description of Christian worship back to the synagogue.[62]

Given the weight of the evidence on the side of silence with regard to the singing of psalms in synagogues prior to 70 CE, how does this affect our reconstruction of the worship in the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls? At first glance, it might seem an argument *against* supposing that the Dead Sea Scrolls community were regularly using

---

[58] L. A. Hoffman, *The Canonization of the Synagogue Service* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979), especially pp. 127–28 and his analysis of the reference in *Massekhet Soferim* 17:11, "may my portion be with those who recite daily these six psalms."

[59] Above all in his book which incorporates many earlier articles, E. Werner, *The Sacred Bridge: Liturgical Parallels in Synagogue and Early Church* (New York: Schocken, 1970).

[60] For an application to the Christian monastic office, see such classic works as W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925) and C. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* (London: Oxford University Press, 1944).

[61] J. McKinnon, "On the Question of Psalmody in the Ancient Synagogue," *Early Music History* 6 (1986): 159–91; J. A. Smith, "First Century Christian Singing and its Relationship to Contemporary Jewish Religious Song," *Music and Letters* 75 (1994): 1–15; "The Ancient Synagogue, the Early Church and Singing" *Music and Letters* 65 (1984): 1–16. For a recent survey of much of the discussion, see Wendy J. Porter, "Misguided Missals: Is Early Christian Music Jewish or Is It Graeco-Roman?," in *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries* (ed. S. E. Porter and B. W. R. Pearson; JSNTSup 192/Roehampton Papers 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 202–27.

[62] To illustrate from E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), 202: "In 1 Cor 14 Paul refers to hymns and lessons. Since his view of group worship was almost certainly influenced by the synagogue services that he had attended, we may add singing to prayers and the reading and exposition of scripture as possible synagogal activities."

the biblical psalms and other poetry. Yet the opposite case can be made. Some practices of worship may have developed among this community in a quite different way than the 'synagogue pattern.' Talmon, for instance, has proposed that among the Covenantors (as among the Samaritans) the daily service of blessings was kept distinct from a public reading of scripture, as opposed to the synagogue practice of joining the two.[63] Furthermore, Annette Steudel recently has analyzed the problematic passage in CD 11:21–12:1 about the "house of prostration" (בית השתחות) as a reference to local sectarian places of worship.[64] If she is correct,[65] this would mean that certain features associated traditionally with Temple worship—the blowing of trumpets, prostration, purity requirements for entrance—were transferred to non-Temple worship. Indeed, the more we see the worship practiced by the community of the Scrolls as fundamentally priestly in orientation and rooted in the Temple milieu, the more likely it is that singing of psalms—a Temple practice—would have been carried over into a non-Temple context. Thus the fact that the psalms did not enter into synagogue liturgy until rather late may not in fact be that relevant for what was happening in this community whose worship was developing according to quite different norms.

III. *Final Considerations for Future Study*

The above consideration of the differing roles that psalmody played in the development of worship at Qumran and in the synagogue invites reflection on whether there are other ways in which a focus on broader issues of communal self-understanding and identity can supplement the examination of specific poetic texts and thus shed light on our basic question. Two such areas may be named here, although they cannot be explored in any depth at this time.

In a provocative article a few years ago, Devorah Dimant challenged us to move beyond attention to details and to pursue the elu-

---

[63] Talmon, *The World of Qumran from Within*, 241; also H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 191: "Readings from the Scripture, customary in synagogue communities, were never practiced at Essene prayer services."

[64] A. Steudel, "The Houses of Prostration CD XI,21–XII,1—Duplicates of the Temple," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 49–68.

[65] For counter arguments, see Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers*, 243–45.

sive core of the system that produced the Scrolls. She asked, "What was the essential, basic idea which held together the entire system and what was the self-image underlying it?" In her answer, she proposed that "one such clue may be found in the Qumranic self-image as an angel-like priestly community."[66] One of the essential tasks of the heavenly angels is to sing the divine praises in songs and hymns (Job 38:7; Pss 103:20–22, 148:1–3; Sir 42:16–17; *Jub* 2:3; 1QM 12:1; *Hymn to the Creator*). Thus, to the extent that both individuals and the community as a whole understood themselves to be 'angel-like,' song and praise, particularly in poetic form, could be expected to play a central role in their worship.

Secondly, in some recent scholarship, the paradigm of the Greco-Roman 'voluntary associations/*collegia*' has been used effectively to shed light on a variety of aspects of the community of the Scrolls.[67] Classical scholars emphasize the important role of music, musicians and choirs in the *collegia*, particularly in *collegia* apart from those of professional musicians.[68] Insofar as the Dead Sea Scrolls community drew some elements of its organization and structure from comparable Greco-Roman organizations, this suggests yet another possible influence that may have lead to a heightened role for music and singing in the community.

Although much work remains to be done on the actual texts of the poetic materials found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, I conclude by emphasizing that ultimately the determination of the use and function of the poetic corpus will not be resolved solely by analysis of the texts per se. Further study will demand closer attention to issues of concurrent developments in synagogues throughout the Second Temple period, the fundamental self-understanding that shaped the worldview of the authors of the Scrolls, and possible influences from parallel sociological structures in the Greco-Roman world.

---

[66] D. Dimant, "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community" in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East* (ed. B. D. Cooperman; Baltimore: University Press of Maryland, 1996), 95.

[67] J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson, *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Routledge, 1996); M. Weinfeld, *Organizational Pattern and Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman World* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

[68] See the examples collected and the bibliography supplied by S. G. Wilson, "Early Christian Music," *Common Life in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Graydon F. Snyder* (ed. J. V. Hills et al.; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1999), 390–401.

This page intentionally left blank

THE NUMBER OF PSALMS IN *1QHODAYOT*[a] AND SOME OF THEIR SECTIONS

Hartmut Stegemann
Göttingen University, Germany

Since the publication of E. L. Sukenik's edition of the *1QHodayot* scroll in 1954,[1] there has been some discussion concerning the number of psalms[2] in its eighteen columns and sixty-six fragments. Usually, little more than thirty different psalms are distinguished within Sukenik's columns 1–18.[3]

This article considers not only (A) the text of Sukenik's edition of the *Hodayot*, but also (B) the results of material reconstructions of the entire scroll, as well as (C) additional indications of psalm incipits or endings, deriving from the evidence of *4QHodayot*[a–f]. Section (D) notes a few hypothetically reconstructed psalm incipits, and Section (E) speculates on the possibility of additional distinct psalms. These observations result in a total of at least twenty-eight, at most thirty-four different psalms in the original scroll. Only twenty-two of them are discernable in Sukenik's columns 1–18. Finally, this article will make additional formal observations concerning some *sections* of psalms

---

[1] E. L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1954 [Hebrew], 1955 [English]).

[2] In this article the *Hodayot* are not called "(Thanksgiving) Hymns," but "psalms," according to the terminology used, e.g., by Bonnie Kittel in *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary* (SBLDS 50; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981); or by Eileen Schuller in her edition of the *4QHodayot* manuscripts, "4QHodayot 427–432," *Qumran Cave 4.X: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. G. Chazon et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 69–232, with plates IV–XIV. See also her article in this volume, pp. 173–189.

[3] Within Sukenik's columns 1–18, G. Vermes identified 25 distinct psalms (*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [Middlesex: Penguin, 1962], 149–201); S. Holm-Nielsen discerned 31 (*Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* [ATDan 2; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960], 6). J. Licht (*The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* [Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957], 55–178 [Hebrew]), and A. Dupont-Sommer ("Le Livre des Hymnes découvert près de la mer Morte (1QH): Traduction intégrale avec introduction et notes," *Semitica* 7 (1957): 1–120, pp. 119–120) found 32. A. van Selms, (*De Rol der Lofprijzingen: Een der Dode Zee-Rollen vertaald en toegelicht* [Baarn: Bosch and Keuning, 1957], 190–91), and G. Morawe (*Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von Qumrân: Studien zur gattungsgeschichtlichen Einordnung der Hodajôth* [Theologische Arbeiten 16; Berlin 1961], 166) identified 33.

in the *Hodayot* scroll (F), which (G) may support the idea of a special collection of "Teacher's Psalms" within *1QHodayot*[a].

A. *Psalm Incipits According to Sukenik's Edition*

There are only fourteen clearly discernable psalm incipits in Sukenik's edition of the *Hodayot*. Thirteen of them fall within its columns 1–12 with an additional one in its columns 13–18. I list these incipits here according to the new column and line numbering of *1QHodayot*[a] that has resulted from the material reconstruction of the entire scroll.[4] Throughout this article, I indicate the corresponding column and line numbers of Sukenik's edition in parentheses following the new numbers.[5] These incipits are: **VI 34** (14:23), **X 22** (2:20), **X 33** (2:31), **XI 20** (3:19), **XI 38** (3:37), **XII 6** (4:5), **XIII 7** (5:5), **XIII 22** (5:20), **XV 9** (7:6), **XV 29** (7:26), **XV 37** (7:34), **XVI 5** (8:4), **XVII 38** (9:37), and **XIX 6** (11:3). Since these incipits are generally acknowledged by scholars of the *Hodayot,* there is no need for further discussion of the evidence.[6]

---

[4] See below, *Appendix 1*. A previous version of *Appendix 1* was published with my article, "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; exec. ed. G. Marquis; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 272–84.

[5] *Editor's note*: For the sake of accuracy in transmitting the material, we have retained in this article Professor Stegemann's format for citing columns and line numbers, although this differs from the convention followed in the rest of the volume.

[6] The only real problem in this respect is the incipit of the psalm in line XVII 38 (9:37). Sukenik's edition did not note any text in the opening first and second third of this line. H. Bardtke, S. Holm-Nielsen, M. Mansoor, and M. Delcor refrained from any textual restoration. See Bardtke, "Die Loblieder von Qumrân," *TLZ* 81 (1956): 149–54, 589–604, 715–24, p. 720; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 170; Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated, With an Introduction* (STDJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 162; Delcor, *Les hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot): Texte hébreu, introduction, traduction, commentaire* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1962), 222. All other scholars restore here (א)אודכה אדוני כי[, some at the very beginning of the line: van Selms, *De Rol der Lofprijzingen*, 95; Dupont-Sommer, "Le Livre des Hymnes," 73; J. Carmignac, "Les hymnes," in J. Carmignac and P. Guilbert, *Les textes de Qumran*, (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1961), 1:248; Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 182; J. Maier, *Die Qumran–Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (3 vols.; Uni-Taschenbücher 1862–63, 1916; Munich: Reinhardt, 1995–96), 1:95; and F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–98), 1:184. Others indent the reconstructed phrase, in combination with the text at the end of this line: Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 150; A. M. Habermann, *Megillot Midbar Yehudah* (Tel Aviv:

B. *Incipits Recovered Through the Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot*ª

I completed a material reconstruction of the entire *Hodayot* scroll in 1963;[7] a second reconstruction, accomplished independently of my own results, was achieved by Émile Puech twenty-five years later.[8] Our reconstructions are nearly identical, except that Puech was able to position several additional minor fragments,[9] and also to situate some further fragments of Sukenik's *Hodayot* scroll that are missing from the *editio princeps*.[10] Sukenik's columns 1–18 have now been arranged in a new order, and most of his sixty-six fragments have been restored to their original locations within this scroll.

These material reconstructions indicate that the *1QHodayot* scroll was produced from seven sheets of leather with four columns on each sheet, resulting in a total of twenty-eight columns for the entire scroll. Sukenik's column 17 is actually the final one on the opening sheet, i.e., column IV of the original scroll; next come Sukenik's

---

Maḥbarot Lesifrut, 1959), 125; E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran. Hebräisch und deutsch: mit masoretischer Punktation. Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (Munich: Kösel; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964; 4th ed. 1986), 148; and M. Abegg, "Thanksgiving Hymns," in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (ed. M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook; San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 84–114, p. 105. However, at the very beginning of this line there are indeed some letter traces (see Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, plate 43), which exclude both suggestions and are clearly the remains of בׄ[רו]ךְ אׄתֹּ[ה אדוני (and not of . . . בׄ[רו]ךְ אׄתֹּ[ה אל; if the latter were the case, the top of the ל would still be visible). The only scholar who has previously suggested a psalm incipit here, beginning with ברוך, is É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (*EBib* n.s. 21/22; Paris: Libr. Lecoffre [J. Gabalda], 1993), 2:381.

[7] By arrangement with John Strugnell in 1964, this reconstruction was to have been published together with his *4QHodayot* manuscripts. Unfortunately, this evidence has become accessible only recently: see Schuller, DJD 29.69–232. I am currently preparing the full text of my reconstruction for publication.

[8] See É. Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du rouleau des hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 38–55. Some of his results are discussed in detail in "Un Hymne essénien en partie retrouvé et les Béatitudes: 1QH V 12–VI 18 (= col. XIII–XIV 7) et 4QBéat," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 59–88; and *La croyance*.

[9] E.g., Sukenik's fragments 30, 31, 43, 44, 54, and 63.

[10] All these fragments are included in *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche* (ed. E. Tov with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann; Leiden: Brill, 1993): see the list of SHR(ine of the Book) photographs in the *Companion Volume to the Dead Sea Scrolls Microfiche Edition* (ed. E. Tov with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann; Leiden: Brill and IDC, 1995), 24. Three of the fragments had been published by É. Puech, "Un Hymne essénien," 60–82 (with planche I on p. 61). These are: 1QHª V 20–21 (13:3–4) middle (see SHR 4277: reverse); VI 19–22 (14:8–11) right (see SHR 4275), and VII 37–39 (15:24–26) middle (see SHR 4276: reverse). Another fragment is noted in "Quelques aspects," 50: XX 31 (12:28) left (see SHR 4251).

columns 13–16, as columns V–VIII of the original scroll. Sheets 3, 4, and 5 contain Sukenik's columns 1–12, now relabelled as columns IX–XX, while the eight concluding columns of this scroll (XXI–XXVIII) have been reconstructed from the different parts of Sukenik's column 18 and most of his fragments 1–9 + 45–66. The results of those material reconstructions, with the new column and line numbers, are set out in *Appendix 1*.

In addition, Émile Puech and I realized independently that the *Hodayot* fragments of 1Q35, published by J. T. Milik in DJD, do not belong to Sukenik's scroll, but to a second *Hodayot* scroll from cave 1.[11] These two fragments contain the remains of the texts of three psalms in the very same sequence as Sukenik's scroll, corresponding to the text of XV 30–XVI 14 (7:27–8:13).[12] Therefore, the two fragments of 1Q35 have been relabelled *1QHodayot*^{b}, while Sukenik's scroll is now designated *1QHodayot*^{a}.

The material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*^{a} provides us with four psalm incipits in addition to those already known from Sukenik's edition:

1. *1QH^{a} V 1 (top of Sukenik's column 13)*

The text of 1QH^{a} V 1–11 is completely lost, due to the decay of the leather in the top part of the scroll. However, the evidence at the end of the previous column requires the start of a new psalm at the very beginning of column V.

1QH^{a} V–XVIII (Sukenik's columns 13–16 + 1–10) originally each had 41 lines of writing. The opening sheet of the scroll with columns I–IV presumably would have had the same number of lines per column. In column IV (Sukenik's column 17), line 41 is totally blank, i.e., a dry line without any script;[13] it is preserved from about the midst of the column onwards to the left margin, while the line before

[11] "35. Recueil de Cantiques d'action de grâces (1QH)," D. Barthélemy, O. P. and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 136–37.

[12] See also É. Puech, "Quelques aspects," 39–40; cf. *idem*, "Restauration d'un texte hymnique à partir de trois manuscrits fragmentaires: 1QH^{a} xv 37–xvi 4 (vii 37–viii 3), 1Q35 (H^{b}) 1, 9–14, 4Q428 (H^{b}) 7," *RevQ* 16 (1995): 543–59; and E. M. Schuller, "A Thanksgiving Hymn from 4QHodayot^{b} (4Q428 7)," *RevQ* 16 (1995): 527–41.

[13] This dry line is not visible on plate 51 of Sukenik's edition, but it is in the original scroll.

ends with the phrase עד[לעולמי (IV 40 [17:28]), which suggests the *end* of a psalm. Furthermore, the remains of 4Q428 (4QH[b]) 1 1–3 probably overlap with 1QH[a] IV 39–40 (17:27–28). The final line of this fragment contains the words עד לעולמ]י ׄיכה[, with a clear bottom margin below. This text may well have ended 4QH[b] X (or XI), with a new psalm starting at the top line of the next column.[14]

Only following the rearrangement of Sukenik's columns, which clarified the number of lines in the columns as well as their order, has it been possible to identify this psalm incipit.[15]

2. *1QH[a] V 12 (frg. 15 i 3)*

As noted above, lines 1–11 of 1QH[a] V are totally lost because of the decay of the leather. The main part of this column, V 18–38, is represented by Sukenik's column 13:1–21. The right portion of Sukenik's frg. 15, containing the remains of 6 lines, has now been placed adjoining the right upper edge of Sukenik's column 13, with text close to the beginnings of the original lines V 12–17; the ends of the original lines V 12–20 are preserved on the left portion of Sukenik's frg. 15 column 1. Additional text for this column is provided by Sukenik's frgs. 31 1–3 (as V 13–15); 17 1–7 (V 15–21); 20 1–5 (V 23–27, the ends of the lines); and 33 1–3 (V 38–40, midst of column); however, this text is not relevant to the present discussion.

Most significantly, Émile Puech was able to identify the text in the top line of the right piece of Sukenik's frg. 15 as the beginning of a new psalm, containing the words [מזמור למ]שכיל להתנפל לפנ]י אל.[16] Similar language occurs in other psalm incipits (e.g., VII 21 [15:8 + frg. 10 10]; XX 7 [12:4]; and XXV 34 [frg. 8 10]). Puech's discovery implies that the psalm lost from the top of this column had no more than 10 or 11 lines (V 1–11).[17]

---

[14] See Schuller, DJD 29.133 and plate VII.

[15] The same conclusion was reached by Puech, "Quelques aspects," 52: "un (?) autre hymne s'intercalait a la col. V 1–10/11."

[16] See Puech, "Un Hymne essénien," 61 and 63, and his drawing on p. 65. The possibility of a new psalm beginning in 1QH[a] V 12 (frg. 15 i 3) has been accepted by E. M. Schuller and L. Ditommaso, "A Bibliography of the Hodayot, 1948–1996," *DSD* 4 (1997): 63; as well as by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1:150.

[17] Line V 11 may have been either a complete *vacat* or written to less than half of its length.

3. *1QH[a] VII 21 (15:8)*

The main part of the original column VII is represented by Sukenik's column 15:1–26, now VII 14–39. Sukenik's frg. 32 1–3 has been joined to the bottom of this column, forming the beginnings of lines VII 40–41. Lines VII 12–21, from the middle of the column to its left margin, are represented by Sukenik's frg. 10 1–10, enriched at its left edge by the four lines of frg. 42 (now VII 12–15) and by the four lines of frg. 34 (now VII 16–19). This combination of Sukenik's frgs. 10, 42, and 34 is attested also by 4Q427 (4QH[a]) V 6–11 (frg. 8 i 6–11); however, 4QH[a] V lacks any text corresponding to the remains of Sukenik's column 15:1–7.[18]

The material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*[a] confirms that the beginnings of the lines of Sukenik's column 15:1–8 are continued—after a broad gap due to the decay of the leather—by the textual remains of his frg. 10 3–10 (now VII 14–21). Line VII 20 (15:7) starts with the word כי and continues after the gap with ב]הפלא מאדה (frg. 10 9) followed by a clear *vacat*, while the next line (VII 21 [15:8]) starts with ברוך].[19] If we had only the evidence of *1QHodayot*[a], we might consider the possibilities that ברוך introduces *either* (a) a new psalm *or* (b) a section within a psalm. However, since the text corresponding to VII 14–20 in 4QH[a] 8 i 6–12 is followed in 8 i 13–21 by another psalm (not discernible within the existing text of *1QHodayot*[a]),[20] the *vacat* in the middle of 1QH[a] VII 20 (frg. 10 9; = 4QH[a] 8 i 12) must likewise signify the real end of that psalm.

Furthermore, the few letters surviving at about the middle of the line in 1QH[a] VII 21 (frg. 10 10) may be completed to read שיר] מזמור למשכיל;[21] i.e., phrasing that characterizes the introductory line of a new psalm (cf. 1QH[a] V 12 [frg. 15 i 3] and XXV 34 [frg. 8 10]).

---

[18] See Schuller, DJD 29.109–116.

[19] Sukenik's edition has only]ב at the beginning of this line, completed as ב]רוך אתה by Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*, 164; or as ברו]ך by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1:154. Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 195, and Carmignac, "Les hymnes," 160, regard the text from at least lines VII 22 (15:9) onwards as belonging to a psalm different from that of the column before.

[20] See the edition of this psalm in Schuller, DJD 29.109–116.

[21] The word מזמור is added above the line after שיר and was reproduced in Sukenik's edition erroneously as מבין (frg. 10 10). The correct reading, מזמור, appears only in Puech, *La croyance*, 385, and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 154. Schuller and Ditommaso, "Bibliography," 65, also allow the possibility that 1QH[a] VII 21 (18:5) might represent the incipit of a new psalm.

The only remaining problem is suggesting an appropriate text for the long gap in the beginning of 1QH[a] VII 21 (15:8). I propose there ברו]ך אתה אל הרחמים ב[שיר מזמור למשכ]יל with אל written in ancient Hebrew letters as in the continuation of this psalm at VII 38 (15:25). This would fill in the gap perfectly. But other textual suggestions are also possible.

The psalm that begins in 1QH[a] VII 21 (15:8) should have ended somewhere in the lost bottom lines of the next column, i.e., in VIII 38–41 (16:20–23). Some scholars have attributed the text of Sukenik's column 16:1–20, now VIII 19–38, to a psalm distinct from that of column VII, even distributing the remains of those lines between two separate psalms.[22] However, VIII 26 (16:8) marks the beginning, not of a new psalm, but only of the next *section* of the psalm before (see the arguments for this decision in paragraph F.5 below).

In the past, we could not determine exactly how many lines had been lost between VII 39 (15:26) and VIII 19 (16:1). There could have been at least twenty lost lines, perhaps including the beginning of a new psalm. The material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*[a] reduces this gap to only seven lost lines. The beginnings of lines VII 40–41 are now provided by Sukenik's frg. 32 1–2, the text of which excludes the possibility of a new psalm incipit within those lines. The text of the right half of lines VIII 12–19 is now supplied by Sukenik's frg. 12 1–7, which excludes the start of a new psalm in those lines as well. Furthermore, the ends of lines VIII 8–16 are preserved on Sukenik's frg. 13 1–9, where all lines are written to their very ends. Therefore, only VIII 1–8 could theoretically have included the beginning of a new psalm. The decisive factor is that the new text of lines VIII 8–18 (Sukenik's frgs. 13 1–9 + 12 1–7) continues the topics of VII 21–41 (15:8–26 + frg. 32 1–2), so we no longer need to speculate that a new psalm begins in the remaining gap between the two columns.

4. *1QH[a] XXV 34 (Frg. 8 10)*

The material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*[a] shows that the beginnings of lines XXV 25–36 are represented by Sukenik's frg. 8 1–12, while the ends of lines XXV 29–37 survive on Sukenik's frg. 7 i 1–9. Line

[22] Only a very few scholars, like Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 234 n. 1, and Carmignac, "Les hymnes," 164 n. 1, discuss this problem at all.

XXV 34 starts with למשכיל מזמ]ור. This textual evidence can be enriched with the help of 4QH[a] II 18 (frg. 3 4), which continues the text of XXV 34 as follows: למשכיל מזמ]ור שיר להתנפל.[23] This *must* be the beginning of a new psalm, because 4QH[a] II 15–17(= frg. 3 1–3, the preceding lines) contains the ending of a psalm corresponding to 1QH[a] XX 4–6 (12:1–3); i.e., a psalm that falls at quite a different place in the *1QHodayot*[a] psalm sequence.

The psalm starting in 1QH[a] XXV 34 (frg. 8 10) originally had 54 lines and ended in XXVII 3. Its parallel text in *4QHodayot*[a] covered columns II 18–V 3 (frgs. 3 4–8 i 3).[24] This same text was also the first psalm in the scroll 4Q431 (4QH[e]), and still partly survives there in columns I 12–20 and II 11–19.[25] In any case, even without the help of the 4Q evidence, there can be no doubt that 1QH[a] XXV 34 marks the beginning of a new psalm.

C. *Additional Psalm Incipits Deriving From the Evidence of 4QHodayot*

The evidence of the *4QHodayot* manuscripts provides us with five more psalm incipits, or at least helps us determine their locations in *1QHodayot*[a]. Some of these incipits had already been suggested by previous commentators; now it is possible to locate them precisely.

The decisive arguments for the exact placement of some psalm incipits in *1QHodayot*[a] are provided by the material reconstruction of the scroll *4QHodayot*[a]. The remains of the latter scroll represent five separate psalms, in a sequence other than that of *1QHodayot*[a]. The correspondences are:

	4QHodayot[a]		*1QHodayot*[a]
1	I 1–II 17	=	XIX 6–XX 6 (11:3–12:3)
2	II 18–V 3	=	XXV 34–XXVII 3 (frg. 8 10ff)
3	V 4–V 12	=	VII 12–VII 20 (15:1–7 + frg. 10 1–9)
4	V 13–VI 9	=	lost (within cols. I–III or XXVII–XXVIII?)
5	VI 10–XI 5	=	XX 7–XXII 42 (12:4–frg. 4 20)

[23] See Schuller, DJD 29.91–93. The underlined letters survive in *4QHodayot*[a].

[24] For the discussion of the end of this psalm in *4QHodayot*[a] see paragraph C.3 below.

[25] Schuller, DJD 29.199–208.

This alignment of texts allows us to locate three psalm incipits, at 1QH[a] VII 12 (frg. 10 1), XX 7 (12:4), and XXVII 4 (lost); see also the discussion of XXIII 1 (18:1) in section D below. The evidence of 4Q432 (4QpapH[f]) yields two more incipits.

1. *1QH[a] VII 12 (Frg. 10 1)*

For the textual evidence on 1QH[a] VII 12–20, see the previous discussion of VII 21 (15:8). The question is where the psalm that ends in VII 20 (15:7 with frg. 10 9) began. Lines VII 1–11 are totally lost by decay of the leather, with the possible exception of a trace of a final *mem* about the middle of line VII 11 (frg. 10, above its line 1).[26] In the previous column, a new psalm starts with VI 34–41 (14:23–28, with frg. 19 1–3 at the beginning of lines 39–41), which may have continued in the top lines of column VII. But, whether or not VII 12–20 is the final part of this psalm is still an open question.

In *4QHodayot*[a] the text corresponding to 1QH[a] VII 14–20 (15:1–8) is V 6–12 (frg. 8 i 6–12).[27] Textually, the length of the lines in both manuscripts is the same. The lost line, 4QH[a] V 5 (= 1QH[a] VII 13) cannot have been the opening line of a new psalm. On the other hand, the psalm *4QH*[a] II 18–IV 23 (= 1QH[a] XXV 34–XXVI 42) must have continued into the top part of column V and should have ended there in lines 1, 2, or 3.[28] The final section of this psalm started about the middle of line IV 22 (= 1QH[a] XXVI 41); i.e., not more than 1.5 lines of it can be located before the end of column IV. The two preceding sections in *4QHodayot*[a] had about 5 lines (IV 7–11) and 11.5 lines (IV 12–22), respectively. Therefore, I speculate that the final section of this psalm continued to V 3 and had 1.5 + 2.5 = 4 lines, the minimum amount of text for a section of equal length.

Correspondingly, in *1QHodayot*[a], the psalm starting in VI 34–41 (14:23–28) would have continued at least to VII 9, at most to VII 11, while the psalm ending with VII 13–20 could have started in lines VII 10, VII 11, or VII 12. I favor the last possibility, given

[26] This letter trace was found on plate 56 of Sukenik's edition by Puech, "Quelques aspects," 46 n. 28 ("traces de 2 lettres"), and later identified as the bottom part of a ם. Schuller offers it in her edition, see DJD 29.109 and 112.

[27] See Schuller, DJD 29.109–114.

[28] See Schuller, DJD 29.81 and 113.

the quantity of text required in *4QHodayot*[a] at the top of column V for the end of the final section of the preceding psalm.

It is at least *possible* to reconstruct the incipit of a new psalm in 1QH[a] VII 12, using some wording such as [ברוך אתה אל עליון אשר במעין]גבׄורׄתכה השכלתנׄוׄ. If there is indeed a trace of a final *mem* in the middle of the line before, it could suit עולם, עלמים, or the third person plural masculine suffixes, ־ם or ־הם at the end of a psalm, with the left part of line VII 11 remaining *vacat*. But these textual reconstructions are highly speculative.[29]

2. *1QH[a] XX 7 (12:4)*

4Q427 (4QH[a]) V 13–VI 9 (frg. 8 i 13–ii 9) offers the remains of a psalm that has no textual overlap with the surviving columns and fragments of *1QHodayot*[a],[30] but that theoretically could have been located in the decayed parts of its columns I–III or XXVII–XVIII. This new psalm is followed in 4QH[a] VI 10–21 by the opening sections of another psalm, which textually corresponds to 1QH[a] XX 7–21 (12:4–18); the incipit of this psalm in 4QH[a] VI 10, למשכיל]הודותׄ ותפלה,[31] corresponds to [למשכי]ל ה[ו]דות ותפלה in 1QH[a] XX 7 (12:4). Furthermore, the text corresponding to 1QH[a] XX 5–6 (12:2–3) may now be identified as the end of a separate psalm, also found as 4QH[a] II 15–17 (frg. 3 1–3); it is followed there by the psalm II 18–V 3 = 1QH[a] XXV 34–XXVII 3.[32] Without this *4QHodayot*[a] evidence we could not be sure that there was a transition from one psalm to the next in the top lines of 1QH[a] column XX (12).[33] But this is now attested without any doubt.

[29] Schuller correctly states in DJD 29.111, n. 51: “Frg. 10 is written in a different orthography (־כה suffix instead of ־ך) than the rest of the first eight columns of 1QH[a], which suggests that it may have been copied from a different source.” Thus, even independently of the *4QHodayot*[a] evidence, the psalm in 1QH[a] VII 12–20 (13:1–7 + frg. 10 1–9) differs from that in VI 34–41 (14:23–28 + frg. 19 1–3).

[30] See Schuller, DJD 29.109–116.

[31] Ibid., 110.

[32] Ibid., 91.

[33] According to Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 196f and 199 n. 1; Carmignac, “Les hymnes,” 262; Delcor, *Les hymnes de Qumran*, 245; and Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*, 156, Sukenik’s lines 12:1ff (now XX 4ff) should continue a psalm from the column before. Van Selms, *De Rol der Lofprijzingen*, 107 and 109f; Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 172; Dupont-Sommer, “Le Livre des Hymnes,” 81f; Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 64, 90 n. 396, and 166; and Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 188, postulate the beginning of a new psalm somewhere between XIX 41 (11:38) and XX 4 (12:1). Only when Puech placed Sukenik’s frg. 54 1–3 at the beginning of lines XX 4–6

3. *1QH[a] XXVII 4*

In *4QHodayot*[a], the long psalm that started in II 18 (frg. 3 4) ended in the top lines of column V, probably in V 3.[34] The corresponding text in *1QHodayot*[a] runs from XXV 34 (frg. 8 10) to the top lines of column XXVII, probably to XXVII 3,[35] but the top of this column is now lost because of the decay of the scroll. Nevertheless, at least one more psalm must have been included in *1QHodayot*[a], since the material reconstruction of this scroll places its combined frgs. 61 and 62 at the beginnings of the lines XXVII 12–14, and frg. 48 at the middle of XXVIII 11–15.[36] Whether or not there was more than one psalm in the two final columns of this scroll will be discussed below. At the least, the psalm represented by Sukenik's frgs. 61 and 62 in 1QH[a] XXVII 12–14 would presumably have started in XXVII 4.

4. *1QH[a] IX 1 (top of Sukenik's column 1)*

The scroll 4Q432 (4QpapH[f]) was damaged by decay, rolled with the beginning of its text inside and the end of its text outside.[37] The material reconstruction of this scroll yields the results that (a) its columns I–IV contained only the "Creation Psalm" of 1QH[a] IX 1 (1:1 [lost])–X 4 (2:2); and that (b) at the beginning of this text one turn of the scroll took about 5 cm. No further column could have preceded this psalm in 4Q432. Therefore, the "Creation Psalm" of *1QHodayot*[a] must have started in IX 1, not in the column(s) before.[38]

(12:1–3) did he notice that those lines represent the final part of a psalm; and that thus, another psalm should start in XX 7 (12:4) with ודות ותפלה ה]ל[למשכי]; see Puech, "Quelques aspects," 49–50. This opinion is now shared by Maier, *Die Qumran–Essener*, 103; Abegg, "Thanksgiving Hymns," 108; and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 190.

[34] See Schuller, DJD 29.81 and 113; cf. section B.4 above.

[35] By chance the final lines of the columns 4QH[a] IV 23 (frg. 7 ii 23) and 1QH[a] XXVI 42 had the very same text, which should continue in the next columns with about the same number of lines.

[36] Puech, "Quelques aspects," 51, placed Sukenik's fragment 48 left of fragment 7 ii 1–13, now XXVI 26–38, in the *bottom part* of column XXVII, perhaps lines 30–34 (= fragment 7 ii 5–8), while he left the combined fragments 61 + 62 dislocated (see there n. 37). But to my eyes the right edges of those fragments are very similar to the right edges of the combined fragments 9 and 50 (now XXIV 4–17 left) as well as of the combined fragments 46 i and 51 (now XXV 11–16 left). Therefore, all those fragments should come from the *upper parts* of the columns after column XXVI.

[37] See Schuller, DJD 29.210 and the drawing there, foldout plate III.

[38] In column IX (Sukenik's column 1), the second person masculine singular suffix

5. *1QH[a] X 5 (2:3)*

In 4Q432 the top line of column V (frg. 3 1) reads [אודכה אד]וֹנָי כָּ[י] ישרתה בלבבי כול[מעשי עולה], while lines 2–5 overlap textually with 1QH[a] X 6–8 (2:4–6).[39] In the past, most scholars have suggested that the psalm represented at least by X 6–21 (2:4–19) is different from the "Creation Psalm" in the column before. But no one was able to identify where in the top lines of column X the transition from one psalm to the next took place.

Even though the line X 4 (2:2) is written rather close to its end, the next line in *1QHodayot*[a] should have started—after a *vacat* of not much more than 2 cm—with [אודכה אדוני כי ישרתה בלב]בָּי כול מעשי עולה,[40] as the beginning of the psalm that ends in X 21 (2:19).

D. *Psalm Incipits Hypothetically Suggested*

Three additional psalm incipits may be hypothetically proposed in *1QHodayot*[a]:

1. *1QH[a] I 1 (Beginning of the Scroll)*

The material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*[a] shows that the first sheet of the scroll had four columns of text, its last column being represented by Sukenik's column 17 plus his frg. 14, now IV 12–40. At present no fragment has been assigned to column I, although column II is attested by Sukenik's frgs. 23 (= II 12–16 left) and 16 (II 24–32 left), and column III by frgs. 21 (III 15–19 middle) and 11 (III 23–33 middle). Nevertheless, independent of the problem of how many different psalms may have been included in columns I–IV, the incipit of the first psalm would have been in I 1.[41]

---

is usually written ־כה, in contrast to the preceding column VIII (Sukenik 16), which uses ־ך, cf. above n. 29. Therefore, this "Creation Psalm" cannot continue a psalm which might have started in VII 21 (15:8) or in VIII 26 (16:8).

[39] See Schuller, DJD 29.215.

[40] The possibility that this psalm began with ברוך אתה אדוני is excluded by the fact that in 4QH[f] V 1 ישרתה [י]כָּ וֹנָי[אד] is so close to the right margin of its column that the remaining gap is too short to fill in ברוך אתה.

[41] The scroll would have started in I 1 with the text of its first psalm without any heading or introductory passage, like the beginning of the biblical psalter.

2. *1QH[a] XI 6 (3:5)*

Most scholars are of the opinion that the psalm represented by 1QH[a] XI 7–19 (3:6–18) does not continue the psalm in X 33–41 (2:31–39), but represents a separate composition.[42] At least the first line of column XI (Sukenik 3) must have continued the psalm of the column before.[43] But where in lines XI 2–6 (3:1–5) could the incipit of a new psalm have come?

The few scholars who have discussed this problem[44] have offered two primary candidates for the opening of a new psalm: XI 4 (3:3) and XI 6 (3:5). In any case, the opening line of the new psalm should have been indented, as lines XI 2–5 (3:1–4) are written rather close to the left margin of this column.

The surviving text of line XI 4 (3:3), from about the middle of this line to the left margin is [אֵלי האירותה פני לִבְרִיתְכָה, perhaps introduced by כי(א) אתה]אֵלי or by ואתה]אֵלי. This אֵלי 'my God,' cannot belong to the opening phrase of a new psalm.[45] Furthermore, the terminology of the next line [לכה בכבוד עולם עם כול] fits better at the end of a psalm than in an opening section.

Therefore, line XI 6 (3:5) is evidently the better candidate for the opening of a new psalm.[46] The psalm would have begun about 2 cm from the right margin of this column, with the text [אודכה אדוני כי(א) אמ]ת פיכה ותצילני מ[סוד שוא] ומ[ ]ים/[הוש]עתה נפשׁ[י. Compare (a) the incipits of all other psalms from X 5 (2:3) to XVI 5 (8:4), which read (א)אודכה אדוני כי; (b) (א)כי אמת פיכה (XIX 10 [11:7] and XXII 13f [frg. 1 i 9 + column 19:9]); and (c) a nominal sentence—

---

[42] The only explicit exception is Carmignac, "Les hymnes," 191f, who regards X 33–XI 19 (2:31–3:18) as just one psalm.

[43] The text at the very end of the line 1QH[a] X 41 (2:39) is לש[ון כלמודיכה ובמשׁ[פט].

[44] Van Selms, *De Rol der Lofprijzingen*, 44, and Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 78, did not discuss this problem. Others, like Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 166, Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 157, and Abegg, "Thanksgiving Hymns," 93, are of the opinion that the psalm which ends XI 19 (3:18) should have started somewhere in the more or less lost top lines of this column.

[45] Habermann, *Megillot*, 118, neglected the letter-trace before לי and proposed here a new psalm beginning [אודכה אדוני כי(א) לי האירותה פניך], which is syntactically and palaeographically difficult. This suggestion is discussed as a possibility by S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 52 n. 1.

[46] This suggestion was favored by A. Dupont-Sommer, "Le Livre des Hymnes," albeit his textual reconstruction was too long and somewhat difficult, see there p. 36 n. 1; it is now shared by Puech, "Quelques aspects," 52.

instead of a verbal sentence—after אודכה אדוני כיא in the psalm just beforehand, X 33 (2:31).

3. *1QH[a] XXIII 1 (18:1)*

In *1QHodayot*[a], no incipit of a psalm survived within the long stretch—237 lines of text in more than 5 columns—between XX 7 (12:4) and XXV 34 (frg. 8 10). Just half of this text—120 lines in *1QHodayot*[a]—was occupied by the long psalm found also in 4QH[a] VI 10–XI 5,[47] its parallel text in *1QHodayot*[a] ending in the lost three bottom lines of column XXII. Furthermore, in 4Q428 (*4QHodayot*[b]), its column LVI, the lower part of which is preserved in its frg. 14,[48] may well have started with the text corresponding to 1QH[a] XXIII 1, which was the top line of that column (XXIII 2–17 = Sukenik's column 18:1–16). The rather fragmentary text surviving from the top of column XXIII (18) is appropriate for the opening section of a new psalm, while the text surviving in the bottom part of the previous column—XXII 22–39 (frg. 4 1–20)—could represent the final sections of another psalm. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest the incipit of a new psalm at the beginning of the line 1QH[a] XXIII 1.

E. *Additional Psalms in 1QHodayot[a]*

In addition to those psalms already discussed above, there may have been others, particularly in the badly damaged four opening and two final columns of *1QHodayot*[a], and perhaps in the better-preserved parts of this scroll as well.

---

[47] See Schuller, DJD 29.110–119. The last piece of textual evidence that has been placed in 4QH[a] is column IX 7 = frg. 12 = 1QH[a] XXI 36 (frg. 3:16) (see ibid., 81–82 for summary table). The remainder of 1QH[a] XX 37–XXII 42 should have ended in 4QH[a] XI 5, which is now totally lost. One cannot exclude the possibility that the lost lines 1QH[a] XXI 39–42 + XXII 1–4 contained the beginning of a new psalm. But there is also no need to propose two different psalms: the text of 1QH[a] XXII 5–13 (frg. 1 i 1–13 + [col.] 19:8–10) suits better the continuation of the psalm in the column before than the opening lines of a new psalm. Concerning the psalm which starts in 1QH[a] XX 7 (12:4), Puech is also of the opinion that "cet hymne ou série pourrait aller jusqu'en XX 34," "Quelques aspects," 53. See below paragraph F.11 for further discussion.

[48] See Schuller, DJD 29.149f.

1. *Additional psalms within 1QH[a] I 1–IV 40 (IV = Sukenik's column 17)*

The material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*[a] demonstrates that the opening sheet of this scroll had 4 columns, or a total of 163 lines.[49] It is rather unlikely that these columns contained only one very long psalm. However, the fragments surviving from the opening sheet do not help to decide how many different psalms could once be found in this part of the scroll.[50]

The lengths of the psalms on the next sheet are:

1QH[a]	V 1–11 (Sukenik: lost)	=	11 lines
	V 12–VI 33 (13:1–14:22)	=	63 lines
	VI 34–VII 11 (14:23–15:top)	=	19 lines
	VII 12–20 (15:1–7 + frg. 10)	=	9 lines
	VII 21–VIII 41 (15:8–16:20)	=	62 lines

Based on these numbers, one might suggest at least 3 separate psalms with about 50–60 lines each, but not more than 6 different psalms with about 20–30 lines each, within the scroll's 163 opening lines. Nevertheless, these calculations are highly speculative.[51]

2. *Not more than one psalm within 1QH[a] XIII 22–XV 8 (5:20–7:5)*

From the psalm incipit in 1QH[a] XIII 22 (5:20), to the end of the text before the next clear incipit in XV 9 (7:6), there are 69 lines. The bottom parts of columns XIII and XIV (Sukenik's columns 5 and 6) clearly contain no psalm incipits, but the three opening lines of both column XIV (6) and column XV (7) are completely lost due to the decay of the scroll. Theoretically, there could have been incipits of new psalms in both gaps, and there are, indeed, some scholars who have considered these possibilities.

On the other hand, the short text surviving in XV 1–8 (7:1–5) does not seem likely to represent the main part of a separate psalm,[52] but is better regarded as the end of the psalm in the column before.

---

[49] Line IV 41 contains no writing, see paragraph B.1 above.

[50] At minimum, there are no clear incipits or endings of psalms or *vacat* lines in II 12–16 (frg. 23 1–4), II 24–32 (frg. 16 1–9), III 15–19 (frg. 21 1–5), and III 23–33 (frg. 11 1–11).

[51] The only definitive way to attribute the fragments from the first sheet of this scroll to *different* psalms may be future form-critical studies.

[52] This was advocated by Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 120f, A. Dupont-Sommer, "Le Livre des Hymnes," 56f, and Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 42 and 166.

The text surviving in XIV 4–6 (6:1–3)[53] continues and concludes the lamentations of XIII 24–41 (5:22–39), while the next *section* of this psalm clearly starts with the words ואתה אלי] / גליתה אוזני במ[ו]סר מוכיחי צדק (XIV 6–7 (6:3–4). Therefore, I prefer to consider 1QH^a XIII 22–XV 8 (5:20–7:5) as one long psalm.[54]

3. *Not more than one psalm within 1QH^a XVI 5–XVII 36 (8:4–9:36)*

From the psalm incipit in 1QH^a XVI 5 (8:4) to the clear end of a psalm in XVII 36 (9:36) there is a long text of 73 lines. A few scholars had suggested in the past that the text of column XVII (9) does not continue the psalm before, but represents a new one.[55]

In my opinion, this is impossible. The final line of column XVI, XVI 41 (8:40), ends with [אנוש לאי[ן]; therefore, the opening line of the next column *must* have continued the text of the column before. The text preserved in the next two lines, XVII 2–3 (9:2–3), does not fit the patterns, otherwise attested in the *Hodayot*, for the openings of new psalms. Therefore, 1QH^a XVI 5–XVII 36 (8:4–9:36) *must* be regarded as *one long psalm* with a total of 73 lines.

Prior to the material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*^{a}, it was impossible to identify 1QH^a XVII 1 (9:1) as the preserved top line of this column. As long as one could speculate on the possibility of one or more lines at the top of this column, a transition from one psalm to the next within those lines could not be excluded. As it is, *4QHodayot* fragments convincingly bridge the gaps between the bottom lines of columns in *1QHodayot*^{a} and the top lines in the next columns, eliminating the possibility that those lines begin a new psalm.[56]

---

[53] The incipit of a new psalm within those lines was proposed by van Selms, *De Rol der Lofprijzingen*, 69, Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 109f, Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 83 and 166, and Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 168.

[54] 1QH^a XIII 20–XV 8 (5:20–7:5) is regarded as one long psalm also by Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 99–129, Carmignac, "Les hymnes," 216–28, and G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 226–44. See also Puech, "Quelques aspects," 52.

[55] Only Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 141f, and Dupont-Sommer, "Le Livre des Hymnes," 69. Jeremias once discussed XVI 5–41 (8:4–40) as a psalm of the Teacher, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 249–64; but he is now of the opinion that XVII 1–36 (9:1–36) continues that psalm (oral communication).

[56] The gap between 1QH^a XI 40 (3:39 + frg. 25 1) and XII 2 (4:1) is now bridged by 4QpapH^f fragment 7 1–4 (column XI 1–4); see Schuller DJD 29.222f. 4QH^b frg. 10 1–12 (col. XL 13–24) has text corresponding to 1QH^a XV 37–XVI 6 (7:34–8:5); see Schuller, DJD 29.141–44.

4. *One additional psalm within 1QH[a] XXIII 1–XXV 33?*

From the psalm incipit suggested in 1QH[a] XXIII 1, to the next clear incipit of a psalm in XXV 34 (frg. 8 10), there were 117 lines of text.[57] Theoretically, this could signify one long psalm; compare the 120 lines of the preceding psalm, 1QH[a] XX 7–XXII 42 (12:4–frg. 4 20). At the same time, however, there are five *gaps* within this part of the scroll, in any of which a new psalm might theoretically have started: XXIII 18–20, XXIII 40–XXIV 4, XXIV 19–20, XXIV 40–XXV 2, and XXV 18–24. No corresponding *4QHodayot* evidence bridges these gaps.

The topic common to the top and bottom parts of column XXIV[58] is the 'fallen angels' and their deeds. Column XXV[59] continues with further reflections on those רוחות and their fate in the final judgment. Therefore, all these sections should belong to the same psalm. The topics of XXIII 2–17 (18:1–16) and XXIII 21–39 (frg. 2 i 1–18) differ.[60] Nevertheless, one cannot exclude the possibility that column XXIII is the opening part of a psalm that continues in columns XXIV and XXV. If there were two psalms in those columns, the transition from the first to the second was probably somewhere in the second gap: XXIII 40–XXIV 4.

---

[57] See above paragraph D.3.

[58] 1QH[a] column XXIV is reconstructed with the help of 7 fragments:
lines 6–9 (beginnings) = frg. 57 ii 1–4
lines 9–15 (beginnings) = Sukenik 19:1–7
lines 6–17 (ends) = frg. 9 1–12
lines 5–10 (ends) = frg. 50 1–6
lines 21–28 (middle) = frg. 45 1–8
lines 27–39 (beginnings) = frg. 2 ii 1–13
lines 24–37 (ends) = frg. 6 1–4
Furthermore, 4QH[b] frg. 15 1–8 (col. LVIII bottom part) bridges the gap in 1QH[a] XXIV 10–15 (middle of lines).

[59] 1QH[a] column XXV is reconstructed mainly from 6 fragments:
lines 3–16 (beginnings) = frg. 5 1–14
lines 11–14 (ends) = frgs. 51 1–4 + 46 i 1–4
lines 25–35 (beginnings) = frg. 8 1–11
lines 25–27 (ends) = frg. 63 1–3
lines 29–37 (ends) = frg. 7 i 1–9
Furthermore, the text of this column is completed by some of the evidence of 4QH[b] frgs. 17–20, see Schuller, DJD 29.152–57.

[60] See, e.g., the description of those contents by Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 253 and 261.

5. *One or two more psalms within 1QH[a] XXVII–XXVIII?*

The psalm that starts in 1QH[a] XXV 34 once ended in XXVII 3.[61] The next psalm is represented by Sukenik's frgs. 61 + 62, which come from the very beginnings of lines XXVII 12–14, just 8 lines from the opening of this psalm in XXVII 4. The next identified segment of *1QHodayot*[a] is Sukenik's frg. 48 1–5, which represents the middle part of column XXVIII 11–15.[62]

At present we cannot know (a) whether frg. 48 belongs to the same psalm as frgs. 61+62; nor (b) how many lines of the original column XXVIII were written after its last preserved line, XXVIII 15, at most 27 more lines. From XXVII 4 to XXVIII 42 would have been a total of 81 lines, from XXVII 4 to XXVIII 15 a total of 54 lines. There may have been two or three different psalms in those columns, but one cannot exclude the possibility that there was only one long psalm. Perhaps some further research on the still dislocated fragments of *1QHodayot*[a] scribe B, i.e., frgs. 49, 53, 58, 59, and 64–66, together with some of the at least six unpublished fragments found by Émile Puech,[63] will enable us to place some of them in columns XXVII and XXVIII, thereby helping to solve these problems.[64]

---

[61] See above, paragraphs B.4 and C.3.

[62] For the place of those fragments in the scroll see above n. 36.

[63] See Puech, "Quelques aspects," 51.

[64] It is also quite possible that the text 4Q440 (4QHodayot-like text C), published by Eileen Schuller in DJD 29.248–254 with plate XVI, which evidently comes from the end of a scroll, may represent the end of the same collection of psalms as *1QHodayot*[a] and *4QHodayot*[b]. Fragment 3 i of that manuscript had 25 lines (this is rather close to the number of lines in *4QHodayot*[b]; see Schuller, DJD 29.125f). Unfortunately, (a) one cannot know how long those lines were; (b) whether 4Q440 1 1–7 belongs to the same column as frg. 3 i or to some column before, i.e., whether both fragments together represent 25 or 50 lines of text; and (c) how many different psalms are attested by those fragments. At the very least, there would be no problem fitting this text into 1QH[a] XXVII–XXVIII without any textual overlap with the fragments already placed there. There is also no textual overlap with the still dislocated fragments of *1QHodayot*[a] scribe B mentioned above. Whether or not there is any textual overlap of 4Q440 with the additional 6 fragments of É. Puech (above n. 63) is not certain.

Results

The foregoing discussion suggests that *1QHodayot*[a] contains:

A. 14 incipits of psalms according to the Sukenik edition;
B. 4 additional incipits through the material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*[a];
C. 5 additional incipits thanks to *4QHodayot* evidence; and
D. 3 more hypothetically suggested incipits;
26 incipits in total; plus
E. 2(–5) more psalms suggested within I 1–IV 40; *perhaps* 1 more psalm within XXIII 1–XXV 33; and *perhaps* up to 2 more psalms within XXVII 4–XXVIII 42;
28–34 different psalms within 1QH[a] I–XXVIII.

Only 22 of these 28–34 different psalms are in those parts of *1QHodayot*[a] that were represented by Sukenik's columns 17 + 13–16 + 1–12 + 18, now columns IV–XX + XXI/XXIII (the two parts of column 18). In previous scholarship, 25–33 different psalms had been detected in these columns.[65] Émile Puech had already reduced this number to 28 psalms, since 3 of his "31 (au minimum) hymnes"[66]—V 1–11, XXII 34–XXV 33, and XXV 34–XXVII 3—lay outside the text represented by the 18 columns of Sukenik's edition. All remaining differences in calculation are due to the fact that several *sections* of psalms have been regarded as *incipits of separate psalms* by other scholars. We now turn to this problem.

F. *Passages Representing Sections of Psalms*

There are 11 locations in *1QHodayot*[a] where previous scholars have postulated *incipits* of new psalms, while I suggest instead that these represent only *sections* of psalms. Let me start with some fundamental formal observations:

1) 1QH[a] columns I 1–XIX 25 (11:22) were written by its scribe A, who *always* indented the incipit of a new psalm at least a few

[65] See above n. 3.
[66] See Puech, "Quelques aspects," 53.

centimeters if the text of the final line of the preceding psalm occupied *more than half of that line*; see: X 5 (2:3), indentation 2 cm; X 22 (2:29), 5 cm; XI 6 (3:5), 2 cm; XI 20 (3:19), 4.8 cm; XI 38 (3:37), 7 cm; XII 6 (4:5), 3.7 cm; XV 9 (7:6), 6.5 cm; and XV 29 (7:26), 6.5 cm.

2) Only if the text of the final line of the preceding psalm occupied *less than half of that line*, did the new psalm start at the very beginning of a line; see: VI 34 (14:23); VII 12 (frg. 10 1); VII 21 (15:8); X 33 (2:31); XIII 7 (5:5); XIII 22 (5:20); XV 37 (7:34); XVI 5 (8:4); XVII 38 (9:37; a *vacat* of the complete line above); and XIX 6 (11:3).

3) Usually, *sections* of psalms start at the very *beginning* of a line only if *more than half of the line before* is occupied by text of the preceding section: see VI 28 (14:17), a ואני section; IX 23 (1:21), an אלה ידעתי section; and XVII 23 (9:23), a כי אתה אלי section. The single exception to this practice is at XVI 17 (8:16); here a ואתה אלי section starts at the beginning of a line, even though *less* than half of the preceding line is occupied by text of the section before.

These formal pecularities of *1QHodayot*[a] scribe A have not been given due consideration by most scholars, who have proposed *incipits* of psalms at the beginnings of lines despite the fact that *more than half of the line before* is occupied by some other text, sometimes even to its very end without any *vacat*. Between 1QH[a] I 1 and XIX 25 (11:22), written by scribe A, I identify ten places where *sections* of psalms begin that had been misidentified as psalm incipits by various scholars. In nine of these cases, scribal practices, often supported by textual findings, demand re-identifications. Only in the case of 1QH[a] VI 19 (14:8) is the new identification based on *textual* findings alone. A similar re-identification on formal grounds is possible in the part of *1QHodayot*[a] written by scribe B, at XXII 34 (frg. 4 15).

1.–3. *1QH[a] IV 21, 29, 38 (17:9, 17, 26)*

In 1QH[a] IV (Sukenik's column 17) the beginnings of all the lines are lost due to the decay of the scroll. Not one of Sukenik's fragments 10–44 can be placed in the openings of those lines; only frg. 14 1–8 can be positioned at the ends of lines IV 14–21. At least the final third of line IV 20 (17:8) is a *vacat*. The extant part of line IV 28 (17:16) is *vacat*. Line IV 37 (17:25) contains writing for just over half of its length.

If this column originally had the length of lines usual for *1QHodayot*[a], i.e., about 13–14 cm, the text preserved in lines IV 19–40 (17:7–28) was not too far from the right margin of this column, only about 1–2 cm. Therefore, most scholars restore אודך אדוני, or simply אודך, at the beginnings of lines IV 21, 29, 38 (17:9, 17, 26) as incipits of new psalms,[67] even though there is no other example in *1QHodayot*[a] of a psalm with only three lines (like IV 38–40 = 17:26–28), or of a psalm incipit with אודך alone, i.e., not followed by אדוני, or אלי.

A new approach to the text in 1QH[a] IV (Sukenik 17) may start from a palaeographical observation. Preceding מרוחות (IV 29 [17:17]), a trace of the last letter of the previous word is easily recognizable, on Sukenik's plate 51 as well as on all other photographs of this column. This trace of a letter suits neither ך[אוד][68] nor ני[אודך אדון],[69] but is clearly the complete left part of a final *mem*, ם[. This letter fits well God's title as אל הרחמים, which we find in other openings of *sections* in *1QHodayot*[a], e.g.: XVIII 16 (10:14) ברוך אתה אדוני אל הרחמים והתנינה (11:29) and XIX 32 ברוך אתה אל הרחמים ו[רב ה]חסד. Therefore, the best suggestion for the beginning of this line is [ברוך אתה אל הרחמי]ם מרוחות אשר נתתה בי . . .

Similarly, the beginning of line IV 21 (17:9) may well have been . . . מנסתרות אש[ר ברוך אתה אל הדעות]. Compare the opening of a *section* in 1QH[a] XX 34 (frg. 4 15): . . . ברוך אתה אל הדעות אשר, and note אל הדעות in IX 28 (1:26); XX 13 (12:10); XXV 32f (frgs. 7 i 4 + 8 9); cf. also 1QS 3:15.

There is only one other title of God like this in the *Hodayot*. God is designated as אל עליון in 1QH[a] XII 32 (4:31) and XIV 36 (6:33). This divine title may well have been used in the opening of line IV

---

[67] Only few scholars regarded 1QH[a] IV 21 (17:9) as the beginning of a new psalm, opening before מנסתרות[with [אודך / אודכה אדוני]. See Dupont-Sommer, "Le Livre des Hymnes," 96f; Puech, *La croyance*, 391; M. Abegg, "Thanksgiving Hymns," 86; with [אודך], see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 148; without a precise textual suggestion, see Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 243f.

All scholars—except Habermann, *Megillot*, 132, and Carmignac, "Les hymnes," 174—regarded 1QH[a] IV 29 (17:17) as the beginning of a new psalm, filling in before מרוחו the formula [אודך / אודכה אדוני], or just [אודך]; see Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 198, and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 148.

Finally, 1QH[a] IV 38 (17:26) is seen as the incipit of a new psalm by all scholars, who usually supply [אודך / אודכה אדוני כי] at the beginning of the line before הניפותה, although Habermann, *Megillot*, 132 fills in only [אודכה כי], and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 148 have only [אודך כי].

[68] See García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 148.

[69] See Puech, *La croyance*, 392 n. 278.

38 (17:26), reading [ברוך אתה אל עליון אשר]הניפותה רוח קודשך על עבדך . . .

With these long openings reconstructed for lines IV 21, 29, 38 (17:9, 17, 26), this column becomes about 2.5 cm wider than usually estimated. Two observations support this calculation: (a) Column IV is the final column of the first sheet of this scroll, and columns VIII and XII, the final columns of its second and third sheet, are wider than the other columns on their respective sheets (cf. *Appendix 2*); (b) While scribe A of *1QHodayot*[a] usually tried to finish his lines as close as possible to the left margin strokes of the columns, he ended most of the lines of column IV at some distance from the left margin stroke; in lines IV 23 (17:11) and IV 34 (17:22) the space exceeds 1 cm, i.e., a distance of more than 5 letters.[70] This exceptional evidence indicates that this column already had rather long lines in the *Vorlage* before the scribe, and that the person who prepared the vertical dry-lines of *1QHodayot*[a] made the final column of the first sheet still broader than really needed for these long lines. Therefore, it is plausible to suggest long openings for these lines.

Considering the evidence from this perspective, 1QH[a] IV 21–40 (17:9–28) would not represent the remains of three *different* psalms, but the three final *sections* of one long psalm, starting somewhere before IV 13 (17:1). There are at least two other formal parallels in *1QHodayot*[a]: (a) The long psalm XIX 6–XX 6 (11:3–12:3) also concludes with three ברוך אתה sections, beginning at XIX 30, 32, and 35 (11:27, 29, 32);[71] (b) Another long psalm, XXV 34–XXVII 3 (= 4QH[a] II 18–V 3), concludes with three sections introduced by השמיעו ואמורו, each time followed by a direct address to God (XXVI 26, 31, and 41, according to the better-preserved parallel text in 4QH[a] IV 7, 11, 22).[72] In both cases, these are clearly the concluding *sections* of the psalms, not sequences of different psalms.[73]

---

[70] See Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, plates 51 (column 17) and 56 (fragment 14), and cf. the left margins of all other columns written by scribe A (plates 35–45 + 47–50).

[71] Cf. the discussion on these sections below, paragraph F. 8–10.

[72] See Schuller, DJD 29.97–108. In 4QH[a] IV 11f (frg. 7 ii 11f), I favor the reading of וימרו (= ויאמרו) at the beginning of line IV 11, while at the end of the line before, [השמיעו] may be suggested instead of [לעולמי עד], as in the DJD edition, see there p. 97 and cf. the notes on line II 12 (p. 99) and the end of line II 11 (p. 106). In IV 22 (frg. 7 ii 22), I prefer to suggest אל עליון instead of אל הדעות as in the edition, see there pp. 98 and 108.

[73] Perhaps the last psalm in 4Q440 (4QHodayot–like text C), which is mentioned above, n. 64, also ended with three ברוך אתה sections in frgs. 3 i 18 (beginning of

The common topic of all parts of the psalm preserved in 1QH[a] IV 12–40 (17:1–28 + frg. 14 1–8 at the end of lines IV 14–21) is הרוח 'the spirit.' The first extant section, IV 12–20 (17:1–8 + frg. 14 1–7), has a catalogue of phrases that begin—after a short *vacat* within the line—with מרוח[74] followed by a participle, e.g., מרוח דורשת (IV 18 [17:6]); and that end with בלוא-formulations like בלוא משפט (IV 14, 18 [17:2, 6]) or מצוה ב[ל[וא] (IV 19 [17:7]). The next section (IV 21–27 [17:9–15]), the first of the psalm's three final sections, explains punishment and salvation through God's final judgment as included in his נסתרות, IV 21 (17:9); the suggested title of God as אל הדעות in the section's opening line fits well with this topic. The following section, IV 29–37 (17:17–25), is on the knowledge given by God to the humble person; the divine epithet אל הרחמים in the opening line of the section would be fitting for such a topic. The final section, IV 38–40 (17:26–28) formulates the idea of salvation by the gift of God's רוח הקודש (cf. 1QS 4:20–26), which supports the reconstruction of אל עליון for God's title in its opening line (cf. 1QS 4:22).

4. *1QH[a] VI 19 (14:8)*

In *1QHodayot*[a], wherever we find more than half of a line written, with the text of the next line indented, we have the incipit of a new psalm.[75] The only exception is in 1QH[a] column VI (Sukenik's column 14), where we have a *vacat* of 3 cm at the end of line VI 18 (14:7); while—after a broad gap in Sukenik's edition (see his plate 48)—the next line preserves, after its midpoint, the words]אדוני הנותן בלב עבדך בינה (VI 19 [14:8]). Scholars customarily complete this line with either אדוני [אודך] or אדוני [ברוך אתה], assuming a *vacat* of almost half a line preceding this text to indicate the incipit of a new psalm.

Basically, this *textual* reconstruction is supported by the *material* reconstruction of the scroll. In Sukenik's edition, the left part of this column is preserved from VI 12 to VI 41 (14:1–41), whereas the first line extant from the right part of the column is VI 23 (14:12). However, the material reconstruction of the scroll provides us with

---

line now lost), 3 i 20 (ברוך [אתה אלי) and 3 i 24f ([. . .] / ברוך); see Schuller, DJD.252, and her discussion of this evidence, 248f.

[74] Cf. also formally מנסתרות IV 21 (17:9) and מרוחות IV 29 (17:17).

[75] See the discussion at the beginning of this section.

almost the complete text of the opening thirds of lines VI 12–24 (14:1–13).[76] Sukenik's frg. 18 1–7 has the beginnings of lines VI 12–18 (14:1–7); frg. 22 1–7 their continuations in VI 16–22 (14:5–11); frg. 15 ii 1–5 the beginnings of lines VI 17–21 (14:6–9); frg. 44 1–5 some further text of lines VI 20–24 (14:9–13); and an additional fragment with 3 lines continues lines VI 20–22 (14:9–11). As a result, the *vacat* in the opening third of line VI 19 (14:8) is now well-attested at least by frgs. 15 ii 3 and 22 4; while the combined letters of frgs. 15 ii 4, 44 1, line 1 of the additional fragment, and frg. 22 5 establish the text at the beginning of line VI 20 (14:9) as להשכיל בכול אלה ולהת[בונן ב . . . .[77]

The serious problem resulting from this material reconstruction of the scroll is the *new textual reading* of כול אלה in VI 20 (14:9). In *1QHodayot*[a], wherever we find אלה, it *always* refers to matters mentioned in previous sections; i.e., it must always be translated, "those (aforementioned) matters." Convincing examples of this are the openings of new sections with: (a) ואלה after a long *vacat* beforehand in the same line, V 24 (13:7); (b) אלה after a long *vacat* at the end of the previous line, IX 23 (1:21); and (c) אלה in the openings of new sections, in XVIII 16 (10:14) and XIX 36 (11:33). We find a comparable usage of כול אלה at the very end of a section in XVIII 14 (10:12); cf. כול אלה in frg. 27 2; III 27 (frg. 11 5); V 30 (13:13); V 31 (13:14); VIII 24 (16:6); and XXIII 25 (frg. 2 i 5). The other occurrences of אלה in *1QHodayot*[a] are: IX 40 (1:38); XIII 5 (5:3); XV 4 (7:1); XVIII 6 (10:4); XXI 7 (18:21); XXI 23 (frg. 3 3, see 4QH[b] 13 6); XXIII 12 (18:11); XXIII 36 (frg. 2 i 16); and two times in XXVI 35 (frg. 7 ii 10, see 4QH[a] IV 16f). Not one occurrence of אלה in the *Hodayot* refers to matters that follow.[78]

Therefore, 1QH[a] VI 19 (14:8) cannot be the *incipit* of a new psalm, but only the opening of a new *section* within a psalm. As *sections* of psalms in the *Hodayot* are *never* introduced by אודך אדוני,[79] the best

[76] This evidence is well summarized by Puech, "Un Hymne essénien," 59–88; see especially his drawing, p. 64 (Fig. 1–Col. VI).

[77] The same text is in Puech's drawing (see preceding note).

[78] In other Qumran texts there are many examples of אלה referring to matters which *follow*, see, e.g., 1QS IV 2; V 7; VI 24; VIII 20; IX 12; CD XII 19, 20, 23; XIII 22.

[79] Compare the list of incipit*s* of psalms in *1QHodayot*[a] (*Appendix 3* below), to the list of beginnings of sections (*Appendix 4*).

reconstruction is אדוני[ברוך אתה];[80] cf. VIII 26 (16:8); XVIII 16 (10:14); XIX 30, 35f (11:27, 32f). The full text of this opening of a *section* within the psalm can now be completed as אדוני[ברוך אתה] הנותן בלב עבדך בינה / להשכיל בכול אלה ולהת[בונן ב . . .

The question remains open, as to why scribe A *indented* the opening of a *section* of a psalm in VI 19 (14:8), even after a long *vacat* at the end of the preceding line. There is no other example like this in the manuscript *1QHodayot*[a]. One can only speculate that some feature in the *Vorlage* of the scribe of *1QHodayot*[a] caused this irregularity.[81] Nevertheless, following the material reconstruction of the text in the opening third of line VI 20 (14:9) to include the words כול אלה, there should be no doubt that VI 19 (14:8) is the opening of a further *section*, not the *incipit* of a new psalm.

5. *1QH[a] VIII 26 (16:8)*

1QH[a] VIII 26 (16:8) starts with ברוך אתה אדוני גדול העצה ורב העליליה which is regarded as the *incipit* of a new psalm by some scholars.[82] However, the preceding line is written to its very end. According to the customary practice of *1QHodayot*[a] scribe A, he would have indented this line if a new psalm was to start here. Therefore, VIII 26 (16:8) is only the final *section* of that psalm which starts in VII 21 (15:8) and ended somewhere in lines VIII 38–41 (16:20ff), which were destroyed by the decay of the leather.

6. *1QH[a] XVIII 16 (10:14)*

In *1QHodayot*[a] the text of column XVIII (Sukenik's column 10) runs to the very end of line XVIII 14 (10:12). The next line is totally

---

[80] This kind of reconstruction was also proposed by Bardtke, "Die Loblieder," 342; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 218 and 220 n. 1 (he preferred this reconstruction "since it goes best with the following participial construction"); Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 30; J. Carmignac, "Les hymnes," 154; Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 192; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 152.

[81] Perhaps in the *Vorlage* of the scribe, the text corresponding to 1QH[a] VI 18 (14:7) was written to the very end of the line, and therefore, the beginning of the next section was indented in the next line; cf., e.g., 4Q428 (4QH[b]) XLVIII 23 (frg. 12 i 4), Schuller, DJD 29.145f. This indentation may have been imitated by the scribe of *1QHodayot*[a].

[82] See Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 236f n. 1; Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 30; Kittel, *Hymns of Qumran*, 156; Maier, *Die Qumran–Essener*, 59; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 156.

vacat. At the very beginning of XVIII 16 (10:14) we have ברוך אתה אדוני, which is regarded as the opening of a new psalm by all scholars.

Unfortunately, in Sukenik's edition the text at the ends of the lines XVIII 16–19 (10:14–17) is missing. However, Émile Puech convincingly placed there Sukenik's frg. 30 1–4.[83] Now the text of line XVIII 16f (10:14f) has been completed to read ברוך אתה אדוני אל הרחמים ו[רב ה]חסד כי הודעתני אלה לספר / נפלאותכה . . . . As in VI 19f (14:8f), the word אלה in this line must refer to matters in the previous passage, which ends with the words רק לכבודכה עשיתה כול אלה XVIII 14 (10:12). Thus, XVIII 16 (10:14) is evidently not the *incipit* of a new psalm, but the opening of a further *section* of that long psalm which starts in XVII 38 (9:37) and ends in XIX 5 (11:2).

7. *1QH[a] XIX 18 (11:15)*

In 1QH[a] XIX 6 (11:3) a new psalm starts with . . . אודכה אלי כי . . . . After eleven almost completely preserved lines of writing, the text ends in XIX 17 (11:14) before the middle of the line; i.e., more than half of this line is *vacat*.

The next line, XIX 18 (11:15), reads אודכה אלי ארוממכה צורי, starting just 9 mm from the right margin stroke of this column. However, there is actually a spot of ink before אודכה, coming from the last letter of some word before,[84] which is not noted in Sukenik's text. This evidence is simply ignored by some scholars,[85] whereas others supply here some word in a rather artifical manner.[86] In any case XIX 18 (11:15) is regarded by almost all scholars as the beginning of a new psalm.

---

[83] See Puech, "Quelques aspects," 46.

[84] See in Sukenik, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, plate 45.

[85] See van Selms, *De Rol der Lofprijzingen*, 103; Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 165; Habermann, *Megillot*, 127; Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 186; Lohse, 154; Kittel, *Hymns of Qumran*, 156; Maier, *Die Qumran–Essener*, 100; Abegg, "Thanksgiving Hymns," 107; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 188. Some of these scholars postulate a small *vacat* at the beginning of this line or fill in brackets without any textual supplement.

[86] See A. Dupont-Sommer, "Le Livre des Hymnes," 79: ה[הוד]; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 190 n. 1: י[אנ] or perhaps, י[נם אנ]; J. Carmignac, "Les hymnes," 258f n. 1: "Moi" (=י[ל]?); Delcor, *Les hymnes de Qumran*, 239f: discussion of several possibilities; Puech *La croyance*, 382 n. 220: "Nous lisons . . . [brw]k . . . exponctué . . . correction du scribe." Bardtke, "Die Loblieder," 722, and Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung*, 30 and 34 n. 39, proposed a new psalm within the gap at the end of the line before and added ה[ועת], or ז[אז], at the beginning of line XIX 18 (11:15).

Indeed, the trace of a letter before אודכה might easily be read as a yod (י [. . .]) at the beginning of this line, and the gap to the right margin is completed perfectly by supplying here י[ואנ].[87] At least 43 more ואני sections are preserved in *1QHodayot*[a] (see *Appendix 5*), often starting after a *vacat* of 3–8 mm within the line, but sometimes also coming at the beginning of a line after a *vacat* at the end of the preceding line: see VI 28 (14:17), *vacat* at end of previous line is 3 cm; and XVIII 22 (10:20), *vacat* 3.5 cm.[88] Even if the text [ואנ]י אודכה אלי ארוממכה צורי "I too, O my God, will give you thanks, will exalt you, O my Rock," may formally look a little strange, we may nevertheless see it as a continuation of the heavenly communities' praise in the lines before XIX 16f (11:13f).

1QH[a] XIX 6 (11:3) to XX 6 (12:3) corresponds to the opening of the scroll 4Q427 (4QH[a]) I 1–II 17. In the latter context, the text of I 9–15 (frg. 1 1–7) corresponds to 1QH[a] XIX 19–30 (11:16–27) from about the words ובר[י פלא onwards. The text of 1QH[a] XIX 6–17 (11:3–14) just fills the lost lines of 4QH[a] I 1–7.[89] ואני אודכה אלי would have been located in *4QHodayot*[a] at the beginning of line 8, perhaps a little bit indented. However, the scribe of *4QHodayot*[a] frg. 1 is so inconsistent in his spacing between letters that it is alternatively possible to calculate the position of ואני אודכה אלי at the very beginning of line 8, with the line before written rather close to its end. Evidently, then, *4QHodayot*[a] did not indicate the start of a new psalm with the text corresponding to 1QH[a] XIX 18 (11:15).

Therefore, 1QH[a] XIX 18 (11:15) should no longer be regarded as the *incipit* of a new psalm, but as the beginning of a *section* of the long psalm running from XIX 6 (11:3) to XX 6 (12:3).

8.–10. *1QH[a] XIX 30, 32, 35f (11:27, 29, 32f)*

In 1QH[a] XIX 30 (11:27), the text starts after a small *vacat* in the middle of this line, with ברוך אתה[אדוני א]שר נתתה לעבדכה / שכל דעה. The beginning of line XIX 32 (11:29) is ברוך אתה אל הרחמים והחנינה without any *vacat* at the end of the preceding line. Line XIX 35

---

[87] This suggestion is now adopted by Schuller, see DJD 29.79 n. 4.

[88] In 1QH[a] XX 14 (12:11) there is a *vacat* of 6 mm before ואני משכיל, while in the corresponding text 4QH[a] VI 14 (frg. 8 ii 17), this phrase is at the very beginning of a line with more than half of the line before *vacat*; see Schuller, DJD 29.110.

[89] See the discussion of the evidence in Schuller, DJD 29.79, 81, and 89f.

(11:32) ends—without a preceding *vacat*—with the words [ברוך אתה], which are continued in the next line by אדוני כי אתה פעלתה אלה.

Each of these three occurrences is regarded as the beginning of a new psalm by at least two scholars.[90] A major problem is that all these lines are written by *1QHodayot*[a] scribe B, who evidently did not keep to the rules of formal division between different psalms observed by scribe A.[91] Only in XIX 35 (11:32) do the *contents* of the opening phrase prevent it from being considered a psalm incipit. The word אלה links these words, as a *section* of a psalm, with aforementioned matters.[92]

The scribe of 4Q428 (4QH[b]) ended the line in frg. 12 i 3 with [ושלום עו]לם, corresponding to 1QH[a] XIX 30 (11:27). He indented the ensuing text, [ברוך אתה א]דוני, about 2 cm from the right margin in the next line, but we cannot tell whether he wanted to indicate the beginning of a new psalm or only a section within a psalm.[93] Nevertheless, in those parts of *1QHodayot*[a] written by its scribe B (i.e., from the bottom part of column XIX (Sukenik 11) to the end of the scroll), both extant psalm incipits, XX 7 (12:4) and XXV 34 (frg. 8 10), show that scribe B also started a new psalm with a new line, as did scribe A. Therefore, one may exclude the possibility that scribe B started a new psalm *within* the line XIX 30 (11:27).

Similarly, we have no scribal evidence against considering the line XIX 32 (11:29) as the beginning of a new psalm. However, two other considerations mitigate against such a conclusion: (a) If the parallel text 4QH[a] I 1–II 17 is just one psalm,[94] then 1QH[a] XIX 6–XX 6 (11:3–12:3) must also be one psalm with sub-sections like XIX 32 (11:29). (b) As we have noted, the final parts of two other *1QHodayot*[a] psalms contain three formal sections (IV 21, 29, 38 [17:9,

---

[90] XIX 30 (11:27) and XIX 35 (11:33) are regarded as incipits of separate psalms by Carmignac, "Les hymnes," 261f, and by Maier, *Die Qumran–Essener*, 101f. Puech, "Quelques aspects," 52, and *La croyance*, 381f, as well as García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 190, consider only XIX 30 (11:27) as the incipit of a new psalm. XIX 32 (11:29) is seen as the incipit of a new psalm by van Selms, *De Rol der Lofprijzingen*, 106; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 6 and 196, cf. 194 n. 25; and Kittel, *Hymns of Qumran*, 156.

[91] See, for example, XX 7 (12:4) where a new psalm starts at the very beginning of this line, while the preceding line is written up to its very end.

[92] See the foregoing discussion on 1QH[a] VI 19f (14:8f).

[93] See Schuller, DJD 29.145f, with the editor's comments on line 4.

[94] See the foregoing dicussion on 1QH[a] XIX 18 (11:15).

17, 26] and XXVI 26, 31, 41 [= 4QH[a] IV 7, 11f, 22]).[95] Why then must the three ברוך אתה sections in XIX 30, 32, 35f (11:27, 29, 32f) be attributed to different psalms? These two arguments are admittedly not decisive, but they may help support the interpretation of XIX 32 (11:29) as only a *section* rather than the beginning of a separate psalm.

11. *1QH[a] XXII 34 (frg. 4 15)*

Émile Puech is so far the only scholar who has suggested that 1QH[a] XXII 34 (frg. 4 15) [. . .] / [ה]ברוך אתה אל הדעות אשר הכינות should be regarded as the beginning of a new psalm ending in XXV 33 (frg. 8 9): "avec l'expression אל הדעות formant inclusion, XXII 34 et XXV 32 s."[96] There are two difficulties with Puech's suggestion: (a) Both scribe A and scribe B of *1QHodayot always* start a new psalm at the very beginning of a new line (see XX 7 (12:4) and XXV 34 [frg. 8 10] after a clear *vacat* at the end of the line before (frg. 7 i 5). There is evidently not a *vacat* in XXII 34 (frg. 4 15) before ברוך אתה. (b) The next sentence is ותפנע בעבדכה זות למענכה, "and this affecteth Thy servant for Thy sake," according to the apt translation of S. Holm-Nielsen.[97] In this case זות, "this," clearly refers back to the pains of the psalmist in the lines before, and like אלה, is often used in the opening lines of a new *section*; cf. 1QH[a] V 24 (13:7), VI 19f (14:8f), XVIII 16 (10:14 with frg. 30 1), and XIX 35f (11:32f).[98] . . . ברוך אתה אל הדעות אשר, XXII 34 (frg. 4 15), may well introduce the *final section* of the long psalm XX 7 (12:4)–XXII 42,[99] but not a new psalm.

The foregoing investigation shows that there are fewer psalms in *1QHodayot*[a] than usually suggested, since there are some *sections* of psalms that were formerly regarded by several scholars as *incipits* of separate psalms.

---

[95] See above, F.(1)–(3), with nn. 71 and 72.
[96] See Puech, "Quelques aspects," 53.
[97] Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 264f with n. 14.
[98] Cf. preceding discussion. Cf. also זאת / זות referring to aforementioned matters: 1QH[a] VI 38 (14,27); XX 35 (12,32); XXI 4.12 (18,18.26).
[99] The extant text of which ends in XXII 39 (frg. 4 20).

G. *Some Formal Idiosyncrasies of the Teacher's Psalms*

In the past several scholars were of the opinion that all of the *Hodayot* might have been composed by the מורה הצדק, "Teacher of Righteousness," who had established the Essenes' *Yaḥad*.[100] Gert Jeremias, in his book *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (1963), was the first scholar who in a qualified manner distinguished seven psalms as "Lehrerlieder" ("Teacher's Psalms") from the others, the so–called "Gemeindelieder" ("Community Psalms"). According to Jeremias, the Teacher's Psalms are: X 5–21 (2:3–19); X 33–XI 5 (2:31–3:4); XII 6–XIII 6 (4:5–5:4); XIII 7–21 (5:5–19); XIII 22–XV 8 (5:20–7:5); XV 9–28 (7:6–25); and XVI 5–XVII 36 (8:4–9:36).[101]

All these psalms fall within 1QH^a IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36). As we now know from the material reconstructions of the scrolls 4Q429 (4QH^c) and 4Q432 (4QpapH^f), this group of psalms circulated as a separate collection.[102] By contrast, the scrolls 4Q427 (4QH^a) and 4Q431 (4QH^e) exclusively represent psalms that have their parallels in 1QH^a I–VIII (Sukenik's columns 17 + 13–16) and XVII 38–XXVIII 42 (Sukenik 9:37–12:36, column 18, and frgs. 1–9 + 45–66); that is, they contain only "Community Psalms," in sequences different from that in *1QHodayot*^{a}.[103] The only other scroll which represents *all* psalms of 1QH^a I–XXVIII, also in the same order, is 4Q428 (4QH^b).[104]

The foregoing research on the number of different psalms in *1QHodayot*^{a} includes some *formal* observations favoring a separate collection of Teacher's Psalms in IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36), which have not yet been discussed in *Hodayot* studies.

1. *Incipits of Psalms*

The incipits of at least five different psalms in *1QHodayot*^{a} preceding V 12 (frg. 15 i 3) and following XXVII 3 (end of the psalm XXV 34–XXVII 3) are now lost because of the decay of the leather. But

---

[100] For references see M. C. Douglas, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux," *DSD* 6 (1999): 239–266, p. 240 with n. 5.

[101] See Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 168–267.

[102] See the arguments in Schuller, DJD 29.178f (4QH^c) and 210f (4QpapH^f).

[103] See Schuller, DJD 29.77–123 (4QH^a) and 199–208 (4QH^e).

[104] See Schuller, DJD 29.125–75. 4Q430 (4QH^d) is just one small fragment with the same text as 1QH^a XII 14–20 (4:13–19), see Schuller, DJD 29.195–98. Perhaps this fragment comes from a third scroll with text corresponding to 1QH^a IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36), but other suggestions are also possible, see Schuller, DJD 29.195.

all incipits of the twenty-three psalms from V 12 to XXVII 3 are—at least fragmentarily—preserved except the incipits of those two psalms which started in IX 1 (top of Sukenik's column 1) and XXIII 1 (top of Sukenik's column 18).[105]

All incipits of the thirteen psalms following IX 1–X 4 (1:1–2:2) up to the psalm XVI 5–XVII 36 (8:4–9:36) are well-preserved. They clearly read אודכה אדוני כי(א, except for X 5 (2:3), where אודכה אדוני כי is to be restored, according to the parallel text in 4QpapH[f] V 1 (frg. 3 1),[106] and XI 6 (3:5).[107]

The wording of these incipits is quite different from that of the other eight psalms. In only one other place, VI 34 (14:23), do we again meet אדוני ך[אוד], but it continues there with כנדול כוחך ורוב . . . נפלאותיך. In XIX 6 (11:3) we find אודכה אלי, continued there with . . . כי הפלתה עם עפר. There are no equivalents of this phrasing in IX 1–XVII 36.

Twice we find incipits of psalms with ברוך אתה, at VII 21 (15:8) and XVII 38 (9:37); this wording is also suggested in VII 12 (frg. 10 1). There is not one example of an incipit containing ברוך אתה within IX 1–XVII 36.[108]

The three remaining incipits are V 12 (frg. 15 i 3), [מזמור למ]שכיל . . . להתנפל; XX 7 (12:4) [למשכי]ל[ה]וֹדות ותפלה להתנפל והתחנן תמיד; and XXV 34 (frg. 8 10), למשכיל מזמ[ור שיר להתנפל . . .; all of them again without any equivalent in IX 1–XVII 36.

As we have seen, scholars have posited incipits of psalms with אודך אדוני in IV 21, 29, 38 (17:9, 17, 26), and VI 19 (14:8). But I have argued that these are only *sections* of psalms, probably once introduced with ברוך אתה.[109]

---

[105] Cf. the list of all incipit*s* of separate psalms in *1QHodayot*[a] below, *Appendix 3*.

[106] See above, paragraph C.5.

[107] See above, paragraph D.2.

[108] The only possible exception in the present text of 1QH[a] is XIII 22 (5:20). The primary scribe started here a new psalm introduced by . . . אודכה אדוני כי. Afterwards, the word אודכה was cancelled by dots above and beneath its letters and ברוך אתה written instead of it above the line. The scribal hand of this 'corrector' is the same which, e.g., added some text in X 25 and X 31 (2:23, 29). Perhaps, this 'corrector' understood the long psalm XIII 22–XV 8 (5:20–7:5) as some kind of a further *section* of the short psalm before, XIII 7–21 (5:5–19), which has similar contents. Alternatively, one may suggest that the 'corrector' had another copy of this psalm starting with ברוך אתה, and he changed the text accordingly. In either case, the primary scribe of *1QHodayot*[a] started this psalm with אודכה.

[109] See above, paragraph F.(1)–(4). In the biblical psalter we find only one opening of a psalm with ברוך (Ps 144:1). Twice we find this term somewhere within a

The evidence clearly shows that (a) the extant psalm incipits within 1QH[a] IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36) differ from all other extant incipits in the scroll; and that (b) the opening of a psalm with אודכה אדוני כי(א) is a pecularity of this part of *1QHodayot*[a].

2. *Sections of Psalms*

My analysis above suggests that there were at least eleven *sections* introduced by ברוך אתה in the preserved text of 1QH[a]: IV 21, 29, 38 (17:9, 17, 26); V 15 (frg. 15 i 6); VI 19 (14:8); VIII 26 (16:8); XVIII 16 (10:14); XIX 30, 32, 35 (11:27, 29, 32); and XXII 34 (frg. 4 15) (cf. below, *Appendix 4a*). No section of the psalms within IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36) is introduced this way. Even the term ברוך is missing from that part of the scroll!

There are at least forty-four *sections* of psalms introduced with ואני in all parts of *1QHodayot*[a] (see below *Appendix 5*) But there are only three sections introduced by ואני הייתי, all of them within IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36): X 13 (2:11); XIII 24 (5:22); and XVI 15 (8:14). There is no equivalent to this formula in the other psalms.

Furthermore, seven sections of psalms are introduced by ואהיה, usually with a small *vacat* before it: X 10, 12, 16, 17 (2:8, 10, 14, 15); XI 8 (3:7); XIV 27 (6:24); and XVI 28 (8:27) (cf. below, *Appendix 4c*). Not one ואהיה is attested outside 1QH[a] IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36).

Jeremias did not discuss seven of the fourteen psalms within 1QH[a] IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36) as "Teacher's Psalms." In the case of XI 38–XII 5 (3:37–4:4) and XV 37–XVI 4 (7:34–8:3), their text was too scanty in Sukenik's edition. In addition, Jeremias excluded IX 1–X 4 (1:1–2:2), X 22–32 (2:20–30), XI 6–19 (3:5–18), XI 20–37 (3:19–36), and XV 29–36 (7:26–33) because of their contents, notwithstanding the fact that XI 6–19 (3:5–18) includes the ואהיה section of XI 8 (3:7), while all other occurrences of ואהיה as well as of הייתי ואני are within his "Teacher's Psalms." Why should we not regard at least XI 6–19 (3:5–18) as a "Teacher's Psalm"?

Thus, not only the psalm *incipits*, but also the beginnings of some

---

psalm (Pss 68:20 and 119:12). ברוך four times begins the *final section* of a psalm (Pss 28:6; 31:22; 118:26; 124:6) and seven times the *concluding phrase* of a psalm (Pss 41:14; 66:20; 68:36; 72:18f; 89:53; 106:48; 135:21). In general, the formal evidence of the *Hodayot* is rather similar to that of the biblical psalter in this respect, but evidently further developed.

psalm *sections*, in 1QH[a] IX 1–XVII 36 (1:1–9:36) differ formally from corresponding passages in the other parts of this scroll.

A Final Remark

In the last weeks of the year 1999, DJD 29 was published, containing Eileen Schuller's edition of the *4QHodayot* evidence. Previously, we could not know that two scrolls, 4QH[c] and 4QpapH[f], contained *only* the "Teacher's Psalms" of 1QH[a] X 5–XVII 36 (2:3–9:36), introduced by the so-called "Creation Psalm," IX 1–X 4 (1:1–2:2).[110]

Earlier that year, Michael C. Douglas published his article, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited." Using a new approach, he argues from terminological observations that *all* psalms of 1QH[a] X 5–XVII 36 (2:3–9:36) might indeed have been authored by the Teacher—with different degrees of probability—as well as the "Creation Psalm" itself (IX 1–X 4 [1:1–2:2]).[111] Douglas' article really reads like a prophecy foretelling some results of the—at that time still forthcoming—publication of *4QHodayot* when it states: "I believe that 1QH col. 9 [i.e., the 'Creation Psalm'] was composed as the introduction to the collection of 'Teacher Hymns,' and that this block, 9:1–17:36, or perhaps 9:1–18:14, was transmitted as an independent book that I call the 'Teacher's Book'."[112] The psalm starting with בָּ[רו]ךְ אתה[ה], (1QH[a] XVII 38 [9:37]) really was outside this collection.[113] But the other relevant observations of that article are supported by my own investigation.

The foregoing formal observations on incipits of psalms and some of their sections may now supplement the earlier suggestions of Gert Jeremias and the newer insights of Michael C. Douglas. We may draw a fundamental distinction between a single collection of fourteen "Teacher's Psalms" and several different collections of "Community Psalms" representing the literary units that lie behind the presentation of at least twenty-eight separate psalms in the scroll *1QHodayot*[a].

---

[110] For references see above, n. 102.

[111] See M. C. Douglas, "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis," 256f with n. 31.

[112] Ibid., 256.

[113] The psalm which starts in 1QH[a] XVII 38 (9:37), see the incipit of this psalm above note 5, does not end with XVIII 14 (10:12), as supposed by M.C. Douglas, but continues to XIX 5 (11:2), see above the discussion on XVIII 16 (10:14), F.6. At least this *long* psalm cannot have been included in the final part of the scroll *4QHodayot*[c]; see the evidence as discussed by E. Schuller in DJD 29.179.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: *Results of the Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot*[a]

A. New numbering of E. L. Sukenik's columns 1–19

E. L. Sukenik		*H. Stegemann*			
col. 1:1–39	=	col. IX 3–41	col. 11:1–38	=	col. XIX 4–41
col. 2:1–39	=	col. X 3–41	col. 12:1–36	=	col. XX 4–39
col. 3:1–39	=	col. XI 2–40	col. 13:1–21	=	col. V 18–38
col. 4:1–40	=	col. XII 2–41	col. 14:1–28	=	col. VI 12–39
col. 5:1–39	=	col. XIII 3–41	col. 15:1–26	=	col. VII 14–39
col. 6:1–36	=	col. XIV 4–39	col. 16:1–20	=	col. VIII 19–38
col. 7:1–36	=	col. XV 4–39	col. 17:1–28	=	col. IV 13–40
col. 8:1–40	=	col. XVI 2–41	col. 18:1–16	=	col. XXIII 2–17
col. 9:1–36	=	col. XVII 1–36	col. 18:16–33	=	col. XXI 2–19 left
col. 9:37–40	=	col. XVII 38–41	col. 19:1–7	=	col. XXIV 9–15 right
col. 10:1–39	=	col. XVIII 3–41	col. 19:27–29	=	col. XXII 13–15 right

B. Positions of E. L. Sukenik's fragments 1–9 + 45–66 (scribe B) and 10–44 (scribe A); New numbers of columns and lines according to H. Stegemann

frg. 1 i	=	col. XXII 3–17 left	frg. 6	=	col. XXIV 24–37 left
frg. 2 i	=	col. XXIII 21–38 left	frg. 7 i	=	col. XXV 29–37 left
frg. 2 ii	=	col. XXIV 27–39 right	frg. 7 ii	=	col. XXVI 26–38 right
frg. 3	=	col. XXI 21–38 right	frg. 8	=	col. XXV 25–36 right
frg. 4	=	col. XXII 20–39 left	frg. 9	=	col. XXIV 4–17 left
frg. 5	=	col. XXV 3–17 right	frg. 10	=	col. VII 12–21 middle

frg. 11	=	col. III 23–33 middle
frg. 12	=	col. VIII 12–20 right
frg. 13	=	col. VIII 8–16 left
frg. 14	=	col. IV 13–22 left
frg. 15 i[a]	=	col. V 12–17 right
frg. 15 i[b]	=	col. V 12–20 left
frg. 15 ii	=	col. VI 17–21 right
frg. 16	=	col. II 24–32 left
frg. 17	=	col. V 15–21 middle
frg. 18	=	col. VI 12–18 right
frg. 19	=	col. VI 39–41 right
frg. 20	=	col. V 23–27 left
frg. 21	=	col. III 15–19 middle
frg. 22	=	col. VI 16–22 right
frg. 23	=	col. II 12–16 left
frg. 24	=	col. IX 2– 5 left
frg. 25	=	col. XI 40–41 middle
frg. 26	=	col. XIV 40–41 right
frg. 27	=	still dislocated
frg. 28	=	still dislocated
frg. 29	=	col. XIII 31–33 left
frg. 30	=	col. XVIII 16–19 left
frg. 31	=	col. V 13–15 middle
frg. 32	=	col. VII 40–41 right
frg. 33	=	col. V 38–40 middle
frg. 34	=	col. VII 16–19 left
frg. 35	=	still dislocated
frg. 36	=	still dislocated
frg. 37	=	still dislocated
frg. 38	=	still dislocated
frg. 39	=	still dislocated
frg. 40	=	still dislocated
frg. 41	=	still dislocated
frg. 42	=	col. VII 12–15 left
frg. 43	=	col. XII 18 middle
frg. 44	=	col. VI 20–24 right
frg. 45	=	col. XXIV 21–28 middle
frg. 46 i	=	col. XXV 8–14 left
frg. 46 ii	=	col. XXVI 10–14 right
frg. 47	=	col. XXII 24–28 right
frg. 48	=	col. XXVIII 11–15 middle
frg. 49	=	still dislocated
frg. 50	=	col. XXIV 5–10 left
frg. 51	=	col. XXV 11–16 left
frg. 52	=	col. XXII 17–19 left
frg. 53	=	still dislocated
frg. 54	=	col. XX, 4–7 right
frg. 55 i	=	col. XXV, 15 left
frg. 55 ii	=	col. XXVI, 15–17 right
frg. 56 i	=	col. XXV, 7 left
frg. 56 ii	=	col. XXVI, 6–10 right
frg. 57 i	=	col. XXIII, 6 left
frg. 57 ii	=	col. XXIV, 6–9 right
frg. 58	=	still dislocated
frg. 59	=	still dislocated
frg. 60	=	col. XX 40–42 right

Appendix 1 *(cont.)*

frg. 61	=	col. XXVII, 12–14 right	frg. 64	=	still dislocated
frg. 62			frg. 65	=	still dislocated
frg. 63	=	col. XXV 25–27 left	frg. 66	=	still dislocated

Appendix 2: *Scribal units in 1QHodayot*[a]

"Scribal units" (SU) designates the number of single letters in a line, including also the distances between words and the equivalent length of the *vacats*.
The scroll has 7 sheets of leather with 4 columns on each sheet.

Col. I	41 lines	66 SU = 2706	
Col. II	41 lines	66 SU = 2706	
Col. IIII	41 lines	66 SU = 2706	
Col. IV	40 lines	78 SU = 3120	
Col. V	41 lines	68 SU = 2788	
Col. VI	41 lines	64 SU = 2624	
Col. VII	41 lines	66 SU = 2706	
Col. VIII	41 lines	74 SU = 3034	**Total = 22.390** ("Community Psalms")
Col. IX	41 lines	63 SU = 2583	
Col. X	41 lines	59 SU = 2419	
Col. XI	41 lines	66 SU = 2706	
Col. XII	41 lines	68 SU = 2788	
Col. XIII	41 lines	67 SU = 2747	
Col. XIV	41 lines	67 SU = 2747	
Col. XV	41 lines	61 SU = 2501	
Col. XVI	41 lines	60 SU = 2460	
Col. XVII	36 lines	57 SU = 2052	**Total = 23.003** ("Teacher's Psalms")
	4 lines	57 SU = 228	

Col. XVIII	41 lines	54 SU = 2214	
Col. XIX	24 lines	64 SU = 1536	(scribe A from the beginning of the scroll)
	19 lines	50 SU = 950	(scribe B to the end of the scroll)
Col. XX	42 lines	54 SU = 2268	
Col. XXI	42 lines	54 SU = 2268	
Col. XXII	42 lines	48 SU = 2016	
Col. XXIII	42 lines	52 SU = 2184	
Col. XXIV	42 lines	52 SU = 2184	
Col. XXV	42 lines	51 SU = 2142	
Col. XXVI	42 lines	51 SU = 2142	
Col. XXVII	42 lines	51 SU = 2142	
Col. XXVIII	42 lines	51 SU = 2142	**Total = 24.416** ("Community Psalms")

Total of scribal units in this scroll (including all *vacats*) = 69.809

Number of scribal units in	
at least 8 "Community psalms" col. I–VIII	22.390
at least 6 "Community psalms" col. XVII 38–XXVIII 42	24.416
at least 14 "Community psalms"	**= 46.806**
	= about two thirds of entire scroll

Number of scribal units in 14 "Teacher's psalms" col. IX 1–XVII 36 = 23.003

= about one third of entire scroll

Appendix 3: *Incipits of psalms in 1QHodayot*[a]

①–⑤ = *4QHodayot*[a] psalms no. 1–5 (see above, p. 198)
● = incipit evident already in Sukenik's edition
⊙ = incipit derived from material reconstruction of *1QHodayot*[a]
○ = incipit thanks to *4QHodayot* evidence
no circle = incipit hypothetically suggested
text underlined = *4QHodayot* evidence

Numbering of ***H. Stegemann***				*Numbering of* ***E. L. Sukenik***	*Lines in 1QH*[a]
incipit lost	[I 1–II]			(some fragments)	
incipit lost	[II–III]			(some fragments)	163
incipit lost	[III]–IV 40			(frgs.+17:1–28)	
incipit lost	[V 1–11]	⊙		(13 top)	11
[מזמור למ]שכיל להתנפל לפני אל . . .	V 12–VI 33	⊙		(13:1–14:22)	63
[אוד]ך אדוני כנדול כוחך ורוב נפלאותיך . . .	VI 34–VII 11	●		(14:23–15 top)	19
[ברוך אתה אל עליון אשר במעין]נבורתכה השכלתנו[. . .	VII 12–20	○	③	(15:1–7)	9
ברו[ך אתה אל הרחמים ב]שיר מזמור למש[כיל . . .	VII 21–VIII 41	⊙		(15:8–16:20)	62
incipit lost	IX 1–X 4	○		(1:1–2:2)	45
[אודכה אדוני כי ישרתה בלב]בי כול מעשי עולתה . . .	X 5–21	○		(2:3–19)	17
אודכה אדוני כי שמחה נפשי בצרור החיים . . .	X 22–32	●		(2:20–30)	11
אודכה אדוני כיא עינכה על[י]בשכול נפשי . . .	X 33–XI 5	●		(2:31–3:4)	14
[אודכה אדוני כיא אמ]ת פיכה ותצילני . . .	XI 6–19			(3:5–18)	14
אודכה אדוני כי פדיתה נפשי משחת . . .	XI 20–37	●		(3:19–36)	18
אודכה אדוני כיא היתה לי לחומת עוז . . .	XI 38–XII 5	●		(3:37–4:4)	9

אודכה אדוני כיא האירותה פני לבריתכה . . .	XII 6–XIII 6	●		(4:5–5:4)	41
אודכה אדוני כי לא עזבתני בנורי בעם נכר . . .	XIII 7–21	●		(5:5–19)	15
*אודכה אדוני כי לא עזבתה יתום . . .	XIII 22–XV 8	●		(5:20–7:5)	69
אודכה אדוני כי סמכתני בעוזכה . . .	XV 9–28	●		(7:6–25)	20
אוֹדכ[ה אדו]ני כי השכלתני באמתכה . . .	XV 29–36	●		(7:26–33)	8
אוֹדכה אדוני כי לוא הפלתה נודלי בעדת שו . . .	XV 37–XVI 4	●		(7:34–8:3)	9
אוד[כה אד]וני כי נתתני במקור נוזלים ביבשה . . .	XVI 5–XVII 36	●		(8:4–9:36)	73
ב[רו]ך אתה אדוני . . .	XVII 38–XIX 5	●		(9:37–11:2)	50
אודכה אלי כי הפלתה עם עפר . . .	XIX 6–XX 6	●	①	(11:3–12:3)	43
[למשכי]ל [ה]ודות ותפלה להתנפל והתחנן תמיד . . .	XX 7–XXII 42	○	⑤	(12:4–frg. 4 20)	120
incipit lost	XXIII 1–XXV 33			(18:1–frg. 8 9)	117
למשכיל מז[מור שיר להתנפל . . .	XXV 34–XXVII 3	⊙	②	(frg. 8 10ff)	54
incipit lost	XXVII 4–[XXVIII 42]	○		(some fragments)	81
incipit lost	4QH[a] V 13–21+VI 1–9		④	(additional psalm)	18

* Changed to ברוך אתה by a hand other than that of the original scribe.

Appendix 4a: *(אתה) ברוך Sections in 1QHodayot*[a]

○ = new line after *vacat* in line before
● = sometimes or usually regarded as incipits of new psalms
Text underlined = *4QHodayot* evidence

	ed. H. Stegemann		*ed. E. L. Sukenik*	*vacat* before
(1) Psalm ending	IV 12–40		(17:1–28)	
[ברוך אתה אל הדעות]מנסתרות אש[ר . . .	IV 21	●	(17:9)	○
[ברוך אתה אל הרחמי]ם מרוחות אשר נתתה בי . . .	IV 29	●	(17:17)	○
[ברוך אתה אל עליון אשר]הניפותה רוח קודשך על עבדך . . .	IV 38	●	(17:26)	○
(2) Psalm	V 12–VI 33		(13:1–14:22)	
ברוך] אתה אדוני אש[ר ת]כופר רוח בשר ברחמ[יך . . .	V 15		(frg. 15 i +17 1+31 3)	
[ברוך אתה]אדוני הנותן בלב עבדך בינה / להשכיל בכול אלה . . .	VI 19	●	(14:8+frgs.)	○
(3) Psalm	VII 21–VIII 41		(15:8–16:20)	
ברוך אתה אדוני נדול העצה ורב העלילליה אשר מעשיך הכול . . .	VIII 26	●	(16:8)	
(4) Psalm	XVII 38–XIX 5		(9:37–11:2)	
ברוך אתה אדוני אל הרחמים ו[רב ה]חסד כי הודעתני אלה . . .	XVIII 16	●	(10:14+frg. 30,1)	○
(5) Psalm	XIX 6–XX 6		(11:3–12:3)	
ברוך אתה[אדוני אש]ר נתתה לעבדכה שכל דעה . . .	XIX 30	●	(11:27)	
ברוך אתה אל הרחמים והתנינה כנדול כוחכה ורוב אמתכה . . .	XIX 32	●	(11:29)	
ברוך את[ה] / אדוני כי אתה פעלתה אלה . . .	XIX 35f	●	(11:32f)	

(6) Psalm	XX 7–XXII 42		(12:4–frg. 4 20)	
ברוך אתה אל הדעות אשר הכינות[ה] / [. . .]	XXII 34	●	(frg. 4 15)	
(7) Psalm	XXV 34–XXVII 3		(frg. 8 10–frg. 7 ii 13)	
נדול אל ע[ושה פלא] / כיא השפיל . . .)[1]	XXVI 26)		(frg. 7 ii 1)	○
ברוך אל ה[מפ]לי [פ]לאות נאות ומנדיל[2] . . .	XXVI 31a		(frg. 7 ii 6)	
[ברוך אל עליון הנ]וטה שמים בכוחו[3] . . .	XXVI 41		(–)	

Appendix 4b: *Other large sections in 1QHodayot*[a]

○ = new line after *vacat* in line before

		ed. H. Stegemann	*ed. E. L. Sukenik*	*vacat* before
	Psalm	V 12–VI 33	(13:1–14:22)	
[vacat within the line: 5.6 cm]	ואלה אשר הכ[ינותה מקדם]עולם לשפוט בם . . .	V 24	(13:7)	
	Psalm	IX 1–X 4	(1:1–2:2)	
[*vacat* end of line before: 3.8 cm]	אלה ידעתי מבינתכה כיא גליתה אוזני לרזי פלא . . .	IX 23	(1:21)	○
	Psalm	XVI 5–XVII 36	(8:4–9:36)	
[*vacat* end of line before: 8.2 cm]	ואתה אלי שמתה בפי כיורה נשם לכול °[. . .	XVI 17	(8:16)	○
[*vacat* end of line before: 2.1 cm]	כי אתה אלי למוע[ד . . .	XVII 23	(9:23)	○

[1] Text according to 4QH[a] 7 ii 7f; not preserved in 1QH[a]. This section is added here in parentheses, since ברוך is not used in its opening.
[2] Text according to 4QH[a] 7 ii 12; missing in 1QH[a] XXVI 31.
[3] Text according to 4QH[a] 7 ii 22; not preserved in 1QH[a].

Appendix 4c: אהיה—*Sections in 1QHodayot*[a]

	ed. H. Stegemann	*ed. E. L. Sukenik*	*vacat* before
ואהיה פח לפושעים ומרפא לכול / שבי פשע . . .	X 10	(2:8)	[3 mm]
ואהיה על עון רשעים / דבה בשפת עריצים . . .	X 12	(2:10)	[5 mm]
ואהיה איש ריב למליצי תעות וֿבעֿל / [מד]נים . . .	X 16	(2:14)	[3 mm]
ואהיה לרוח קנאה לנגד כול דורשי חל[קות]/ . . .	X 17	(2:15)	[4 mm]
]וֿאהיה בצוקה כמו אשת לדה מבכריה . . .	XI 8	(3:7)	[3 mm]
ואהיה / ככבא בעיר מצור . . .	XIV 27	(6:24)	
ואהיה כאיש נעזב בינוֹן [. . .	XVI 28	(8:27)	[3 mm]

Appendix 5: אני—*sections in 1QHodayot*[a]

○ = new line after vacat (in) line before
● = usually regarded as an incipit of a new psalm
x = אני חייתי—sections
text underlined = *4QHodayot* evidence

	ed. H. Stegemann	*ed. E. L. Sukenik*	*vacat* before
ואני הובינותי כי את אשר בחרתה הכי[נותה] דרכו . . .	IV 33	(17:21)	
ואני עבדך ידעתי / ברוח אשר נתתה בי [כי . . .	V 35	(13:18)	[8 mm]
ואני ידעתי מבינתך / כי . . .	VI 23	(14:12)	[3 mm]
[*vacat* end of line before: 3 cm] ואני ידעתי ברוב טובך . . .	VI 28	(14:17)	○
ואני עבדך חנותני ברוח דעת ל[בחור בא]מֹת / [וצד]ק . . .	VI 36	(14:25)	
ואני ידעתי בבינתך כיא . . .	VII 25	(15:12)	[2.5 cm]
ואני ידעתי כיא . . .	VII 35	(15:22)	

	ואני ידעת֯יך כי לך ד֯[רך]כ֯[ו]ל֯ ח֯י֯ . . .	VII 38		(15:15)	[8 mm]
	ואני בחרתי להבר כפי כרצו[נ]ך֯ . . .	VIII 28		(16:10)	
	ואני על דבריך קרב֯ת֯י֯[. . .	VIII 37		(16:19)	
	ואני יצר החמר ומגבל המים . . .	IX 23		(1:21)	[4 mm]
	ואני הייתי נגינה לפושעים . . .	X 13	x	(2:11)	[5 mm]
	ואני אמרתי חנו עלי גבורים . . .	X 27		(2:25)	
	ואני במוס לבי כמים . . .	X 30		(2:28)	[3 mm]
	ואני יצר / החמר מה אני מגבל במים . . .	XI 24		(3:23)	[3 mm]
	[ו]א֯ני בתומכי בכה אתעודדה . . .	XII 23		(4:22)	
	ואני ידעתי כי לוא לאנוש צדקה . . .	XII 31		(4:30)	[3 mm]
	ואני ר֯ע֯ד֯ ורתת אחזוני . . .	XII 34		(4:33)	
	ואני אמרתי בפשעי נעזבתי מבריתכה . . .	XII 36		(4:35)	[3 mm]
	ואני הייתי על ע֯[. . . . .]דני לריב . . .	XIII 24	x	(5:22)	
	ו֯אני נאל֯מ֯תי מ֯ה֯ו֯[רת]ם֯[. . .	XV 4		(7:1)	[5 mm]
	ואני נשענתי ברוב[רחמיכה . . .	XV 21		(7:18)	
	ואני הייתי לב֯זאי נהרות / שוטפים . . .	XVI 15	x	(8:14)	
	ואני משאה למשאה וממכאוב לנ֯גע . . .	XVII 6		(9:6)	[3 mm]
	ואני בכה הצ֯[. . .	XVII 18		(9:18)	[at least 8 mm]
	ואני עפר ואפר מה אזום בלוא חפצתה . . .	XVIII 7		(10:5)	[5 mm]
[vacat end of line before: 3.5 cm]	ואני לפי דעתי באמת֯[כה אזמרה בחסדכה] . . .	XVIII 22		(10:20)	○
	ואני מה כיא / [ה]ב֯י֯נ֯ו֯תני בסוד אמתכה . . .	XIX 6		(11:3)	
	ואני ידעתי כי אמת פיכה . . .	XIX 10		(11:7)	[3 mm]
[vacat end of line before: 7.5 cm]	[ואנ]י֯ אודכה אלי ארוממכה צורי . . .	XIX 18	●	(11:15)	○
	ו֯אני נפתח לי מקור לאבל מרומים . . .	XIX 22		(11:19)	
	ואני משכיל ידעתיכה אלי ברוח / א֯שר נתתה בי . . .	XX 14		(12:11)	[6 mm]

Appendix 5 *(cont.)*

ואני מעפר לקח[תני ומחמר ק]ורצתי / למקור נדה וערות קלון . . .	XX 27	(12:24)	
ואני נאלמתי ומה אדבר על זות . . .	XX 35	(12:32)	
ואני יצר / [חמר ומגבל מים . . .	XXI 11	(18:25)	
]ואני יצר העפר נש[ענתי . . .	XXI 17	(18:31)	
ואני יצר הע֗[פר . . .	XXI 31	(frg. 3 11)	[4.5 cm]
ואני איש פשע ומנולל / [. . .	XXII 8	(frg. 1 i 4)	
ואני בקצי חרון / [. . .	XXII 9	(frg. 1 i 5)	
ואני יצר החמר נשענתי / על זר֗[ועכה החזקה . . .	XXII 12	(frg. 1 i 8)	
ואני בקצי אתמוכה / בברי֗ח[כה . . .	XXII 14	(frg. 1 i 10)	
ואני יצר[. . .	XXII 19	(frg. 52 3)	[at least 4 mm]
ואני פחדתי ממשפטכה֗[. . .	XXII 28	(frg. 4 9)	
ואֲני מה כיא מעפר לוקחתי . . .	XXIII 24	(frg. 2 i 4)	

MAʿAMADOT: A SECOND-TEMPLE NON-TEMPLE LITURGY*

Joseph Tabory
Bar-Ilan University

A. *Introduction*

The biblical picture of the sacrificial ritual presents the priests as the servants of God who perform this ritual. The Levites have no status in the ritual but they do have a function: they serve basically as caretakers of the Tabernacle/Temple. The rest of Israel has neither status nor function within the sacrificial service. However, rabbinic sources present us with a Temple liturgy in which all three divisions of the Jewish people participate. The priests offer the sacrifices, the Levites sing during part of this ritual (as instituted by David, according to the later books of the Bible), and representatives of the rest of Israel stand at the gate of the Temple, the Nicanor Gate, and observe what the priests (and the Levites) are doing. This observation is considered their participation in the ritual[1] and is known as *maʿamad* (מעמד), presumably due to the standing position taken by the representatives.

This participation of the rest of Israel in the sacrificial ritual is apparently referred to in the *War Scroll*, which depicts "the chiefs of

* I wish to thank Professor Yaakov Sussmann and Professor Chaim Milikowsky for their helpful comments. Translations of rabbinic texts are based on the Soncino editions, with occasional slight alterations; biblical translations follow the NJPS.

[1] Later rabbinic theology discussed the status of the priests in the sacrificial ritual based on the laws of agency. They raised the possibility that the priests were to be considered agents of the laity in offering sacrifices, whether public sacrifices (cf. *b. Yoma* 19a) or sacrifices brought by individuals (cf. *b. Nedarim* 36a). This would make the actual presence of lay persons unnecessary, at least technically, for the one who empowers the agent is considered to be the one performing the act, even if he is not present. However, the only amoraic statement about this issue is that of R. Huna b. Joshua, who stated that the priests are the agents of *God* (cf. both sources cited above, and elsewhere). It has been suggested that the idea that a spectator may be considered a participant is of Greek origin (see S. Handelman, *The Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory* [Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982], 34). A modern parallel is found in the sports arena, where the presence of fans and their encouragement is understood to enable the players to function at their peak.

tribes and fathers of the congregation . . . taking their stand (להתיצב) at the gates of the sanctuary . . . these shall take their stand (יתיצבו) at the burnt offerings and sacrifices" (1QM 2:3–5).[2] In the same passage (1QM 2:3), the term *maʿamad* itself describes the status of the Levites, and has been translated as "station" or "office."[3] It is perhaps significant that the term *maʿamad* denotes the status and position of the Levites in their relationship to the priests in 1 Chr 23:28: כי מעמדם ליד־בני אהרן ("For their appointment was alongside the Aaronites" (cf. 2 Chr 35:15: "And the singers the sons of Asaph were in their place [על־מעמדם], according to the commandment of David").[4]

The *maʿamad* of Israel has been considered a rabbinic institution, intended to make people feel that all Israel participates in the sacrificial ritual, and that this is not solely the prerogative of the priests. It is noteworthy that the reference to the participation of the lay people of Israel in the sacrificial ritual is missing in an earlier copy of the *War Scroll*. Davies has argued that this shows that the reference is a later addition to the text.[5] The addition may stem from the fact that this institution was not originally part of the Temple service but rather was added at a later time.

The main rabbinic source for the *maʿamad* is *m. Taʿanit*:

> On three occasions of the year, on fast days, on *maʿamadot*, and on the Day of Atonement, do the priests lift up their hands to bless [the people] four times during the day: namely at the *shaḥarit* [service], at *musaf* [= noon],[6] at *minḥah*, and at the closing of the gates [*neʿilah*].

---

[2] M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 152. For a discussion of this point see H. and E. Eshel, "*Maʿamadot* in the *War Scroll* and their Significance in Understanding the Attitudes of the Qumran Sect Towards the Funding of Temple Sacrifices," in *Hikrei Eretz: Studies in the History of the Land of Israel, Dedicated to Prof. Yehuda Feliks* (ed. Z. Safrai, Y. Friedman, J. Schwartz; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1997), 223–34 (Hebrew).

[3] Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 152. A similar term, "*statio*," appears in Christian liturgy to designate specific fast days. It has been suggested that the use of this term shows the influence of the *maʿamad*, because the people of the *maʿamad* were also required to fast. See C. Mohrmann, "Statio," *VC* 7 (1953): 221–45.

[4] The term also appears in the description of Solomon's servants as seen by the Queen of Sheba, ומעמד משׁרתו ומלבשׁיהם (1 Kgs 10:5; 1 Chr 9:4), "the *service* and attire of his attendants." The term appears once more in the Bible in the sense of 'stand' or 'status' (Isa 22:19).

[5] P. R. Davies, *1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran—Its Structure and History* (BibOr 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), 26–28, 66.

[6] The Mishnah uses the term *musaf* for the second *maʿamad*, while the parallel in the Tosefta (*t. Taʿanit* 3:1) uses the term 'noon.' I have argued that the second *maʿamad* of the day has nothing to do with the additional sacrifice known as *musaf*;

> The following are [the details concerning] the *maʿamadot*. Because it is said, command the children of Israel [and say unto them]: "my food which is presented unto me." Now how can a man's offering be brought [on the altar] and he not be present? [therefore] the earlier prophets instituted twenty-four *mishmarot*, and each *mishmar* was represented [at the Temple] in Jerusalem by its own *maʿamad* of priests, Levites and Israelites. When the time came for the *mishmar* to go up [to Jerusalem] the priests and Levites went up to Jerusalem and the Israelites of that *mishmar* assembled in their cities and read [from the law] the story of creation. The men of the [Israelite] *maʿamad* fasted on four days of that week, from Monday to Thursday; they did not fast on Friday out of respect for the Sabbath, nor on Sunday, in order not to change over [without a break] from the rest and delight [of the Sabbath] to weariness and fasting, and so [perhaps] die.
>
> On Sunday [they read], "in the beginning" (Gen 1:1–[5]) and "let there be a firmament" (Gen 1:6–[8]); on Monday, "let there be a firmament" (Gen 1:6–[8]) and "let the waters be gathered together" (Gen 1:9–[13]); on Tuesday, "let the waters be gathered together" (Gen 1:9–[13]) and "let there be lights" (Gen 1:14–[19]); on Wednesday, "let there be lights" (Gen 1:14–[19]) and "let the waters swarm" (Gen 1:20–[23]); on Thursday, "let the waters swarm" (Gen 1:20–[23]) and "let the earth bring forth" (Gen 1:24–[28]); on Friday, "let the earth bring forth" (Gen 1:24–[28]) and "and the heavens [and the earth] were finished" (Gen 2:1–[4]).[7]

This text presents an institution that is connected to the Temple sacrifice but at the same time has an independent liturgy, consisting of the reading of the Torah, the Priestly Blessing, and perhaps other elements not mentioned. An analysis of the rabbinic theory of this institution and its origins shows that theory to contain a number of inconsistencies. I have discussed the *maʿamad* at length in an essay in Hebrew;[8] here I shall summarize and refine the conclusions of that paper.

---

it is clear that there was generally no *maʿamad* at all on days when there were additional sacrifices. See J. Tabory, "The Liturgy of the *Maʿamad*," in *From Qumran to Cairo: Studies in the History of Prayer. Proceedings of the Research Group Convened Under the Auspices of the Institute for Advanced Studies of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997* (ed. J. Tabory; Jerusalem: Orhot, 1999), 145–69 (Hebrew). Thus, we must assume that the Tosefta has the original term and the term in the Mishnah has been changed to reflect the connection between the *maʿamadot* and the sacrifices. Cf. S. Friedman, "The Primacy of Tosefta to Mishnah in Synoptic Parallels," in *Introducing Tosefta: Textual, Intratextual and Intertextual Studies* (ed. H. Fox and T. Meacham; Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1999), 99–121.

[7] *M. Taʿanit* 4:3; the translation is based on that of the Soncino, slightly modified: *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Moʿed* (trans. I. Epstein; London: Soncino, 1935), 146.

[8] J. Tabory, "The Liturgy of the *Maʿamad*."

Rabbinic sources refer to the *maʿamad* as an institution comprised of two parts: a group of "Israelites" (that is, lay persons) who went to Jerusalem to attend the sacrificial ritual in the Temple, and a group of "Israelites" who gathered in various cities outside of Jerusalem to read the Torah at specific times of the day. To distinguish between them, we shall refer to the first group as the sacrificial *maʿamad* and to the second group as the liturgical *maʿamad*. There are a number of anomalies connected with these two groups, and it is my contention that these anomalies may be best explained if we assume that the liturgical *maʿamad* was actually an earlier institution than the sacrificial *maʿamad*,[9] and that it was originally created as a substitute for sacrifice. At some later time, as part of the continuing struggle of the sages to strengthen the power of the people over against the priestly elite, the sages decided that the representatives of the people should have an official task in the sacrificial ritual. They co-opted some of those who attended the liturgical ritual and sent them to Jerusalem to be observers during the sacrificial ritual.

It is not possible to date these events with certainty. But I would suggest that the liturgical *maʿamad* was originally founded as a substitute for the sacrificial ritual during the time when the Temple had been polluted by the Seleucids, when proper sacrifices were not offered there. Admittedly, we have no knowledge of how the Jews related to the cessation of public sacrifice during these years. We do know that the destruction of the Second Temple was a severe crisis for Temple-centered Judaism. The challenge of that crisis brought about the revolutions of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, and may have been the stimulus for R. Gamaliel to institute the *Amidah* prayer. The pollution of the Temple in the time of the Seleucids should have presented a similar challenge. It is more or less accepted that the group in Qumran developed their liturgy as a substitute for sacrifice, although sacrifices were being offered in the Temple, because they considered unacceptable the ritual conducted in the Jerusalem Temple by their opponents.[10] It is plausible that the Hasidim who rebelled against

---

[9] Cf. H. and E. Eshel, "*Maʿamadot* in the *War Scroll*," 225, 232, n. 39.

[10] This idea was originally suggested by S. Talmon in his seminal article, "The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in the Light of the Qumran Literature," in *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; Paris: Ducolot; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978), 265–84 (expanded in: *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* [Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press; Leiden:

the Seleucid occupation of the Temple might similarly have created a ritual that would substitute, temporarily, for the lack of proper Temple sacrifice. However, possibly due to the nature of 'temporary' institutions, this institution was not cancelled when the sacrificial ritual was restored. It was decided that the institution would continue in its original sites, the cities of the *maʿamad*, but that some of the participants would go to Jerusalem to be present at the sacrificial offerings.

This had two consequences. First, it changed the nature of the *maʿamad* while maintaining its outer form, which is very often the way that religious reforms are accomplished.[11] Since some of the members of the *maʿamad* were now in the Jerusalem Temple, the members of the group who stayed at home felt that they were connected to the Temple. The *maʿamad* was no longer seen as a *substitute* for sacrifice but rather as an *auxiliary* to sacrifice. Second, the nature of sacrifice itself changed. Sacrifice was no longer the exclusive domain of the priests: the "Israelites," non-priests, were actually considered those who were bringing the sacrifices, with the priests merely serving as their agents. This fit in well with the pharisaic approach, which tried to play down the importance of the priestly class and emphasize the importance and status of non-priests.[12] The people of the *maʿamad* who came to Jerusalem may have tried to fulfill the liturgical aspects of the *maʿamad* while they were attending the Temple sacrifices, but their very presence at the sacrifices may have interfered with this duty. Their limitations are discussed in the Mishnah cited above. Those of the *maʿamad* who remained at home could continue with the complete *maʿamad* liturgy on a daily basis.

Brill, 1989], 200–243). See also J. M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," *HTR* 46 (1953): 141–59 (idem, *Studies in Qumran Law* [Leiden: Brill, 1977], 39–56); L. H. Schiffman, "Prayer and Ritual," in his *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1st ed.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 289–312.

[11] For an example of this in later rabbinic Judaism, see J. Tabory, "The Benedictions of Self-Identity and the Changing Status of Women and of Orthodoxy," in *Kenishta: Studies of the Synagogue World* (ed. J. Tabory; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 2001), 107–38.

[12] See Y. Sussmann, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on Miqsat Maʿase Ha-Torah (4QMMT)," in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Maʿase Ha-Torah* (ed. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell; DJD 10; Oxford, Clarendon, 1994), 179–200; idem, "The History of *Halakha* and the Dead Sea Scrolls—A Preliminary to the Publication of 4QMMT," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989–1990): 11–76 (Hebrew).

B. *The Sacrificial* Maʿamad

In order to clarify the content and significance of the liturgical *maʿamad*, it is first necessary to give a schematic description of the sacrificial liturgy and show how the sacrificial *maʿamad* was incorporated into it. The sacrificial ritual, according to the rabbinic report in *m. Tamid*,[13] was divided into two parts by a break in the ritual. First, the priests conducted the preparations for offering the meat on the altar. This included slaughtering the animals, sprinkling the blood on the altar, cutting the meat into pieces, and carrying the pieces towards the altar in a ritual procession. At this stage, they did not actually place the meat on the altar but they lined it up on the ramp which led up to the altar. The next step should have been placing the cuts of meat on the altar to be consumed by the fire. However, at this point there was a break in the ritual, and the priests went to the Chamber of Hewn Stone, where they recited the *Shema* and accompanying blessings.

The second part of the ritual began after this break. The priests returned to the Temple courtyard. Some sort of a signal was given[14]

---

[13] Maimonides was apparently the first to give a comprehensive portrayal of the daily Temple sacrifices based on talmudic sources. A detailed description which takes into consideration other sources also was given by P. Billerbeck, "Ein Tempelgottesdienst in Jesu Tagen," *ZNW* 55 (1964): 1–17. For a more concise description in English see S. Safrai, "The Temple," in *The Jewish People in the First Century* (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; 2 vols.; CRINT 1; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 2:865–907.

[14] The signal mentioned in the Mishnah was a metallic sound, possibly musical (see J. Schwartz, "Mishnah *Tamid* and Jericho," in Safrai et al., *Hikrei Eretz*, 247–57 (Hebrew). A literary parallel is found in the book of Revelation (8:5): after the offering of the incense, the angel cast the censer to the earth "and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake." On the relationship between Revelation and the Jerusalem Temple ritual see P. Wick, "There Was Silence in Heaven (Revelation 8:1)," *JBL* 117 (1998): 513–14. Amoraic sources, which seem to reflect a Second Temple tradition, refer to a human announcer, Gebini the Temple Crier (*y. Shekalim* 5:1, 48d; *b. Yoma* 20b; cf. Schwartz, "Mishnah *Tamid* and Jericho," 254–55). Maimonides, in his commentary to the Mishnah, explained that the herald's cry took place in the morning, just at the opening of the Temple. He found support for this position in the Mishnah which reports that the removal of the ash from the altar was done in the morning at *keriat hagever* (*m. Yoma* 1:8). However, the amoraim disagreed as to whether this phrase was to be translated "at the call of the crier" or "at cock crow" (*b. Yoma* 20b). Billerbeck ("Ein Tempelgottesdienst") and Safrai ("The Temple") follow the explanation of Maimonides. However, there is no evidence that the Levites and lay representatives gathered for the ritual this early. I have argued that the human crier and the metallic sound were used at different times to announce the same event: the beginning of the public part of the sacrificial ritual (see Tabory, "The Liturgy of the *Maʿamad*").

to announce that the public part of the ceremony was about to begin. Upon hearing the signal, the priests, Levites and "Israelites" took their places for their parts in the ceremony. After a priest had offered the incense on the golden altar in the sanctuary, the priests gathered on the sanctuary steps, from which they would recite the Priestly Blessing; the Levites stepped up onto a podium, from which they would sing the Temple song. The lay representatives of the *maʿamad* congregated at the Nicanor[15] gate to participate in the ceremony by observing it.[16] The priests began by blessing the assembled gathering,[17] after which the meat was ceremoniously taken from the ramp and placed upon the fire on the altar. At the end of this process, the wine was poured into cups on the altar, and this was a sign for the Levites to begin their song, the closing act of the ceremony.

It is significant that the placing of the meat on the fire was the heart of the public ceremony. This primacy of the meat offering contrasts with later rabbinic theology and halakha, which stresses the smearing or sprinkling of the sacrificial animal's blood on the altar as being of primary importance. I am not going to discuss the biblical theology of sacrifice in this paper,[18] but I think it is clear that, according to the portrayal of the ritual in this *early* rabbinic source,

---

[15] The Nicanor gate was situated at the entrance to the sacrificial area. For a discussion of the sources that refer to this gate and its history see J. Schwartz, "Once More on the Nicanor Gate," *HUCA* 62 (1992): 245–83.

[16] Cf. the statement in the *War Scroll*: "the chiefs of tribes and father of the congregation . . . taking their stand at the gates of the sanctuary . . . these shall take their stand at the burnt offerings and sacrifices" (1QM 2:3–5). Rashi wrote that the "Israelites" of the *maʿamad* also drew the water and hewed the wood required in the Temple (Rashi, *b. Taʿanit*, 26a, lemma *qorban musaf*). There is no source for this in tannaitic or amoraic literature. Cf. Y. T. L. Heller, *Tosafot Yom Tov* to *m. Taʿanit* 4:4, lemma *qorban musaf*).

[17] Maimonides assumed that this was the only time that the Priestly Blessing was recited in the Temple during the day. It was not repeated at the evening sacrifice. Cf. *Responsa Radbaz* 5:238; R. Jacob Emden, *Siddur Hayabez* (ed. J. S. Weinfeld; 2 vols.; Jerusalem: Eshkol, 1994), 1:709–10. However, Maimonides also assumed that the blessing was recited after the flesh of the sacrifice had been placed upon the altar rather than before (*Mishnah Torah, Hilkhot Tamidim Umussafim* 6:5). His commentators have pointed out that there is no rabbinic source for this assumption. R. Moses of Coucy concedes that the Mishnah implies that the blessing was recited before the meat offering, but he maintains that Maimonides is relying on the biblical pattern of Aaron, where the blessing follows the completion of the sacrifices. He mentions that there is also talmudic support for this opinion in *b. Yoma* (*Sefer Mitzvot Gedolot* [Venice, 1547], positive commandment 190, 218d), but I have not been able to find such support.

[18] See H. C. Brichto, "On Slaughter and Sacrifice, Blood and Atonement," *HUCA* 47 (1976): 19–55.

the emphasis of the sacrificial ritual in the Second Temple is on the offering of the meat.[19]

This is not, however, to downplay the importance of a third element of the sacrificial ritual, the incense offering. Indeed, the description of the incense offering in the Mishnah (*m. Tamid* 5:2–6:3) is much more detailed than the description of the offering of the meat (*m. Tamid* 7:3). The moment of the incense offering, at least as far as the evening is concerned, was considered the optimal moment for private prayer, and there is evidence that crowds gathered in the Temple to pray at this auspicious moment.[20] However, the incense offering was not performed in public. Rabbinic law was very strict in forbidding anyone to be present at this offering besides the priest who was actually burning the incense. Indeed, no one was allowed to be present even in the open area adjacent to the sanctuary in which the incense was offered (*m. Kelim* 1:9). Only after the incense offering did the public ceremony begin, with the priests blessing the people. This was immediately followed by the ceremonial transfer of the meat from the ramp to the fire on the altar. Although this was an honor divided among a number of priests, the Mishnah discusses how this task should be done if the High Priest wished to do it himself (*m. Tamid* 7:3). The Mishnah also discusses the proper procedure in the event that the High Priest wished to worship God by prostrating himself in the Temple (*m. Tamid* 7:1), but it does not mention what should be done if he wished to offer the incense. I suspect that the latter is not mentioned because the High Priest wished to exercise his prerogatives only at the offering of the meat, as this was the most public part of the ceremony. The importance of the meat offering is significant for pinpointing what was considered the time of the sacrifice, as we shall discuss further on.

---

[19] Cf. Y. Baer, "The Sacrificial Rite in the Period of the Second Temple," in his collected essays, *Studies in the History of the Jewish People* (Jerusalem: The Israeli Historical Society, 1986), 399–457 (Hebrew). This article appeared originally in *Zion* 40 (1975): 95–153. It is possible that the stress on the blood ritual should be limited to those sacrifices that are meant to serve as atonements. In later rabbinic theology, the daily sacrifices also served as atonements (*Song of Songs Rabbah* 1:9:6).

[20] M. Weinfeld, "The Afternoon Prayer," in *Gevuroth Haromah: Jewish Studies Offered at the Eightieth Birthday of Rabbi Moses Cyrus Weiler* (ed. Z. Falk; Jerusalem: Mesharim, 1987), 77–82 (Hebrew).

C. *The Liturgical* Maʿamad

I will now turn to the liturgical *maʿamad*, and I would like to focus on three points about this institution as it is portrayed in rabbinic sources. The first point is the issue of what was done at the *maʿamad*; the second is the time of the *maʿamad*; and the third is the aspect of community connected with the *maʿamad*.

1. *The Liturgy*

The Mishnah cited above portrays the liturgy of the *maʿamad* as consisting of reading the Torah. However, the mishnaic context of this statement shows clearly that the Priestly Blessing was also part of the liturgy of the *maʿamad*—although it gives us no sense of where this blessing was incorporated into the liturgy. The biblical command that the priests bless the people of Israel (Numbers 6:22–27) is somewhat ambiguous. It does not require that this blessing be used as part of a sacrificial ritual nor does it tell us when this blessing is to be pronounced. It is true that Leviticus reports that Aaron blessed the people after offering sacrifices (Lev. 9:22). However, this blessing does not seem to be a fulfillment of the biblical command to bless Israel but rather an ad hoc blessing, an expression of Aaron's feelings at the completion of his first sacrificial ritual. It is hard to find any direct connection between Aaron's blessing and the blessing prescribed in Numbers,[21] and it is thus difficult to determine whether the Priestly Blessing was really meant to be part of the sacrificial ritual or whether it was to be used in some other context. If we assume that this blessing was originally considered part of the sacrificial ritual, its recitation may have been incorporated into the *maʿamad* liturgy in order to reflect the Temple ritual.

---

[21] J. Licht, *A Commentary on the Book of Numbers* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1985–95), 96 (Hebrew). Traditional commentators have argued this point. Rashi explained that the blessing of Aaron mentioned in Leviticus was the Priestly Blessing ordered in Numbers, but Nachmanides disagreed, apparently because of the chronological problem in the biblical text. The biblical pattern of blessing after the conclusion of the ritual is followed in Ben Sira's description of the ritual conducted by the high priest Simon (Sir 50:18; ed. M. Segal, *Sefer Ben-Sira ha-Shalem* [Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972], 342). However, Ben Sira is also ambiguous about the content of the blessing given at the end of the ritual (cf. Segal's commentary, 347–48).

Any attempt to replace the sacrificial ritual with a non-Temple liturgy would have done well to use the Priestly Blessing. This is the only priestly liturgical act not restricted by the Torah to performance in the Temple. As this blessing was normally recited in the Temple, using it in a non-Temple liturgy would stress the importance of this liturgy as a sacrificial surrogate. However, before we discuss the place of this blessing within the liturgy of the *maʿamad*, it will be useful to survey the other uses of the Priestly Blessing in the Second Temple period.

In Second Temple times we find the Priestly Blessing used in two other rituals besides the *maʿamad*, one sacrificial and one non-sacrificial. The use of this blessing in the context of the daily sacrifice as a greeting to the people has been discussed above; its non-sacrificial use was in the context of reading the *Shema*. The only description of the *Shema* reading during the Second Temple period is that which took place in the Chamber of the Hewn Stones during the break between the parts of the sacrificial service (*m. Tamid* 5:1). The reading of the *Shema* opened with the instruction of the leader to those praying, "Recite one blessing," and it closed with the Priestly Blessing.[22] Here it is clear that the Priestly Blessing served as the conclusion of the *Shema* liturgy—in the same way that the Torah reports that Aaron blessed the people.

The best known example of the use of the Priestly Blessing as the close of a ritual is to be found in the *Amidah*. The Priestly Blessing is included in the last blessing of the daily *Amidah*, and this last blessing is also known as the blessing of peace. The sages considered the closing phrase of the Priestly Blessing, the blessing for peace, as the main theme of the Priestly Blessing. The last blessing of the *Amidah* has been described by Ezra Fleischer as a receptacle for the Priestly Blessing.[23] This fits in well with Bilhah Nitzan's discussion of the use of the Priestly Blessing and prayers for peace in Qumran.[24]

---

[22] Medieval commentators assume that this blessing was not recited in the 'official' manner by the priests but was rather meant to close the prayer with a blessing for peace (Maimonides, *Commentary to the Mishnah*, *Tamid* 5:1; *Perush ha-Rosh*, ad loc.).

[23] E. Fleischer, "The *Shemone Esre*—Its Character, Internal Order, Content and Goals," *Tarbiz* 62 (1992–1993): 179–223, p. 193.

[24] B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (Biblical Encyclopedia Library 14; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University, 1996), 105–24 (Hebrew); and see also her paper in this volume,

However, the Priestly Blessing may have had another use in the context of the *Shema*. The "one blessing" which the leader ordered the congregation to recite is not defined in the text and its nature has been the subject of considerable discussion.[25] In this connection, I would point out that the term "one blessing" appears as a description of the way the Priestly Blessing was recited in the Temple. According to the Mishnah, there were actually two ways to perform the Priestly Blessing. In the Temple it was pronounced as "one blessing," while outside the Temple it was pronounced as "three blessings" (*m. Tamid* 7:2). According to rabbinic tradition, the meaning of this distinction is that outside of the Temple it was customary to respond "Amen" at the end of each verse, which effectively broke up the blessing into three units. In the Temple however, the "Amen" response was interdicted,[26] and this meant that the three verses were recited as a single unit. As we noted above, the *Shema* reading was conducted in the Chamber of the Hewn Stones, outside of the area in which the sacrificial ritual was conducted. The sources do not enable us to determine whether this area was considered within the precincts of the Temple, such that the Priestly Blessing would be pronounced as "one blessing," or as outside the Temple, in which case the blessing would be pronounced as three distinct units.[27] I suggest that the instruction to recite "one blessing" meant that they should open the liturgical session with the Temple version of the Priestly Blessing. This liturgy of reading the *Shema*, therefore, both opened and closed with the Priestly Blessing.

We have no evidence, however, as to when the Priestly Blessing was recited in the *maʿamadot* liturgy. We might be inclined to assume that in the *maʿamadot*, as in this mishnaic example of its use in a non-sacrificial context, the Priestly Blessing appears at the end of a series of blessings. But, it might equally well have been used as an

---

pp. 113–132. Cf. D. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 153–54.

[25] For a survey of the opinions on the identity of the "one blessing," see R. Hammer, "What Did They Bless? A Study of Mishnah Tamid 5.1," *JQR* 81 (1991): 305–24.

[26] See H. W. Hogg, "'Amen': Notes on its Significance and Use in Biblical and Post-Biblical Times," *JQR* o.s. 9 (1897): 1–23; S. T. Lachs, "Why Was the 'Amen' Response Interdicted in the Temple?" *JSJ* 19 (1988): 230–40.

[27] The dichotomy of 'Temple/*medinah*' does not mean the same thing in every context. For some purposes, 'Temple' includes all of Jerusalem. For a discussion of this point see J. Tabory, *Jewish Festivals in the Time of the Mishnah and Talmud* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1996), 183, n. 111.

opening blessing, as in the sacrificial service, and conjecturally also in the priestly *Shema* ceremony.

The focal point of the liturgy of the *maʿamad* is the reading of the Torah. This is the main focus of other liturgies known from the Second Temple period as well: the reading of the Torah by the king during the *hakhel* ceremony; the liturgy recited by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement; and the *Shema*, which is also basically a recitation of biblical passages. All three of these readings are accompanied by blessings that have been considered by Heinemann to be prototypes of the *Amidah*.[28] There is no explicit mention of any blessings in connection with the reading of the Torah by the people of the *maʿamad*. Is this just an example of the silence of the sources or does this silence reflect reality? If the latter is the case, it is very likely that the liturgy of the *maʿamad* was instituted before it was thought proper to attach blessings to the reading of the Torah (however, see further discussion below). The Priestly Blessing may have been thought of as the closing ceremony of the Torah reading. Of course, all of these rituals stand in stark contrast to the practice of Qumran, which never instituted any public reading of the Torah. The writings found in Qumran do stress the importance of Torah *study*, but not its liturgical reading.

Let us now turn to the passages selected for reading by the *maʿamad*. We do not know when the continuous reading of the Torah became an established practice. We do know that in other circumstances when the Torah was read publicly, passages relevant to the day were selected. The earliest reading depicted, performed by Ezra in the beginning of Tishrei, was taken from passages of the Torah concerning the festivals of that month (Neh 7:72–8:18). The reading by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement was the passage from Leviticus containing the prescription for the ritual which had just been completed (*m. Yoma* 7:1). He also recited the other biblical passage which commanded the sacrificial order of the Day of Atonement (Numbers 28), although this could not actually be considered 'reading' the Torah, for he 'read' this passage from memory.[29] Thus, if

[28] J. Heinemann, *Prayer in the Period of the Tannaim and the Amoraim: Its Nature and its Patterns* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1966), 143 (Hebrew).

[29] The reason for this practice was to avoid the delay involved in rolling the scroll to this passage. On the reading of biblical passages about sacrifice as a sub-

reading the Torah in the *maʿamad* was to substitute for sacrifices, it would seem natural to pick the passage that deals with the daily sacrifice (Numbers 28:1–8). This was indeed done on festivals, but not on the Sabbath.[30] The choice of the creation passages for the *maʿamad* is somewhat remarkable. It might be explained in two ways. One possibility is that the founders of this ritual rejected the idea of reading the same passage every day and sought some measure of variety.[31] I would suggest another reason. One of the earliest Second Temple sages, Simon the Pious, declared that the sacrificial ritual, together with Torah and *gemilut ḥesed* (generally translated as 'loving-kindness')[32] were the tripod on which the world stood (*m. Avot* 1:2). If sacrifices could not be offered properly, creation might be in danger. Perhaps reading about the creation could protect the creation in lieu of the sacrifices.[33] In this way, the *maʿamad* could short circuit

---

stitute for the sacrifice itself, see R. S. Sarason, "Religion and Worship: The Case of Judaism," in *Take Judaism, for Example: Studies Toward the Comparison of Religions* (ed. J. Neusner; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 53. I think that the daily reading of the *Shema* was also based on this principle. Since one is to say words of Torah upon rising and before lying down in bed, the words selected are those that contain this commandment. The Talmud explains that it was thought fit to include the passage of Balaam in the *Shema* because this also talks about getting up and lying down. It is clear to me that the reason that four passages are included in the *tefillin* is that the commandment of *tefillin* is mentioned four times in the Torah. The *mezuzah* contains only two passages because its commandment is mentioned only in those two passages. See J. Tabory, "The Prayer Book (Siddur) as an Anthology of Judaism," *Prooftexts* 17/2 (1997): 122; idem, "Mishlei Balaam u-Qeriat *Shema*," *Daf Shevui*, Bar-Ilan, Parashat *Balaq* (5759): 1–4; Hammer, "What did They Bless?" 305.

[30] Later authorities wondered about this and decided that the passage about the Sabbath sacrifice was not read on the Sabbath because the passage was too short by itself, and it was too much trouble to take out a second scroll to read it (R. Yosef Qaro, *Shulchan Aruch*, OH 283:1).

[31] Perhaps this was the reason that the Levites sang a different psalm each day of the week. This practice apparently differed from another tradition, according to which the same psalm was sung every day. The most extreme example of this impulse toward variety is the passage found at Qumran (11QPs^{a} 27:5–7) which decrees a different psalm for every day of the year. Cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Poetry*, 219–20.

[32] See J. Goldin, "The Three Pillars of Simeon the Righteous," *Studies in Midrash and Related Literature* (ed. B. L. Eichler and J. H. Tigay; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1988), 27–38.

[33] Cf. the statement of R. Jacob b. Aha in the name of R. Assi: "Were it not for the *maʿamadot*, heaven and earth could not endure, as it is said, 'And he said: "O Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?"' Abraham said: 'Master of the Universe, should Israel sin before Thee wilt Thou do unto them [as Thou hast done] to the generation of the Flood and to the generation of the Dispersion?' [God] replied to him: 'No.' He then said to him: 'Master of the Universe, Let me know whereby I shall inherit it'. [God] answered: 'Take Me a heifer of three years

or bypass the Temple sacrifices, going, as if directly, to the source. This would be, perhaps, a more effective replacement for sacrifice in the case of a polluted Temple than reading passages about the Temple.[34]

Although the theory behind the Torah reading was based on the idea that on each day the *maʿamad* read about the creation of that day, the practice was to read the passage about that day and the one about the following day. Thus, on Sunday they read about Sunday and Monday; on Monday they read about Monday and Tuesday . . . on Friday they read about Friday and the Sabbath. On the Sabbath there was no reading and no *maʿamad* at all. The reason for the expanded reading was to make the text of sufficient length so that it could be divided between three people: a priest, a Levite and a lay person. It is plausible to assume that the reason for requiring three people to participate in the reading was to enable all three classes of Israel to share in the reading.[35] Thus, this practice of reading reflects the idea that non-priests had an equal share in the liturgy.

---

old, and a she-goat of three years old,' etc. Abraham then continued: 'Master of the Universe! This holds good while the Temple remains in being, but when the Temple will no longer be what will become of them?' [God] replied: 'I have already long ago provided for them in the Torah the order of sacrifices and whenever they read it I will deem it as if they had offered them before me and I will grant them pardon for all their iniquities'" (*b. Taʿanit* 27b; *b. Megillah* 31b). Notice that R. Assi's statement implies that the passages of the Torah which should be read in lieu of sacrifices are those passages which describe the sacrifices—thus enabling the world to exist as if the sacrifices had been offered. However, this statement is quoted in the context of the *maʿamadot*, and as a justification for the *maʿamadot*, even though the passages read in the *maʿamadot* were those which reported the creation of the world rather than the passages about the sacrifices. We may assume that the end of R. Assi's statement has been edited in Babylon to reflect Babylonian theology about Torah as a replacement for sacrifices. Note also that this statement assumes that the *maʿamadot* continued after the destruction of the Temple.

[34] A parallel is found in *b. Megillah* 29b, where there as a disagreement about the identity of the passage of the Torah which was to be read on the Sabbath of *Shekalim*. This Sabbath served as the public announcement that the time had come to give the annual *shekel* donation to the Temple, a donation used to purchase the daily sacrifices offered in the Temple. Shmuel said that they should read the passage about the *Shekalim* (Exodus 30), while Rav ruled that they should read Numbers 28, the passage which tells about the daily sacrifice, which was the purpose of the collection.

[35] Cf. *b. Megillah* 21b which refers to the requirement of three readers on Mondays and Thursdays: "What do these three represent? R. Assi said: The Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Hagiographa. Raba said: Priests, Levites, and lay Israelites." The statement of R. Assi is also used to justify the minimum requirement of three verses

No other prayer is mentioned in the context of the *maʿamad*. It is true that later rabbinic sources note a supplicatory aspect of the *maʿamad*. The Talmuds state: "On Monday [they fasted] for those that go down to the sea; on Tuesday for those who travel in the deserts; on Wednesday that croup may not attack children; on Thursday for pregnant women and nursing mothers, that pregnant women should not suffer a miscarriage, and that nursing mothers should be able to nurse their infants" (*b. Taʿanit* 27b // *y. Taʿanit* 21b). Ezra Fleischer, in developing his theory about the absence of prayer in the Second Temple period, pointed out that the supplication is expressed not by prayer but by fasting.[36] We might add that no supplicatory aspect is imputed to Fridays and Sundays—days on which they did not fast.[37]

However, this does not necessarily mean that no blessings at all accompanied the reading of the Torah at the *maʿamad*. There may have been blessings that did not have a supplicatory aspect. The earliest portrayal of a public reading of the Torah, by Ezra at the beginning of the Second Temple period, tells us that Ezra began the rite with a blessing of God (Neh 8:6). The other Second Temple Torah readings noted above were followed by blessings. Thus, it is unlikely that the *maʿamad*'s reading was *not* accompanied by blessing(s). Just as we only know of the inclusion of the Priestly Blessing in the ritual of the *maʿamadot* through the context of the mishnaic discussion, so too, it is possible that blessings associated with this ritual were *not* mentioned in the reports.

It is instructive to compare the *maʿamadot* with the prayers for fast days as described in the Mishnah (*m. Taʿanit* 2). Here we find a detailed report about the series of blessings said on fast days but, as detailed as this description is, we know that it is not complete. For

---

for each reading (*b. Megillah* 24a) and it makes more sense in that context. It may have originated there and been transferred as an explanation of the demand for three people.

[36] E. Fleischer, "On the Beginnings of Obligatory Jewish Prayer," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 422 (Hebrew).

[37] The Talmud (*b. Taʿanit* 27b) explains that the prohibition of fasting on Friday was meant to prevent interference with preparations for the Sabbath. There are several reasons given there for the prohibition of fasting on Sunday (cf. *Sofrim* 16:4, 300) but the most likely one is that it was felt that beginning a fast after Sabbath would adversely influence the Sabbath itself. Cf. J. H. Tigay, "LIFNE HASSABAT and AHAR HASSABAT = 'On the Day Before the Sabbath' and 'On the Day After the Sabbath' (Nehemiah xiii 19)," *VT* 28 (1978): 362–63.

example, it does not even hint at the inclusion of the Priestly Blessing as part of the liturgy. But we know from the Mishnah which discusses the Priestly Blessing (*Taʿanit* 4:2) that this blessing was part of the rite of fast days—although we have no idea where it was incorporated into the ritual. The report of the rite for fast days (*m. Taʿanit* 2) also lacks any reference to the reading of the Torah. However, *m. Megillah* 3:6; cf. 3:4) prescribes what text is to be read from the Torah on fast days. It is possible that this Mishnah reflects a later custom, but I think it is reasonable to assume that there was a reading of the Torah on fast days from the earliest times. Perhaps even the report of the Torah reading by Ezra reflects the tradition that the Torah is read on fast days. If the fast day ritual included both Torah reading and blessings, in addition to the Priestly Blessing, then it is tempting to propose that the *maʿamadot* ritual did the same. Since the existence of these blessings is speculative, we have no way of surmising what their content was. One might even speculate that this was the provenance of some of those prayers found in Qumran that are non-sectarian.[38]

2. *The Time of the* Maʿamad

The second point I would like to discuss is the hours at which the *maʿamadot* took place. The *maʿamadot* are portrayed as occurring four times a day: morning, noon (*ḥaṣot*), *minḥah* and *neʿilah*. These times are supposed to coincide with the sacrifices. Before we can determine if they really do coincide with the times of sacrifice, we must determine when the daily sacrifices described as *tamid* (Numbers 28:3) were actually offered. A biblical lexicon offers two definitions for the word *tamid*. One is "without interruption, continuously" and the other is "of regular repetition."[39] The sacrifice called *tamid* is rendered, for example in the King James version, as "continual [burnt offering]." It is clear that 'continual' does not mean 'constantly' (without inter-

---

[38] See: E. G. Chazon, "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 3–17; idem, "Prayers from Qumran: Methods and Issues," *SBL 1993 Seminar Papers*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 758–72; idem, "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications," *DSD* 1 (1994): 265–84; D. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers*, 236–51.

[39] BDB on *Bibleworks*, CDROM. Version 5.0.02w (2001), s.v. *tamid*. Print ed.: *A Hebrew-Aramaic and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. Briggs (Oxford: Clarendon, 1951).

ruption).[40] The Torah itself prescribed morning and evening (*bein haʿarbayim*) for the time of the perpetual sacrifice. This might have meant 'sunrise and sunset' or even 'sunrise and dusk.'

Rabbinic sources do not give a precise picture of exactly what time the morning sacrifice was offered in the Second Temple period, although it is reasonably clear that the sacrifices were *not* offered at sunrise and sunset (or dusk). The slaughter of the animal took place at first light, sometime before sunrise (*m. Yoma* 3:1) but we do not know when the blood was smeared on the altar. The blood ritual may have been performed approximately at sunrise. As there was a prayer break of undetermined length before the meat was actually brought to the altar, it is difficult to give a precise time for the latter event. The evidence for the afternoon sacrifice is somewhat clearer. The Mishnah reports that this was usually slaughtered at eight and a half hours (three and a half hours before sunset; roughly equivalent to 2:30 p.m.) and the meat was brought to the altar an hour later, at nine and a half hours (roughly equivalent to 3:30 p.m.).[41]

---

[40] Interestingly enough, the rabbis demanded that flesh of sacrifices should be perpetually found on the altar. For this purpose, they ordered holocaust offerings to be brought whenever there was no sacrificial meat on the altar (cf. *m. Shekalim* 4:4).

[41] The time of the regular evening sacrifice is well-documented (*m. Pesaḥim* 5:1): The animal was slaughtered at the eighth-and-one-half hour, and offered at the ninth-and-one-half-hour (in this scheme of marking time, the ninth hour is halfway between noon and sunset; approximately 3:00 p.m.). In special circumstances, the evening sacrifice could be offered earlier—but it was never offered later. The time of the morning sacrifice is problematic. On the one hand, well-documented rabbinic sources imply that the morning sacrifice was offered at daybreak. The Mishnah states that the removal of the ash from the altar in preparation for the daily sacrifice began well *before* daybreak, implying that the slaughter of the animal took place just at dawn, before the sun had actually risen. According to the Mishnah, the activities involved in the evening sacrifice, from its slaughtering until they were ready to place the meat on the altar, took one hour. One would presume that these preparations took the same amount of time in the morning, which means that the offering of the meat could begin at sunrise, approximately 45 minutes after dawn. At the latest, the sacrifice would be offered no later than the first hour (approximately 7:00 a.m.). R. Judah testified that once it happened that the sacrifice was delayed until the fourth hour of the day (*m. Eduyyot*, 6:1); the implication is that this was unusually late. On the other hand, it is well known that people prayed at the time that the incense was being offered. This is well-documented for the evening offering: there are a number of references to people praying at the ninth hour, which was approximately the moment of burning the incense, just before the meat was to be placed upon the altar (it is not clear whether the Priestly Blessing was recited then, as was done in the morning). There is no direct evidence that people prayed at the time of the morning incense. However, since the early Christians prayed at the third hour, noon, and the ninth hour, and since the prayer at the ninth hour coincided with the time of the incense, it is assumed that their third hour prayer

At the risk of sounding a little too anthropomorphic, I will suggest that the times of the *tamid* sacrifices according to the rabbinic picture coincide with mealtimes: a morning meal and dinner in the late afternoon.[42] This analogy may help us understand something about the nature of the sacrificial ritual.

Rabbinic literature gives greatest importance to the sprinkling of the blood of the animal on the altar, considering this the moment of atonement, achievable only if the entire blood ritual is properly performed. According to the rabbis, the offering of the meat was secondary: its improper performance did not hinder the atonement. But as we have already seen, in the Temple ritual itself the actual bringing of the meat to the altar was the central feature.

---

coincided with the morning incense. Mark notes that Jesus was crucified at the third hour, presumably to stress that this was the hour of sacrifice (Mark 15:25; on the discrepancy between this and John 19:14 see N. Walker, "The Reckoning of Hours in the Fourth Gospel," *NT* 4 [1960]: 69–73). It should be noted that there was a break during the morning sacrifice, during which the *Shema* was read with its attendant liturgy. This break seems to have begun before sunrise, since a rabbinic tradition preserved in both Talmuds reports that the time at which the priests recited the *Shema* was too early to fulfill the obligation properly (*b. Yoma* 37b // *y. Berakhot* 1:1, 3a). We have no idea how long this break lasted. It is possible that it extended until the third hour, although then we would be left with the question of why the priests did not postpone their *Shema* somewhat, so that they could read it at the proper time.

[42] The main meal of the day for the Greeks, the *deipnon*, was eaten towards dusk or even after dark. See: R. Flacière, *La vie quotidienne en Grece* (Hebrew translation; Tel Aviv: Am ha-Sefer, 1967), 128; L. A. Moritz, "Meals," *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard; 2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), 658. In imperial Rome, a main meal was eaten at about the eighth or ninth hour in the afternoon (three or four hours before sunset). See: J. Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City at the Height of the Empire* (ed. H. T. Rowell; tr. E. O. Lorimer; Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1967), 288; Moritz, "Meals"; B. Leyerly, "Meal Customs in the Greco-Roman World," in *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times* (ed. P. F. Bradshaw and L. A. Hoffman; Two Liturgical Traditions 5; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 30. Rabbinic sources assume that people ate two meals per day. The Mishnah mentions the poor man's evening meal as a sign of sunset (*m. Berakhot* 1:1), while King Agrippas used to eat at nine o'clock (*b. Pesaḥim* 107b). Cf. S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Fock, 1910–1912), 3:26–40. There is no direct evidence for the time of the morning meal. However, the Mishnah assumes that laborers would take a break from their work to eat. Evidence from this part of the world in a much later period shows that people normally ate twice a day, a light meal taken approximately four hours after sunrise, and the evening meal; see S. D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Genizah* (5 vols.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967–1993), 4:229. It has already been pointed out that the proportions of meat and grain in the sacrifice reflect the proportions in which these elements were served in royal meals (Weinfeld, "The Afternoon Prayer," 79).

Before we examine the times of the *maʿamad* against this background, we must first explore the more general issue of prayer times during the day. There are two distinct traditions, one referring to prayer three times a day and one referring to prayer twice a day. We shall begin with the thrice-daily tradition.

The statement of the psalmist "Evening, morning and noon I complain and moan and He will hear my voice" (55:17) has often been evinced as evidence for prayer three times a day. Marvin E. Tate writes "The suppliant prays three times a day (Cf. Dan 6:10; Acts 10:9, 30)—at set times?"[43] John J. Collins is a bit more skeptical, agreeing that "the psalmist says that he utters his complaint to God 'Evening, morning and noon'", but adding that "it is not clear that a fixed, mandatory observance is presupposed."[44] I would argue that this passage does not really mean that the psalmist prayed three times a day. This expression should rather be understood as a merism signifying that he complains and moans constantly. It would certainly seem that this is true for the psalmist who says, "Seven times a day I praise" (Ps 119:164).[45]

There are, however, two interesting points in this statement that are relevant to our discussion. One is that the merism is not 'night and day' but rather 'Evening, morning and noon,' which has some significance for the psalmist's understanding of the structure of the day. The second point is that the psalmist begins his day in the evening rather than in the morning. Beginning the day in the evening is, of course, the traditional practice of rabbinic Judaism but it was not the way that the day was divided as far as Temple worship is concerned—as was recognized by later Rabbis.[46] It is noteworthy

---

[43] L. C. Allen, *Psalms 51–100* (World Biblical Commentary; Dallas, Texas: World Books, 1990), 20:58.

[44] J. J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia Series; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 268.

[45] See C. A. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark; repr. 1960), 2:436: "probably not implying seven fixed times of worship, but used as the holy number of completeness." Briggs (p. 25) accepts Ps 55:17 ("Evening, and morning, and at noon, will I pray, and cry aloud") as referring to actual hours of prayer, "at the three hours of daily prayer of later Judaism." In a similar vein, Allen, comparing Ps 119:164 to Daniel and Ps 55:16, remarks that, "Piety beyond the norm is indicated" (L. C. Allen, *Psalms 101–150* [World Biblical Commentary; Dallas, Texas: World Books, 1990], 21:138).

[46] *B. Ḥullin* 83a; *b. Temurah* 14a; *b. Pesaḥim* 3a (the latter passage is quoting a halakhic midrash). Cf. U. Cassuto, *From Adam to Noah: A Commentary on Genesis I–V* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1959), 15–17; S. Talmon, "The

that the Slavonic Enoch tells his children: "In the morning and at noon and in the evening of the day it is good to go to the Lord's Temple to glorify the Author of all things."[47] He accepts the tripartite division but he begins it with the morning rather than the evening.

Of particular significance for the history of prayer, and especially for the times of prayer, is a passage found in the Book of Daniel (6:10–17). Prayer is presented here as a regular custom of Daniel, so regular that his opponents assume that he would be willing to give up his life rather than give up his prayer. Norman W. Porteous states, "Probably we should infer that by the time of the Book of Daniel was written the later Jewish practice had already established itself."[48]

The report that Daniel directed his prayers towards Jerusalem has a clear antecedent in the prayer of Solomon, that prayers be directed through the Temple (1 Kgs 8:35, 38, 44, 48). Later rabbinic rulings declared that orientation was affected by distance. A person living some distance from Jerusalem could not pinpoint the location of the Temple and it was deemed sufficient if he would direct his prayers towards Jerusalem. It is not clear why Daniel's prayers were directed towards Jerusalem rather than towards the Temple. It is possible that it was physically and technically difficult to pray towards the Temple and so he prayed to Jerusalem—in the spirit of later rabbinic rulings. It is also possible, and to my mind somewhat more likely, that he prayed to Jerusalem because there was no Temple.

We do not know at what times of the day Daniel offered his prayers. It would seem natural to assume that prayer, if it was to be offered twice a day, would be at daybreak and at sunset. There are two reasons for such an assumption. One is that the rising of

---

Reckoning of the Day in the Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Periods: From Morning or from Evening?" in *The Bible in the Light of its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (ed. S. Japhet; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1994), 109–129 (Hebrew). For the possibility that the daily obligation to sit in a booth on the Festival of Tabernacles was also reckoned from morning to evening see D. Henschke, "When Does One Sit in a Sukkah?: Towards the Restoration of an Early Mishnah," *Atarah le-Chayim: Festschrift for Chayim Zalman Dimitrovsky* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2000), 87–104 (Hebrew).

[47] *2 Enoch* 51:4; see the translation of F. I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 1:178–79.

[48] N. W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1965), 91.

the sun, bringing light, and its setting, bringing darkness to the world, arouse awareness of the cosmic order and the hand of God in it. The plausibility of this assumption is shown by the fact that this is one of the main issues addressed in the traditional prayers recited in the morning and in the evening. The other reason is based on human frailty. The beginning of the day presents a challenge to people who then turn to God and ask God's help for facing the challenges of the day. The setting of the sun causes people to sum up their accomplishments, or lack of them, during the day and turn to God for help and support in the hours of darkness. If we added a third time of the day for prayer, the natural time would be at noon. This is exemplified by the statement in the Jerusalem Talmud:

> What is the source for three prayers a day? R. Samuel bar Naḥmani said: According to the three times a day that people sense the change of times. In the morning one should say "I am grateful to You, my Lord and the Lord of my fathers, that you have brought me forth from darkness to light." At minḥah one should say "I am grateful to You, my Lord and the Lord of my fathers, that just as I was privileged to see the sun in the east, so I was privileged to see it in the west." In the evening one should say "May it be Thy will, my Lord and the Lord of my fathers, that just as you brought me forth from darkness to light, so may You bring me from darkness to light."[49]

Evidence of this division of the day as a Jewish practice may be found in the words of Epiphanius of Salamis (315–403 CE), who reports that Jews gather in their synagogues to curse the Christians three times a day, morning, noon and evening.[50] For these times of day as an expression of human understanding of the division of the day we may turn to the emperor Julian (the "Apostate"), who stated "We ought also to pray often to the gods, both in private and public, if possible three times a day, but if not so often, certainly at dawn and in the evening."[51] The statement of Julian opens another way to understand the significance of three times a day prayer. Dawn and evening are breaks in the day; three times a day symbolizes the constancy of "throughout the day." A statement of Origen in regard to thrice-daily prayer is particularly instructive in this sense. He states

---

[49] *Y. Berakhot* 4:1, 7a. The translation is my own.

[50] *Panarion*, 29.9.2.

[51] *Against the Galileans* 302 A, 329, quoted by A. Momigliano, *On Pagans, Jews and Christians* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), 155.

that one should spend one's life in unbroken prayer and the only way to do this is "if the entire life of the saint is a single unbroken prayer and if part of the prayer is prayer in the stricter sense."[52]

There is yet another source for the division of the day into three times of prayer.[53] The book of Acts mentions as hours of prayer, the sixth hour (noon; Acts 10:9) and the ninth hour (Acts 3:1–2). The third hour also seems to be of significance, for it was at this hour, on Pentecost, that the followers of Jesus spoke in tongues (Acts 2:14). The custom of praying three times a day is also mentioned in the *Didascalia Apostolorum* and by Tertullian, who specifies the third, sixth and ninth hours as the three daily times for prayer. The third and ninth hours are not natural hours for prayer. However, the ninth hour was the hour at which the sacrifices were offered in the Temple; more precisely, this was the time that the incense was offered in the evening.[54] It would thus seem that this division is an attempt to reconcile the idea of prayers as substitutes for sacrifices with the thrice-daily tradition of prayer.[55]

Let us now turn to the twice a day tradition. Twice a day, in the context of praise and prayer to the Creator, generally means sunrise and sunset.[56] This seems to be the *Shema* tradition, according to

---

[52] *De Oratione* 24 (CCL 1:272). The translation is taken from *The Church at Prayer: An Introduction to the Liturgy*. Vol. 4: *The Liturgy and Time* (ed. I. H. Dalmaiss et al.; Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1985), 165.

[53] It is perhaps noteworthy that there were two customs among Romans about mealtimes. Ordinary people ate twice a day, but people who were not so healthy ate three times a day; see J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer* (Leipzig: Mau, 1886), 265. But there is no correlation between these times of the day and prayer times.

[54] A fragile chain of reasoning would lead one to think that the third hour was the time of the morning incense in the Temple. It is clear that the ninth hour of the day was chosen for prayer because it was the time of the incense offering, and this matches rabbinic tradition about the time of the offering. By analogy, the hour of morning prayer, the third hour of the day, might have been the time of the morning incense, for which there is no direct rabbinic evidence.

[55] Cf. O. Holtzmann, "Die täglichen Gebetsstunden im Judentum und Urchristum," *ZNW* 12 (1911): 90–107.

[56] This appears very clearly in the Qumran literature; see E. G. Chazon, "When Did They Pray? Times for Prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature," in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (Festschrift for George W. E. Nickelsburg) (ed. R. A. Argall, B. A. Bow, and R. A. Werline; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 42–51. The early Arabic tradition of prayer times was also twice a day: at sunrise and at sunset. There were objections to these times for prayer in later Islamic theology, lest prayers offered at this time be misconstrued as sun worship. See U. Rubin, "Morning and Evening Prayers in Early Islam," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 10 (1987): 40–64.

which the *Shema* is to be recited when one rises and before one goes to bed. Although the practice is based on a commandment in the Torah, this understanding of the biblical passage is not self-evident. The Torah states that one should "Recite them when you stay at home and when you go away, when you lie down and when you get up" (Deuteronomy 6:7). It would seem just as reasonable to understand this verse as calling for a third recital of the *Shema* sometime during the day, "when you go away," or, perhaps, even a fourth time—"when you stay at home." It would seem that the times for *Shema* are rooted in a twice-daily *tradition* rather than in actual biblical exegesis. The sages utilized the biblical terminology for this tradition, getting up and lying down, to give a somewhat more liberal definition of morning and evening. The morning *Shema* could be said as long as people were still getting up and the evening *Shema* could be said throughout the night, as long as there were people who had not yet gone to bed. This was necessary to enable ordinary people to participate in the *Shema.* Exceptionally pious people, such as those known as *vatikin*, could be expected to pray at actual daybreak; ordinary people needed some leeway.

Most of the sources which deal with times of prayer in the Second Temple period assume the twice a day pattern. The works of Philo and Josephus[57] testify to prayers at daybreak and at sunset. Esther Chazon has shown that the evidence about the times of prayer in Qumran shows two patterns: one is the twice-daily pattern at sunrise and sunset and the other is prayers or hymns at the time of the two *tamid* sacrifices. However, the precise hour of the sacrifice does not seem to be noted in these sources.[58] Collins summarizes: "the norm of three times of daily prayer did not yet prevail at Qumran."[59]

---

[57] See S. Naeh and A. Shemesh, "The Manna Story and the Time of the Morning Prayer," *Tarbiz* 64 (1995): 335–40 (Hebrew).

[58] See above, n. 36.

[59] Collins, *Daniel*, 269. Later rabbinic Judaism dealt with this issue in several ways. Rabban Gamaliel continued the three times a day pattern, but understood the second time to be not at noon but rather parallel to the time of the afternoon sacrifice. R. Joshua maintained that the evening prayer was not obligatory. His system was thus totally new; he insisted on prayer twice a day, that was to take place at the times of sacrifice, rather than at sunrise and sunset (*b. Berakhot* 27b). Sages who insisted on the thrice-daily pattern found a way to connect the evening prayer with the Temple ceremony. The priests in the Temple worked during the night, burning on the altar all the meat which they had not managed to burn during the day. Thus the evening prayer might be said all night, parallel to this activity in the

We may now turn to the times of the *maʿamadot*. As noted above, the Mishnah reports that the *maʿamadot* took place four times a day: morning, noon, *minḥah* and *neʿilat sheʿarim* ["the closing of the gates," commonly shortened to *neʿilah*, "closing"], and these do not fit either of the above-mentioned patterns. Morning and noon may be recognized as part of the thrice-daily pattern. The precise meaning of *neʿilah* is the subject of rabbinic disagreement. One opinion is that the reference is to the closing of the gates of heaven (sunset and the beginning of night) while another assumes that the reference is to the closing of the gates of the Temple, which occurred somewhat earlier. The suggestion that this denotes the closing of the Temple gates is somewhat remarkable, as there is no evidence that this closing had any particular significance for the Temple ritual. In our most detailed description of the sacrificial ritual, the description of the Day of Atonement ceremony, which ends with conducting the High Priest to his home at the end of the ritual, the closing of the gates is not even mentioned.[60] I would suggest that this term originally designated the closing of the gates of heaven, and that it thus was the third and final hour of the three times a day pattern, which marked the stages of the sun: sunrise, the zenith at noon, and sunset. The identification of this closing prayer with the closing of the gates of the Temple may have been a later attempt to create a correlation with the Temple worship.

This identification highlights the anomaly of the fourth prayer time for the *maʿamad*, which is called *minḥah* and presumably took place at the time of the evening sacrifice. I would suggest that this *maʿamad* was a later addition to the original institution of a thrice-daily

---

Temple (*m. Berakhot* 4:1); cf. the commentary of Ch. Albeck, *Shisha Sidre Mishnah: Seder Moʿed* (Jerusalem: Bialik; Tel Aviv: Devir, 1952), loc. cit.

[60] Cf. L. Ginzberg, *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud* (4 vols.; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1941–1961), 3:75–90 (Hebrew). The opening of the gates is mentioned as part of the morning activities (*m. Tamid* 1:3) but the main point of the Mishnah is the security measures involved in opening the gates, nor is there any ceremony associated with this activity. There is no parallel description of the closing of the gates, although a person called Ben Gever is mentioned as being in charge of closing them (*m. Shekalim* 5:1; most commentators assume that he was also in charge of opening the gates). The opening of the gates is numbered among the wonders connected to Jericho, for the noise of their opening reached Jericho (*m. Tamid* 3:8; cf. J. Schwartz, "Mishnah *Tamid* and Jericho," 247–57). Presumably, the gates made the same noise upon being closed, but this is not mentioned in any source.

pattern. It may have been added as part of the attempt to connect the *maʿamad* with the Temple ritual. If this is the case, we may now refine our understanding of the theology of the *maʿamadot*. They were initially intended as a replacement for sacrifices then temporarily suspended. However, they were not meant to be a literal substitute for sacrifice. That is, they were not meant to supplant the animal sacrifices, nor were they meant to be held at the time of sacrifice. Rather, they were meant to provide an alternative method of perpetual worship of God. The Torah considered the twice daily sacrifice as being a "continual offering" or "perpetual offering" (Numbers 28:3).[61] The founders of the *maʿamad* chose the three times a day pattern, as expressed in the book of Psalms, as their way of offering perpetual worship. By reading the story of God's creation constantly (three times a day), they were supporting God's creation.

3. *The* Maʿamad *as Community*

Finally, I would like to refer to the issue of community. We usually think of communal prayer as being a gathering of the community. This is expressed particularly well when a community gathers in fast and prayer to avert some calamity. Here we find that if one of the members of the community does not participate, it is not a true communal prayer.[62] However, the communal service in the Temple was performed, not by the community, but by its representatives. A small number of people performed a liturgy for the entire community. The sages later argued over whether the priests themselves were

---

[61] Most English translations use 'continual' for *tamid*. *Tamid* also means constant or perpetual. In the case of the shew-bread, which was to be 'constantly' or 'always' on the table (Exod 25:30), the rabbis interpreted this term very literally. According to *m. Menaḥot* 11:7, the bread was replaced by pairs of priests. One pair slid the bread off the table on from one end while the others slid the new bread onto the table from the other side so that the bread was *tamid* ('always') on the table. It seems that the perpetual light (Lev 24:2) was originally meant to be lit only during the night, but rabbinic tradition demanded that any candles which had gone out during the night should be relit in the morning. In later times, *tamid* in this connection was understood to mean "perpetual" as used in the context of a synagogue lamp. For the changes in the meaning of this term see Y. Ben-David, "Ner tamid, esh tamid," *Leshonenu*, 28 (5737 [1977]): 171–76 (Hebrew). I am grateful to my friend and colleague, Prof. Y. Spiegel, for bringing this article to my attention.

[62] See D. Levine, "Who Participated in the Fast-day Ritual in the City Square? Communal Fasts in Third and Fourth Century Palestine," *Cathedra* 94 (1999): 33–54 (Hebrew).

to be considered the servants of God or the agents of the people of Israel in service of God. There is certainly an aspect of Jewish prayer that is representative. The idea is that a gathering of people pray and their prayer is representative of the community. This has been developed in the theology of the great modern theologian and rabbi, Joseph B. Soloveitchik, but it has clear antecedents in rabbinic sources. The idea of the *maʿamadot* centers on such representation. There is no indication of the number of people required for the *maʿamad* ritual. The expanded Torah reading suggests that three people participated in the reading, presumably following the rabbinic tradition that a priest, a Levite and a layperson should all take part (see above, section C.1). Thus, the gathering of the *maʿamad* was a microcosm of the Jewish people and demonstrated the equality of all divisions of the people.

This interpretation of the *maʿamadot* explains why there was no liturgical *maʿamad* on the Sabbath. It is well known that Jews were accustomed to gather together on the Sabbath in their communities all over the world for the reading and study of the Torah.[63] There was thus no need for a *representative* gathering. It was only during weekdays that such a gathering was necessary,[64] until R. Gamaliel

[63] See, most recently, H. A. McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1994); reviewed by A. J. Saldarini, *CBQ* 58 (1996): 557–59; and by S. Safrai, *Zion* 60 (1995): 349–52 (Hebrew); and see P. W. van der Horst, "Was the Synagogue a Place of Sabbath Worship Before 70 CE?" in *Jews, Christians and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period* (ed. Steven Fine; London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 18–43. See also S. Safrai, "Gathering in the Synagogues on Festivals, Sabbaths and Weekdays," in *Ancient Synagogues in Israel: Third-Seventh Centuries C.E. Proceedings of Symposium, University of Haifa May 1987* (ed. R. Hachlili; Oxford: BAR, 1989), 7–15; idem, "Gathering in the Synagogues on Festivals, Sabbaths and Weekdays," in Safrai et al., *Hikrei Eretz*, 235–245 (Hebrew).

[64] It is likely that the custom of fasting and reading the Torah on Mondays and Thursdays developed out of the *maʿamadot*. We have already noted that, although fasting was a regular feature of the *maʿamad*, the people of the *maʿamad* did not fast on Sundays or Fridays. Thus, they fasted from Monday through Thursday. Pietists who wished to imitate them but did not accept the full regimen fasted on Mondays and Thursdays. Since these pietists gathered only twice a week, they could not read the selections referring to the days of creation. Nor could they schedule their reading as part of the regular Torah reading cycle, which must have already developed by this time, because not everyone gathered together on Mondays and Thursdays. The practice they adopted, which has continued till modern times, was to read the beginning of the selection for the following Sabbath.

instituted the idea that every individual should also offer prayer as a substitute for the sacrifices which could no longer be offered.[65] Thus, the *maʿamad* may be understood as one of the earliest, if not the earliest, attempts to replace the sacrificial service of the Temple with a liturgical service.

[65] A corollary of this idea is that the *Amidah* is not a private prayer but rather a prayer for the community. This idea has been developed by Fleischer, who maintains that even those blessings that seem to be of an individual petitional character are really meant for the community. See E. Fleischer, "The *Shemone Esre*"; and G. Blidstein, "Personal and Public Prayer," *Tradition* 10 (1969): 22–28.

This page intentionally left blank

THE LITANY "OUR GOD IN HEAVEN" AND ITS PRECEDENTS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Moshe Weinfeld
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

During the High Holidays, and especially on Yom Kippur,[1] a litany entitled *Abinu Malkenu* ("Our Father, Our King"), attributed to Rabbi Akiba,[2] is recited. In the Sephardic Yom Kippur prayers we find, alongside the *Abinu Malkenu* litany, another litany called *Elohenu Shebashamim* ("Our God in Heaven," an idiom taken from Ps 115:3), that overlaps in its content with the *Abinu Malkenu* litany.[3] The evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls can assist us in tracing the development of this prayer from its biblical antecedents to its medieval form.

The Sephardic litany opens with a passage from Ps 115:1–3 (cf. Ps 135:6), juxtaposed with faith declarations unattested in the Psalmodic literature (enclosed in square brackets):[4]

[For the sake of the holiness of your name and not for us]	[לקדושת שמך עשה ולא לנו]
Not for us, Lord, not for us,	לא לנו יהוה, לא לנו,
But for your name give praise,	כי לשמך תן כבוד
through your mercy and faithfulness.	על חסדך ועל אמתך.

[1] See I. M. Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comparative History* (trans. R. P. Scheindlin; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1993), 178–79.

[2] "R. Akiba stepped down after him and exclaimed: 'Our Father, our King, we have no King but Thee; our Father, our King, for Thy sake have mercy upon us.'" (*b. Taʿanit* 25b). These two sentences represent the opening and conclusion of the *Abinu Malkenu* litany until today.

[3] See D. Goldschmidt, *Seder Rav Amram Gaon* (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1972), 154–55 (Hebrew). Goldschmidt presents a number of parallels: "Our God in heaven, spare us and have mercy upon us"—"Our father, our king, turn your mercy upon us"; "Our God in heaven, write us in the book of life"—"Our father, our king, write us in the book of good life"; "Our God in heaven, write us in the book of remembrance"—"Our father, our king, write us in the book of remembrance," etc.

[4] I. Davidson, *Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry* (4 vols.; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1924–33), see 3:61, no. 1366 (Hebrew).

Why should the nations say: "Where is their God?"	למה יאמרו הגוים: איה נא אלהיהם?
And our God is in heaven,	ואלהינו בשמים
[One is our God in heaven,	[אחד אלהינו בשמים
Our testimony is proclaimed twice daily.	עדותנו בכל יום פעמים,
He lives forever,	חי וקים הוא,
He is full of mercy,	מלא רחמים הוא,
He is full of merits.]	מלא זכויות הוא.]
Whatever pleases him, he does, in heaven and on earth.	כל אשר חפץ עשה בשמים ובארץ.
[Who can say to Him: "What are you doing?"	[ואין מי יאמר לו: "מה תעשה"?
Who can tell Him: "What are you performing?"	ואין מי יאמר לו: "מה תפעל"?
For everything is the work of his hands.]	כי הכל מעשה ידיו.]

The litany itself then continues:

Our God in heaven, spare us and have mercy upon us,	אלהינו שבשמים חוס ורחם עלינו
Our God in heaven, hear the voice of our prayers,	אלהינו שבשמים שמע קול תפילתנו
Our God in heaven, nullify the evil decrees against us . . .	אלהינו שבשמים בטל מעלינו גזרות קשות וכו׳

In Psalms 115 and 135, and only in these psalms, do we find the phrase כל אשר חפץ עשה, "whatever pleases Him He does." As A. Hurvitz has shown,[5] this phrase, which developed in the Second Temple period, expresses the absolute sovereignty of a ruler, in this case the absolute sovereignty of the God of Israel.[6] The phrase כל

[5] A. Hurvitz, "The History of a Legal Formula," *VT* 32 (1982): 257–67.

[6] עשה חפץ, "do whatever he pleases," appears elsewhere in the Bible and in Ancient Near Eastern literature with the meaning of making a transaction and bartering, as I noted in my article: "Initiation of Political Friendship in Ebla and its later Development," in *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft von Ebla: Akten der internationalen Tagung Heidelberg, 4.–7. November 1986* (ed. H. Hauptman and H. Waetzoolt; Heidelberg Studien zum Alten Orient 2; Heidelberg: Heidelberg Orientverlag, 1988), 345–48.

אשר חפץ עשה thus serves as a point of departure in these psalms for a series of faith statements such as: polemics against idolatry, God as Creator, proclamations of monotheism, and the joining of foreigners to the congregation of Israel.

(1) *Polemics Against Idolatry*: After the phrase כל אשר חפץ עשה in Ps 115:3, we read: "Their idols are silver and gold, the work of human hands. They have mouths, but cannot speak, eyes but cannot see; they have ears, but cannot hear, noses, but cannot smell; they have hands, but cannot touch, feet, but cannot walk, they can make no sounds in their throats" (vv. 4–7).[7] An identical passage occurs in Ps 135:15–17.

(2) *God as Creator*: Preceding the polemic in Psalm 135, one finds a description of the wondrous creation performed by the God of Israel: "He makes clouds rise from the ends of the earth; He makes lightning for the rain; He releases the wind from His vaults" (135:7). This idea also appears in Jer 10:13–14 (and 51:16), and is inlaid there, as in Psalm 135, into passages that contain polemics against idols (10:3–4, 8–9, 14–15; 51:17–18): "they cannot speak . . . they have to be carried, for they cannot walk" (Jer 10:5, cf. Isa 46:1–2); "there is no breath in them (Jer 10:14).[8]

(3) *Proclamation of monotheism*: Such a proclamation is juxtaposed with the doctrine of the absolute sovereignty of God: "I know that YHWH is great, that our Lord is greater than all gods" (Ps 135:5). This credo is similar to the declaration of Jethro: "Now I know that YHWH is greater than all gods" (Exod 18:11), and the proclamation of Naaman, commander of the army of Aram: "Now I know that there is no God in the whole world except in Israel" (2 Kgs 5:15).

(4) *Absolute authority of God*: The doctrine of the absolute authority of a ruler appears in Qoh 8:3–4: "For he can do anything he pleases; inasmuch as a king's command is authoritative, and none can say to him, 'What are you doing?'" This verse refers to a human monarch; however, the *Psalms Scroll* from Qumran Cave 11, applies it to the divine king in an addition to Psalm 135, following the canonical v. 9:[9]

---

[7] Translations of biblical passages follow the NJPS.

[8] See M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 226–30.

[9] 11QPs[a] 14:14; J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* (DJDJ 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 35.

כל אשר חפץ יהוה בשמים ובארץ לעשות יעשה אין כיה אין כיהוה ואין שיעשה כמלך אלהים.	Whatever he pleases he does in heaven and on earth, There is none like Yah, there is none like YHWH, There is no one who will act like the King God.

This added passage begins with an expansion of the biblical phrase, כל אשר חפץ ה׳ עשה בשמים ובארץ (Ps 135:6), followed in this new context by two positive statements of God's exclusive authority over creation. One finds a similar progression of ideas in Dan 4:32: "He does as He wishes (וכמצביה עבד)[10] with the host of heaven, and with the inhabitants of the earth. There is none to stay His hand or say to Him, 'What have you done?' (מה עבדת)"; and likewise in the verses leading up to Job 9:12: "Who can say to Him, 'What are you doing?' (מי יאמר אליו מה תעשה)."[11] In contrast to Psalms 115 and 135, in which the act of creation was performed in the past (אשר חפץ עשה), Qoh 8:3–4, Dan 4:32, Job 9:12, and the liturgical addition to Psalm 135 found in 11QPs[a], all speak in the present.

(5) *Joining the congregation of Israel*: Psalms 115 and 135 assume the existence of a group of people called יראי ה׳, "those who fear the Lord" (115:11, 13; 135:20). These people are gentiles who believe in the God of Israel. This phenomenon attests that Psalms 115 and 135 belong to the universalistic layer of Psalms.[12]

Psalms 115 and 135 thus appear to incorporate collections of at least five motifs, resembling anthologies, of Israelite credo: (1) exposure of the vanity of idolatry; (2) admiration for the wonders of the

---

[10] The idiom עשה כרצון/כחפץ (and in Aramaic ידעה כ־) represents late biblical Hebrew; see A. Hurvitz, *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew: A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and its Implications for the Dating of Psalms* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972), 73–78 (Hebrew).

[11] This idea is found in various prayers, such as in the *ne'ilah* service of Yom Kippur: "You separated man from the beginning, and recognized him to stand before you, for who can say to you: 'What are you doing?'; and if he is righteous, what does he give you?" Similarly in the Morning Blessing: "You are YHWH, the God in the heaven and the earth, and in the highest heaven of heaven. In truth you are the first and last, and exclusive of you there is no other god [. . .] you made the heavens and the earth [. . .] and who from amongst all the works of your hands above or below will say to you: 'What are you doing?'" (*Tanna de-Bei Eliyahu Rabbah* 21).

[12] See my article, "Universalism and Particularism in the Period of Exile and Restoration," *Tarbiz* 33 (1964): 228–242 (Hebrew); repr. in *Likkutei Tarbiz*, I: *A Biblical Studies Reader* (ed. M. Weinfeld; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1979), with Addenda, p. 57.

divine act of creation; (3) expression of allegiance to the God of Israel; (4) absolute authority of the God of Israel over the universe; (5) the joining of foreigners to the community of Israel.

Returning to the litany, "Our God in Heaven," one should consider N. Wieder's theory of Moslem influence in light of early Jewish sources, particularly the Cave 11 *Psalms Scroll*. According to Wieder, the verses from Psalms, supplemented by additions, serve as an opening (*muqadima*) to the litany. The litany's editor divided the verses into two passages, Ps 115:1–3a and 115:3b. He inserted a creed between the two passages: "One is our God in heaven, our testimony is proclaimed twice daily; He lives forever, full of mercy, full of merits." Wieder argued that this creed, which is not found in conventional Jewish prayer, was influenced by Moslem liturgy, and especially by the rite of *dhikr*. Wieder similarly assumed Moslem influence on the lines at the end of the opening section: "Who can say to Him: 'What are you doing?' Who can tell Him: 'What are you performing?' for everything is the work of His hands."[13]

Wieder's supposition regarding the Moslem influence on the first insertion is difficult, because each of the titles in the opening is of Jewish origin. "(One is) our God in Heaven" is taken from Ps 115:3 and Ps 135:6. The proclamation of testimony twice daily is based upon the recital of the Shema in the morning and in the evening. This stands in contradiction to the Moslem obligation to pronounce testimony five times a day. חי וקים is very common in Jewish prayer,[14] and the same pertains to "full of mercy" and "full of merits." Wieder admits that the innovation in this litany is not in the use of these epithets themselves, but in their assembly into one unit.[15] However, this combination is also present in Jewish liturgy. For example, we find in a *piyyut* for the High Holidays: "You are our God in heaven and on earth . . . you live forever," and at the end, "you live forever, awesome, elevated and holy."[16]

---

[13] N. Wieder, "Emphatic Articulation of הוא on Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur," *Sinai* 89 (1981): 6–41 (Hebrew); idem, "Addenda to the Article 'Further Notes on Emphatic Articulation of הוא on Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur'," *Sinai* 89 (1981): 260–65 (Hebrew). Cf. now in the collection of his articles: *The Formation of Jewish Liturgy in the East and the West* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1998), 395–436.

[14] Hurvitz, *The Transition Period*, 141.

[15] Wieder, "Emphatic Articulation," 34 = Wieder, *The Formation*, 423.

[16] Text from D. Goldschmidt, *Maḥzor for the High Holy Days*, I: *Rosh HaShanah* (Jerusalem: Koren, 1970), 72.

Wieder's argument that the phrases added after כל אשר חפץ עשה—בשמים ובארץ "Who can say to Him: 'What are you doing?' Who can tell Him: 'What are you performing?' for everything is the work of His hands"—are a product of Moslem influence cannot be substantiated either. As we have seen, similar declarations on the exclusivity of God's authority in the creation are found in Second Temple Jewish sources, Daniel 4:32 and the *Psalms Scroll* from Qumran: "There is none like Yah, there is none like YHWH, there is no one who will do like the King God."[17] A close linguistic parallel occurs at Job 9:12 as well.

The addition to Psalm 135 suggests that this psalm was used liturgically.[18] Psalm 145, which appears in column XV, was also employed liturgically. This is evidenced by the refrain, "Blessed is YHWH and blessed is His name forever and ever," that follows every verse in this psalm,[19] as well as the idiom וזואת לזכרון, which appears at its conclusion.[20] One should not therefore describe the Qumran *Psalms Scroll* as representing a canonical copy of Psalms, as suggested by Flint,[21] but rather as a collection of readings from the Psalms, adapted for liturgical use.

Thus, by the Second Temple period, this biblically shaped affirmation of God's absolute authority over creation had already passed into liturgical usage. It makes no difference whether the added passage in 11QPs[a] is the product of the Qumran scribe or whether it was

---

[17] According to Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*, 14:3–14.

[18] P. Skehan, "A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs[a]," *CBQ* 35 (1973): 198, understands this addition as a three-fold response by the congregation.

[19] For the function of this formulation, cf. N. Wieder, "*Barukh hu (u)varukh shemo*—Its Origins, Time and Versions," in *Studies in Rabbinic Literature, Bible and Jewish History* (ed. Y. D. Gilat, C. Levin, and Z. M. Rabinowitz; Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1982), 277–90 (Hebrew).

[20] Cf. M. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPsa)," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33; S. Talmon, "Hebrew Apocryphal Psalms from Qumran," *Tarbiz* 35 (1966): 224–28 (Hebrew); M. Weinfeld, "Traces of *Kedushat Yozer* and *Pesukey De-Zimra* in the Qumran Literature and in Ben-Sira," *Tarbiz* 45 (1976): 15–26 (Hebrew); B.Z. Wacholder, "David's Eschatological Psalter, 11QPs[a]," *HUCA* 59 (1988): 23–72; M. Haran, "11QPs[a] and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honor of his 70th Birthday* (ed. M. Brettler and M. Fishbane; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 193–201.

[21] P. W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

present in his source. The fact is that this declaration on the exclusivity of God as author of and authority over the creation appeared hundreds of years before Islam, and there is therefore no justification for seeing the corresponding passage in the litany, "Our God in Heaven," as the product of external influence.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS*

* Compiled by Avital Pinnick, Israel.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES*

A. JEWISH TEXTS

1. Bible

* Compiled by Avital Pinnick, Israel.

2. Apocrypha

3. Pseudepigrapha

4. Dead Sea Scrolls

5. Philo and Josephus

6. Mishnah

7. Tosefta

8. Babylonian Talmud

9. Jerusalem Talmud

10. Midrash

11. Jewish Liturgy

B. CHRISTIAN TEXTS

1. New Testament

2. Patristic Literature