



האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים  
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM



universität  
wien



לחקר מגילות מדבר יהודה  
והספרות הקרובה להן  
THE ORION CENTER  
for the Study of the  
Dead Sea Scrolls and  
Associated Literature



Fifteenth International Orion Symposium  
in conjunction with the  
University of Vienna Institute for Jewish Studies and the  
Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies  
***“The Texts of the Bible from the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Biblical Manuscripts of  
the Vienna Papyrus Collection”***

April 10–13, 2016

---

SUNDAY, APRIL 10, 2016

*Beit Maierdorf, Mount Scopus, Room 405*

**Session I (16:00–17:30)**

**Professor Alexander Rofé**  
**Hebrew University**

**“Midrashic Elements in Biblical Texts”**

“Midrashic” is used here to denote the folkloristic and theological literary output typical of postbiblical Judaism.

In the field of folklore the following trends are specified: (a) the identification of two biblical individuals who share the same name; (b) the diversification of roles within groups of biblical heroes; (c) the transformation of a sporadic trait of a biblical character into a constant one; (d) enhancing the prestige of biblical heroes by endowing them with attendants.

The theological trend is active in: (a) insisting on the prominence of the *torah*, (b) introducing *halakhic* terminology into the Scriptures; (c) interpreting biblical history according to beliefs prevalent in Second Temple Judaism (e.g., the belief concerning the slaying of the prophets).

Midrashic elements are present in all of our textual witnesses—MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, LXX, and Qumran MSS. However, when the presence of midrash is extensive and determines a rewriting of biblical episodes, the text in question must be defined not as a copy of a biblical book, but as a midrash on that book. This is the case of 4Q51, usually labelled as 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

**Dr. Jonathan Ben-Dov**  
**University of Haifa**

**“The Textual Variants in Deuteronomy 32 and the Sectarian Debate”**

The textual variants in Deut 32:8 and 43 have been extensively discussed in recent decades as part of the discipline of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. However, it also seems relevant to study the reception history of these various readings, because they are known to us from Second Temple sources. Why is it that specific circles corrected the original reading and embraced it while others did not? One should also study the history of quotations of Deuteronomy 32, to see where and when each of the readings was followed. Divergent beliefs in angels during the Second Temple period can show a way towards understanding the dynamics of this reception. Such a study may, on the one hand, shed light on the circles that produced the MT (and SP) text of Deuteronomy, and on the other hand, reveal information about their opponents.

**Opening Ceremony (18:00–20:00): Keynote Lectures**

**Professor Emanuel Tov**  
**Hebrew University**

“The Development of the Text of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks”

When trying to understand the textual situation of the Torah in the Second Temple period we are faced with a veritable textual plurality, probably reflecting some ten different textual branches, more than in the other books of Scripture. Moving beyond earlier textual theories, I suggest that this plurality should be reduced to a pattern of two large tradition blocks, MT (block I) and all the other texts (block II). Among these other texts, the (probably Palestinian) block composed of the LXX, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the pre-Samaritan scrolls, together with their congeners, are the major component. The LXX and SP form one textual tradition characterized by harmonizing readings, especially pluses, among them several inappropriate ones. This assumption is supported by the binary division of the textual character of the *tefillin* belonging to either the MT or the LXX-SP group. It is further supported by the fact that the MT tradition is quoted only in the rabbinic literature, while the LXX-SP block served as the basis for a number of rewritten Bible compositions. Unlike block II, the MT block remained relatively clean of secondary readings. Among the biblical and non-biblical texts in Qumran there is more evidence for block II than for block I.

**Professor Dr. Bernhard Palme**  
**Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik,**  
**University of Vienna**

“The History of the Vienna Papyrus Collection and its Biblical Manuscripts”

The Department of Papyri of the Austrian National Library houses an extensive collection of ancient documents written on papyrus, parchment, ostraca, and early paper, dating from the 15<sup>th</sup> century BCE to the 15<sup>th</sup> century CE. With 180,000 objects, this is one of the largest collections of ancient manuscripts in the world. It originates from the collection of Archduke Rainer, who began acquiring texts written on papyrus in 1883. Almost all the objects originate from Egypt, where climatic conditions are favorable for the preservation of fragile documents. In October 2001, the papyrus collection was included in UNESCO’s list, “Memory of the World,” as a world documentation heritage site.

Among its objects, the Department of Papyri preserves an important collection of biblical manuscripts, as well as documentary texts illustrating the Jewish and early Christian communities in Egypt. The lecture will provide a survey of the variety of biblical manuscripts and will give an overview of the most important texts.

---

MONDAY, APRIL 11

*Rabin Building, Mount Scopus, Room 2001*

**Session II (9:15–10:40)**

**Prof. Russell E. Fuller**  
**University of San Diego**

“Isaiah and the Twelve in Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Period Writings:  
Textual History and Textual Reception”

This paper will examine some of the issues that impact the use of biblical quotations and allusions to biblical compositions, in Greek and Hebrew compositions of the Second Temple period, for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. An analysis of the quotations of Amos 5:26–27 and Amos 9:11 in the well-known Amos–Numbers midrash in the Damascus Document will show that, although the writer felt free to reorganize the text of the Amos

quotations, the quoted text is otherwise altered in only a limited way. An examination of a blended quotation of Mal 3:24 and Isa 49:6 in Ben Sira 48:10 will likewise show little alteration of the quoted text, but will reveal an ancient variant text. Through these examples, the paper will analyse the implications for the state of the developing text of the Bible and its reception. Although the writers of these compositions altered the order of the components of biblical verses, there are surprisingly few real textual variants.

**Prof. Armin Lange**  
**University of Vienna**

“Jeremiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Elsewhere: The Textual History of Jeremiah in Light of its Quotations”

The Jeremiah quotations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and other ancient Jewish literature from the Second Temple Period throw important spotlights on the textual history of this book. Early quotations and allusions set the *terminus ante quem* of the proto-Masoretic Jeremiah redaction in the early third century BCE. Jeremiah quotations and allusions in the book of Ben Sira and in many Dead Sea Scrolls point to a prominence of the proto-Masoretic text of Jeremiah during the Second Temple period, while the Jeremiah quotations and allusions in other texts may indicate the existence of non-aligned texts of Jeremiah which are lost today.

**Dr. David Frankel**  
**Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies**

“The Contribution of Text Criticism to Literary Analysis, Redaction History, and the Study of Ancient Israelite Religion”

This paper seeks to highlight the contributions of textual criticism and the study of scribal practices to literary analysis, redaction history and the study of ancient Israelite Religion. Several examples will be discussed, two of which are mentioned here. First, various considerations, including an analysis of the use of medial *mem* in the final position in 11 QPs<sup>a</sup>, and a study of *matres lectiones* in ancient Hebrew epigraphs and Aramaic inscriptions, point to the likelihood that the word באדם in Gen. 9:6 should be understood as “in the ground.” This has significant ramifications both for an appreciation of the Primeval History as a literary unit and for an understanding of the redactional character of the P source. Second, many scholars believe that Ps 45:7 provides unique evidence for the belief in the divinity of the king in ancient Israel. However, a study of scribal tendencies to convert the tetragrammaton to Elohim, and vice versa, points to the caution with which one must approach the use of the term Elohim, particularly when dealing with one of the Elohistic Psalms. The failure to clearly distinguish between the Hebrew letters ך and ך at Qumran may help explain the special employment of Paleo-Hebrew characters or four dots for the Divine name, thus ensuring that the name not be misconstrued as יהיה. I suggest that the opposite tendency occurred in Psalm 45:7: The word יהיה was mistakenly construed as the divine name and converted into Elohim. There is thus no evidence to support the claim that the king was deified in ancient Israel.

**Dr. Noam Mizrahi**  
**Tel-Aviv University**

“Linguistic Change, Textual Variation, and Exegetical Motivation:  
Exodus 12:9 according to 4Q11”

4Q11, a copy of Exodus written in the paleo-Hebrew script, is generally close to the so-called proto-Masoretic tradition but nonetheless contains several intriguing variants vis-à-vis the MT. By utilizing both text-critical and historical-linguistic tools, the paper analyzes a curious variant recorded in Exod 12:9, namely, the interchange between MT נג and 4Q11 נו. Unlike previous studies, which dismissed this variant as insignificant or meaningless, the present analysis suggests that this variant reveals essential aspects of the multifaceted process of linguistic change that was operative in ancient Hebrew. The paper also explores the possibility that the occurrence of the variant under scrutiny in the context of the Passover

prescription is not so random; it might be exegetically motivated, as is suggested by the perusal of pertinent traditions that developed around this legal passage during the history of biblical interpretation. This case illustrates how the combined force of both philological and linguistic approaches offers a compelling matrix for understanding the creation and dissemination of textual variants in the scriptural texts of the Second Temple period.

**Session III (14:00–17:10)**

**Prof. Geoffrey Khan**  
**Cambridge University**

“The Karaites and the Biblical Text”

In the first half of this paper, I shall discuss the role of the Karaites in the production of Bible manuscripts and the transmission of the biblical text. It will be argued that Karaites were involved in the main core of the Tiberian Masoretic tradition, which produced the monumental Tiberian codices of the Bible. Not all Masoretes were Karaites. Rather, the Karaites joined forces with non-Karaite scholars in the development and promotion of the Tiberian Masoretic activities. There is firm evidence that Karaites wrote Masoretic treatises and also commissioned the production of some of the extant monumental Tiberian codices. Apart from the monumental codices, which were not exclusively the domain of the Karaites, there is a corpus of medieval Bible manuscripts that were clearly produced in Karaite circles for use by Karaites. This is a unique corpus of Hebrew Bible manuscripts written in Arabic transcription.

In the second half of the paper I shall discuss some of the philological details concerning the Tiberian reading tradition of biblical Hebrew that can be gleaned from the Karaite Bibles in Arabic script and Karaite Masoretic treatises. I shall argue that some of these philological details give us an important insight into the transmission of the Tiberian reading tradition of the Hebrew Bible in the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium C.E.

**Dr. Guy Darshan**  
**Tel-Aviv University**

“1 Kings, 3 Kingdoms, and ‘Rewritten Bible’ Compositions from Qumran: A Reevaluation of the History of the Text”

The study of the textual history of 1 Kings/3 Kingdoms is currently dominated by two approaches. The first follows the theory proposed by David Gooding, according to which the LXX is a late midrashic adaptation of the MT—Emanuel Tov, for example, identifying it as similar to the pre-Samaritan Pentateuchal scrolls. The second, represented by scholars such as Julio Trebolle Barrera and Adrian Schenker, regards the LXX as the earliest recension and the MT as a later adaptation. Neither school convincingly explains the textual history of 1 Kgs / 3 Kgdms, adducing one version as earlier than the other despite the fact that—like the Qumran “Rewritten Bible” compositions—both contain late expansions and creative additions. This paper analyzes two examples that cannot be accounted for by either of the prevalent approaches, and also discusses the meaning and historical background of the late layers—a subject that to date has not been properly investigated.

**Dr. Pablo Torijano Morales**  
**Universidad Complutense de Madrid**

“The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Latin Text”

Among the old versions “only (. . .) the Vetus Latina has any bearing on the Hebrew text of the Bible through its Greek source that is not extant” (E. Tov). The critical value of the VL lies in the highly literal character of the translation and in the antiquity of its text preceding the recensions of the Septuagint. Qumran has contributed to a major consideration of the value of VL: first because of the significant number of variants attested by VL that appear in the Scrolls; and second, because of the light that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and other biblical manuscripts shed

on the Greek Antiochean text, the VL *Vorlage* in the historical books. The present paper will provide an overview of the importance of the VL, the problems entailed by its use, and the new research venues it opens for several canonical and apocryphal books.

**Session IV (17:30–18:50)**

**Dr. Leeor Gottlieb**  
**Bar-Ilan University**

“Targumim and the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls: Separate Versions, Shared Solutions”

Biblical translations bear testimony to the Hebrew *Vorlage* used by their translators, and therefore, ancient biblical translations are regarded as important textual witnesses. The Septuagint is probably the most prominent of the ancient translations in this respect, for it holds abundant indications of a *Vorlage* that differed from the Masoretic Text. Many cases of textual variants derived through Hebrew retroversions from the Greek were later found in Hebrew in the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. The Aramaic Targumim, on the other hand, have been found to correlate highly with the Masoretic Text. Consequently, there are very few instances of textual agreement between biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and the Aramaic Targumim, against the Masoretic Text. That having been said, one may identify very many agreements between the Scrolls and the Targumim in modifications of Scripture that do not necessarily testify to a non-Masoretic Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Targumim.

In this paper I will present examples of such agreements categorized according to grammatical considerations and translation technique.

**Dr. Ira Rabin**  
**BAM Federal Institute for Material Research and Testing, Berlin**  
**Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures, University of Hamburg**

“Continuities in Writing Materials from the Dead Sea Scrolls to  
Medieval Hebrew Manuscripts”

The international Qumran project coordinated at the BAM, Berlin, has resulted in an integrated methodology for determining the original and acquired properties of the skin-based writing surfaces of the Dead Sea Scrolls. This methodology offers a powerful tool for addressing such questions as the provenance, sorting, and comparison of manuscripts. In addition, we have developed specific protocols for on-site studies, which were successfully applied to the fragments from the Schøyen collection in Norway. Our studies show that the Dead Sea manuscripts can be divided roughly into three groups according to their writing surfaces: leather, parchments of a light tint, and those of various shades of brown. The latter ones are invariably tanned, whereas the middle group is characterized by the presence of various inorganic salts. Some of the pale parchments, among them the Temple Scroll (11Q19), are remarkably similar to medieval European parchment. Therefore, we have formulated the working theory that in Judea of the Hellenistic period, two different parchment-making traditions existed side by side: an “eastern” one (represented by the tanned parchments of Qumran, closely resembling Aramaic documents from the fifth century BC), and a “western” one (represented by the untanned/lightly tanned ones, and similar to early Christian Greek parchments).

This division has found support during our first pilot study of the Genizah fragments, in which Babylonian and Palestinian traditions seem to use the “eastern” and “western” technologies, respectively.

The evolution and socio-geographic distribution of writing inks in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages forms the second focus of the BAM group. We use X-ray fluorescence analysis (XRF) to determine the chemical composition of the inks and NIR-reflectography for their typology. Here the early appearance of metal-containing inks clearly belongs to the western tradition, contrasting with the continuing use of soot inks in the East.

TUESDAY, APRIL 12

*Schechter Institute, Neve Sha'an*

**Session V (9:15–12:40)**

**Prof. Moshe Benovitz**  
**Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies**

“The Opening Words of Greek Esther According to *Yerushalmi Megillah* 2:1 (73a)”

According to *m. Megillah* 2:1, the Esther Scroll may be read to non-Hebrew speaking Jews in their native tongue rather than in Hebrew. A gloss of the third-century Palestinian *amora* Rabbi Eleazar, cited in the Yerushalmi passage for that mishnah, insists that even in such a case, the scroll must be written in the Assyrian script, the rabbinic term for the block Hebrew script in which biblical scrolls are written to this day. The *amora* Rabbi Samuel bar Sosartai explains that the reference is to a scroll written גיגנטון. Siegmund Fraenkel correctly identified this form as the transliteration into Hebrew letters of the Greek for the opening words of the Book of Esther, *wayehi*, “And it came to pass” (Esther 1:1). The Greek for *wayehi* is *kai egeneto*, which was presumably pronounced *gegeneton* in some circles in Palestine. The Yerushalmi thus mandates that the Greek version of Esther read in the synagogue be written in Hebrew transliteration: גיגנטון, etc.

Fraenkel's proposal, while undoubtedly correct, does not fully account for the orthography of the transliterated form, with initial *gimel*, final *nun*, crasis of *kai* with augment, and the use of *yod* as the *mater lectionis* reflecting the coalesced vowel. Moreover, extant Greek translations of Esther do not begin with MT 1:1, but with an introductory passage concerning a dream of Mordecai, which begins with the words *Enous deuterou basileuontos Artaxerxou*, “in the second year of the reign of Artaxerxes.” The talmudic passage as interpreted by Fraenkel thus raises questions with regard to the morphology and pronunciation of the Greek spoken by Jews in third-century Palestine, as well as the religious practices of these Greek-speaking Jews. These issues will be explored in this paper.

**Dr. Paul Mandel**  
**Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies**

“The Rise of Textuality in the Rabbinic Period”

It has been a commonplace in scholarship of the rabbinic period that the sages invested much energy and care to interpreting the precise text of the Hebrew Bible, deriving *minutae* of law and lore from “close” readings of the text, and especially from anomalous aspects—grammatical, syntactical and lexical—found therein. This conception has been connected with the activity known as *midrash*, which has been seen as the textual activity *par excellence* of the rabbinic sages, found already—albeit in embryonic form—in the literature of the Dead Sea scrolls. The attestations of the verb *darash* and the noun *midrash* in the Qumran literature as well as in the rabbinic corpus have been understood as markers of this special textual activity. Thus the Qumranic leader, who is given the title *doresh ha-torah*, is understood to have imparted *tools of textual interpretation* to his followers, who viewed themselves as involved in continuous textual interpretative activity. Hillel is recorded as utilizing *midrashic* techniques in the first century BCE, and arguments concerning the proper techniques of legal derivation from the biblical text are understood to underlie the two midrashic schools of the second century CE, following Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiva. The interest in the Hebrew text is seen to be continued by Rabbi Akiva's main disciple, Rabbi Meir, to whom special variant readings, recorded in “his *torah*,” have been ascribed. With regard to all these activities it has been suggested that the so-called “scribes” of this period, known as *sofrim*, took an active role as transmitters of the scriptural text.

This paper takes issue with the view summarized above. The study is based on a lexical investigation of the words *darash*, *midrash*, and *sofer* as attested in the Qumranic and

rabbinic writings and the associated literature of the periods. I suggest that in fact, very little attention was paid to the precise consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, although it is clear that scriptural language, law, and lore had a profound influence on the leadership of the Jewish people, who utilized Scripture as a basis for their approach to history, law, custom, and theology during these eras. I will present several examples of passages from the earlier and later corpora, which I believe should be explained differently than is the rule in current scholarship. I will suggest a new understanding of the relationship between the textual interpretation of Scripture and the determination of law, at the same time explaining the special role of the *sofer* (and his *koiné* Greek counterpart, *grammateus*) in the determination and dissemination of law.

**Prof. Shamma Friedman**  
**Jewish Theological Seminary of America**  
**Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies**

“The Strange Journey of a Demonstrative Pronoun  
from the Judean Desert to the Babylonian Talmud”

The rare Aramaic demonstrative pronoun ܝܚܝ, which occurs in several contexts in the Babylonian Talmud, has posed vexing lexicographic challenges. In one of its contexts it seems to be inspired by Onqelos's rendering of the rare BH demonstrative הַלְלוּהָ. In another, it is embedded in a clause properly comprehended when taken as derived from the Judean Desert formulary tradition. I wish to balance the trend of searching rabbinic material for the legal *sitz im leben* of the Judean Desert documents by explaining talmudic cruxes in light of their Judean antecedents.

**Prof. David Golinkin**  
**Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies**

“On the Biblical Verses Cited in the Babylonian Talmud”

Since the days of Rav Hai Gaon, and especially since 1850, many scholars have discussed the biblical verses quoted in the Babylonian Talmud.

In this lecture, I would like to discuss four aspects of this phenomenon and set out some directions for further research:

- 1) The widespread phenomenon of verses which differ from the Masoretic text;
- 2) “Verses” quoted in the Talmud which are not found in the Bible at all;
- 3) Verses which were cited in abbreviated forms, which led to variant readings as to the ends of the verses in the talmudic manuscripts, which led in turn to different interpretations of the talmudic passages themselves;
- 4) Extreme abbreviation of biblical verses under the assumption that the reader knows the verses.

**Session VI (14:00–15:30)**

**Nancy Benovitz**  
**The Israel Museum, Jerusalem**

“The Rabbinic *Shema* in Greek on a Byzantine Armband”

The paper presents an unpublished silver armband-amulet in the Israel Museum collection that preserves a lost Greek translation of the first two paragraphs of the rabbinic *Shema*. The form of the armband places it among a group of sixth–seventh century Christian armband-amulets from Syria/Palestina and Egypt, which were decorated with Christian iconography, protective motifs, and Greek inscriptions. However, this armband is inscribed with Deut 6:4, Ps 91:1, and a conflation of Deut 6:5–9 and Deut 11:13–21 in a Byzantine Greek translation; the text is based on second-century Greek Bible translations, mainly that of Aquila, of which only fragments have survived. This combination of verses, certain details of the translation, and the lack of Christian imagery indicate that the armband was a Jewish adaptation of the

Christian type. Its resemblance to the subgroup of armbands from Egypt suggests that it was a product of the Egyptian Jewish Diaspora.

**Dr. Noah Hacham**  
**Hebrew University**

“How Do We Identify Greek Jewish Biblical Papyri?”

In *CPJ* volume IV, which is currently in preparation, we include both documentary and literary papyri, among them Greek biblical papyri. The oldest Greek biblical papyri are from the second and first centuries BCE, and are therefore clearly Jewish. However, most of the papyri are from the second century CE onwards. This period saw the growth of Christianity, a religion that read and studied the Greek Bible. The popularity of the Greek Bible among Christians on the one hand, and the decline of the Jewish presence in Egypt following the Diaspora rebellion, on the other hand, support the assumption that the majority of the Greek biblical papyri are Christian. Still, there are Jewish pieces from this period. In this paper I will suggest criteria to distinguish between Jewish and Christian papyri, using several papyri from the Vienna collection as examples, among other documents.

**Prof. Michael Segal and Prof. Emanuel Tov**  
**Hebrew University**

“The Ein Gedi Leviticus(?) Scroll”

A charred scroll was discovered in the 1970s during the excavations of the Ein Gedi synagogue, a site dated to the 6<sup>th</sup> century CE. Due to its physical condition, the scroll is unopenable and unreadable, and its contents have remained a mystery to scholars. Recently, however, employing technological advances in the field of tomography and appropriate mathematical algorithms, Prof. Brent Seales of the University of Kentucky, in consultation with the IAA, successfully generated high resolution images of the contents of the scroll. While the physical remains of the scroll are still inaccessible, we now have computer-generated, virtual images of two columns of the scroll that are as readable as undamaged scrolls.

The two columns that have been uncovered preserve Leviticus 1–2. In this lecture, we will describe the technical aspects of the scroll, present a preliminary transcription, and discuss the significance of this scroll for the textual history of Leviticus in particular, and for the Masoretic text in general. Since the site at which the scroll was found is dated to the 6<sup>th</sup> century, if the scroll was copied during that same general period then it provides important evidence for the state of the biblical text between the Dead Sea Scrolls (until the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE) and the Cairo Genizah manuscripts (9<sup>th</sup> century CE and on).

---

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13

*Rabin Building, Mount Scopus, Room 2001*

**Session VII (9:15–12:30)**

**Prof. Yosef Ofer**  
**Bar Ilan University**

“The Genesis Manuscripts from the Vienna Papyrus Collection”

The six Genesis Genizah fragments in the Vienna Papyrus Collection differ from one another and represent the variety of Torah fragments in the Cairo Genizah. Two fragments are unvocalized and without accents, written in tiny codices with many orthographic mistakes. These fragments represent the popular copies of the Bible that were used by the general public, children and adults.



Three fragments are vocalized and have accents. One of them is of special interest: Ornamented with colored drawings, it represents a relatively new type of manuscript: After every weekly portion comes the Haftarah, followed by a wealth of Masoretic data about the portion, given in a colored frame. In my lecture I shall describe the development of this type of Masoretic data in manuscripts and printed editions.

The sixth fragment is a fifteenth-century Sephardic Torah scroll that was disqualified before its writing had been completed. After its disqualification it was used for scribal exercises and pieces of parchment were cut from it for other uses.

**Dr. Ursula Schattner-Rieser**  
**University of Innsbruck**  
**Institute for Jewish History in Austria**

“The Vienna Biblical Fragments (Exod, Lev, Num) in Light of the Karaite Tradition, and their Relationship to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish Halakhah”

The Vienna Papyrus Collection of the National Library of Austria hosts some interesting biblical fragments, which were imported in the 19<sup>th</sup> century from Egypt to Vienna. Among them are fragments from Exodus, Numbers and Leviticus. With the exception of one leather scroll fragment, they are leaves from codices written in oriental square script on parchment (one on paper), similar to some 10–11<sup>th</sup> c. Bible codices such as Codex Aleppo, Codex Leningrad (B19<sup>A</sup>) and BL Or. 4445. Fragments H 27 (Leviticus 21, 24–30, 33) and H 109 (Lev 7:3–37), for example, are oriental in text tradition and vocalized according to the Tiberian system, and they clearly testify to the Palestinian triennial Torah-reading cycle

The paper aims to locate the Vienna manuscripts within the Masoretic traditions fixed in the talmudic tractates *Sefer Torah* and *Sofrim*; Maimonides’s *Yad, Hilkhoh Sefer Torah*; and the Karaite reading tradition (of Parshiyot/Sedarim and Haftarot); and to compare their features with the scriptural particularities of the Dead Sea Scrolls in terms of orthography and sectional divisions.

The Vienna fragments H 6, H 27, H 109, H 143, and H 192 are therefore important testimonies for tracing the history of the biblical text, as regards the transmission of both content and presentation of the text.

**Dr. Viktor Golinets**  
**Hochschule für Jüdische Studien, Heidelberg**

“Manuscripts of the Former and the Latter Prophets from the Vienna Papyrus Collection”

The lecture deals with five fragmentary manuscripts from the Vienna Papyrus Collection in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. Three fragments contain text from the books of 1 Samuel and Zephaniah, and two fragments belong to Haftarot manuscripts; they feature texts of the books of Joshua and 1 Kings, with commentaries, and texts from the books of Hosea, Ezekiel, and Isaiah. The manuscripts originate from the Genizah of the Ezra Synagogue in Cairo, judging by the state of preservation of the fragments, the writing material—it is both parchment and paper—and the style of the writing. The biblical texts are vocalized and accented according to the standard Tiberian system. However, the use of the signs *dagesh* and *mappiq*, as well as some nuances of vocalization, differ slightly from what we know as standard Tiberian. These peculiarities and the text itself will be discussed at length in this presentation.

**Dr. Leor Gottlieb**  
**Bar Ilan University**

“A Page from a Haftarah Book in the Vienna Papyrus Collection”

One of the holdings of the Vienna Papyrus Collection is a page out of a Haftarah book from the Cairo Genizah. Each Hebrew verse in this manuscript is followed by its counterpart in Aramaic Targum. Scripture is pointed with both Tiberian vocalization and cantillation marks. The manuscript displays several interesting features, first and foremost of which is that the

order of Haftarat follows the triennial reading cycle. This, together with other characteristics of this manuscript, make this page an important attestation of the liturgical practices and Jewish tradition of the community that produced it.

In this paper I will present this manuscript, describe its main features, and place it in the context of other Genizah findings which can be shown to be directly related to it.

### **Session VIII (14:00–17:10)**

**Prof. Emanuel Tov**  
**Hebrew University**

“P. Vindob. G 39777 (Symmachus) and the Use of the Divine Names in Greek Scripture Texts”

The Psalms fragments of P. Vindob. G 39777, probably from the Fayum in Egypt and kept at the Austrian National Library, were originally published as a fragment of Aquila’s translation. At a later stage Mercati suggested that the fragment might have been part of the translation by Symmachus (approximately 200 CE), and this view became the *communis opinio* in scholarship. P. Vindob. G 39777 includes the fragmentary remains of respectively three and five lines of two columns of Psalm 69 (LXX 68), and five lines of one column of Psalm 81 (LXX 80), in the version of Symmachus.

The readings of Symmachus show his free translation style. The most remarkable feature of the Vienna fragments is the writing of the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters in several verses. There is no consensus with regard to the original form of the presentation of the Tetragrammaton in the Greek translations, in the paleo-Hebrew or square Aramaic script or any other way. The present paper presents renewed thinking on this question. Two issues are at stake: 1. What was the shape of the representation of the name of God in the Old Greek translation? and 2. What is the background of a transcription of the name of God in the middle of the Greek text as in the fragment of Symmachus? The major question surrounding the texts that use Tetragrammata with Hebrew characters is whether they have common characteristics.

**Prof. Armin Lange**  
**University of Vienna**

“A Greek Jewish Biblical Manuscript from the Vienna Papyrus Collection?”

Only three Greek Psalms manuscripts from the Vienna Papyrus Collection were written as scrolls. They are dated to the 3<sup>rd</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> (G 39777), 5<sup>th</sup> (G 29525, 30465, 30893, 39786, 40405), and 6<sup>th</sup> (G 02322) centuries respectively. G 39777 is discussed in the presentation of Emanuel Tov (“P. Vindob. G 39777 [Symmachus] and the Use of the Divine Names in Greek Scripture Texts”). This presentation will focus on G 29525 (including G 30465, 30893, 39786, 40405) and G 02322. It will ask if their scroll formats indicates a Jewish background for one or both manuscripts.

**Prof. Josef Oesch**  
**University of Innsbruck**  
**Institute for Jewish History in Austria**

“Ketuvim Manuscripts from the Vienna Papyrus Collection”

The following texts are analyzed in relation to the Dead Sea manuscripts and the Masoretic tradition:

H 11: Ps 10,11\*-12,8;

H 119: Dan 8;

H 14: Job 6,21-7,8;

H 156: Est 9,13-10,3;

H 114: Ps 18,4-19;

H 191: Est 7.6-8,12.

