

## LIGHT ON THE CAVE SCROLLS FROM RABBINIC SOURCES

By SAUL LIEBERMAN

Three times the *Tosefta*<sup>1</sup> refers to practices which it terms: דרך אחרת,<sup>2</sup> heterodoxy. We shall list them in the same order as in the source.

I. *Berakhoth*<sup>3</sup> VII. 6: הרואה את החמה ואת הלבנה ואת הכוכבים ואת המזלות <כסדרן><sup>4</sup> אומר ברוך עושה בראשית. ר' יהודה אומר המברך על החמה הרי זה דרך אחרת, "When one sees the sun, or the moon, or the stars, or the planets, in their original order<sup>5</sup> he must say: Blessed [art Thou . . .] Who hast made the Creation. R. Judah<sup>6</sup> says: When one pronounces a blessing over the sun he is [following] a heterodoxy."<sup>7</sup>

II. *Ibid.*:<sup>8</sup> הפותח . . . באלף למד וחוחם באלף למד<sup>9</sup> הרי זה דרך אחרת,

<sup>1</sup> A rabbinic source compiled some time during the third century. All dates mentioned in this article are C. E. *TP* = *Talmud Palaestinense*. *TB* = *Talmud Babylonicum*.

<sup>2</sup> Literally: a different way.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. Zuckerman, p. 15, l. 9 ff.

<sup>4</sup> So ed. princ. and the editions of *TB Berakhoth* 59b.

<sup>5</sup> I. e. when they begin a new cycle, viz. when the sun is at the vernal equinox at the beginning of the twenty-eight years' cycle, or the moon when it enters the Zodiacal constellation of Aries etc. See Maimonides, Laws Concerning Blessings, X.18. Comp. the parallel passages in *TP Berakhoth* IX.3, 13d; *TB ibid.* 59b, and *Vayyikra Rabba* XXIII.8.

<sup>6</sup> Flourished around the middle of the second century. He often relates traditions considerably earlier than his own date. See *Tosefta Zebahim* II end, and the parallel in *TB Menahoth* 18a.

<sup>7</sup> R. Judah's statement is not recorded in any other source.

<sup>8</sup> 29, p. 17, l. 6.

<sup>9</sup> This is the reading of cod. Vienna and *Rokeah* sect. 363. Cod. Erfurt reads: באלף ולא ברלה וחוחם באלף ולא ברלה, which is an obvious error for: באלף באלף, באלף ולא ברלה וחוחם באלף ולא ברלה, which is an obvious error for: באלף באלף, באלף ולא ברלה וחוחם באלף ולא ברלה. Ed. prin. reads: באלף באלף, באלף ולא ברלה וחוחם באלף ולא ברלה, which should be corrected: באלף באלף, באלף ולא ברלה וחוחם באלף ולא ברלה. In my copy of the ed. princ. the previous clause is emended in an old hand (on the authority of א"א, another version) to read exactly as it is recorded in cod. Erfurt and *Rokeah*. The text in the editio princeps of the *Tosefta* is a product of a

"He who begins [a blessing] . . . with *Aleph Lamed* (i. e. *El*)<sup>10</sup> and concludes it with *Aleph Lamed*<sup>11</sup> is [following] a heterodoxy."

III. *Terumoth*:<sup>12</sup> סינן הרי אלו מותרין. את היין ואת החומץ והמברך על החמה אילו אסורין. ר' יהודה אומר המסנן<sup>13</sup> את היין ואת החומץ והמברך על החמה אחרת *Yabhushin*<sup>14</sup> [which originate] in wine and vinegar<sup>15</sup> are permitted [food]. But when they have passed through a filter they are forbidden. Rabbi Judah said: When one filters wine and vinegar and when one pronounces a blessing over the sun he is [following] a heterodoxy."

Proceeding now to an analysis and explanation of all these heterodoxies let us begin with the last source. R. Judah brands the filtering of wine and vinegar as a heterodoxy.<sup>16</sup> His view

learned scribe who corrected it according to the version in *TP ibid.* IX. 1, 12d. However *TP* follows another tradition in which the person pronouncing such a benediction is styled: הרי זה בור (he is an ignorant person) instead of דרך אחרת (heterodoxy), and thus it lists another case of heterodoxy. A rabbinic source should not as a rule be corrected on the basis of its parallels when its reading is more or less established. See *Kirjath Sepher* XIV, p. 324 ff. In this instance the reading of the *Tosefta* is almost certain

<sup>10</sup> Or *Elokim*, the *Aleph Lamed* being an abbreviation of this word.

<sup>11</sup> Thus avoiding the pronunciation of even the substitute for the Tetragrammaton.

<sup>12</sup> VII.11, p. 37, l. 30 ff.

<sup>13</sup> This is the reading of both codd. Erfurt and Vienna (except for the obvious scribal error in cod. Vienna: המסנן instead of המברך). Ed. pr. reads: מסנן instead of המסנן and המברך instead of המסנן. This is a self-evident scribal mistake: the opinion of R. Judah on the blessing of the sun is absolutely out of place here, unless it is related to his previous statement which he characterized as a heterodoxy. Thus the reading of both codices is unquestionably certain.

<sup>14</sup> The etymology of the word is obscure but from many places in rabbinic literature it is clear that it serves as a general term for insects generated in liquids, see *Tosefta Yadaim* II.2, 68210. Red *Yabhushin* "which are generated by water" (שחחלה ברייתו מן המים) are associated with slime in *TB Zebahim* 22a. This means that they are something like the ascarids of which Aristotle (*Hist. anim.* V.19, 8, 552a) tells us that they originate in slime in the form of very little bits of red weed (*ὡσπερ τὰ φυκία μακρὰ σφόδρα καὶ ἐρυθρά*). Comp. also *Mishnah Nidda* III.2.

<sup>15</sup> Comp. Plinius (*Nat. hist.* XI.41.118): alia genera culicum acescens natura gignit. "Other kind of gnats are bred by a substance growing sour."

<sup>16</sup> Here again the opinion of R. Judah is found in no other rabbinic source. (On the time of this sage, see above, n. 6). Comp. also *Tosefta Mikwaoth* V, end, 657, l. 34.

can be understood only from the context. According to rabbinic law all tiny creatures generated in vegetables and fruit<sup>17</sup> are edible, provided they never become detached from the food.<sup>18</sup> One is also allowed to drink wine with the *Yabhushin* (i. e. larvae) generated in it.

From R. Judah's ruling we gather that there were ultra-pious extremists who contended that liquids containing larvae generated in them may not be taken unless they have been filtered. This extremism was condemned by R. Judah as a heterodoxy.<sup>19</sup>

We find this heterodox view in the so called Covenant of Damascus:<sup>20</sup> אל ישקץ איש אה נפשו בכל החיה והרמש לאכל מהם מעולי "No man shall render himself abominable by eating any living creature and creeping thing: from the larvae<sup>21</sup> of bees to any living creature that lives in the water." This injunction is given without any limitation, and it is evident that any substance containing larvae which were generated in it was forbidden by this sect unless it was strained. It is directly contrary to the rabbinic law which states

<sup>17</sup> Detached from the earth.

<sup>18</sup> Once the insects part from the food if for only one moment they become forbidden, even if they are again mixed with it. See *Tosefta ibid.*; *Sifra Shemini* III. 10, ed. Weiss, 50a; *TB Hullin* 67a.

<sup>19</sup> Any one who disregarded the rabbinic interpretation of the Bible concerning practical law might be called heterodox by them.

<sup>20</sup> Ed. Schechter, p. 12, l. 11; comp. his translation *ibid.*, p. LI, n. 20.

<sup>21</sup> The correct explanation of the word was given by Prof. Louis Ginzberg in his *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*, p. 112: "Das syrische עולי דבריהא, kleine Würmchen." Ginzberg did not indicate his source, and the word is not found in Brockelmann's *Lexicon Syriacum*. However, Payne Smith in his *Thesaurus Syriacus*, p. 2749, s. v. עוליא, quotes from a manuscript work of Moses Bar Cephae: עוליא דדבריהא, and translates it: vermes qui ex apum ovis proveniunt, i. e. "worms that come forth from the egg of bees." Although the word seems to be a *hapax legomenon* there can be no doubt of its existence. It makes especially good sense in our context. Plinius (*Nat. hist.* XI.39.115) tells of larvae which breed in woollen clothing (i. e. moths) and adds: "Also I find in the authorities that some springs in which we bathe are especially productive of this kind of creature; inasmuch as even *wax generales* what is believed to be *the smallest of animals*." (quippe cum etiam cerae id gignant quod animalium minimum existimatur). These are exactly the insects which the sectarians had in mind. Aristotle (*De gener. anim.* III.9, 758b) mentions insects which are spontaneously generated in wool, "and", he adds without further qualification, "in waters." (καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι).

explicitly that one is allowed to drink water from any pit, or cavity, or cave, together with the larvae which bred in it.<sup>22</sup> And while our Rabbi did not condemn filtering of water which might be done for the sake of cleanliness, he explicitly stamped the filtering of wine and vinegar as a heterodoxy, a heretical opinion held by Jewish sectarians.<sup>23</sup>

The second judgment of R. Judah condemning those who pronounced a blessing over the sun can be properly understood only in the context of source I. The commentaries<sup>24</sup> realized that the Rabbi could hardly have objected to the prescribed benediction over the sun which is to be pronounced once in twenty-eight years, and that he probably had a daily benediction in mind.<sup>25</sup> We shall not enter into conjectures about the nature of this benediction, but the very association of the two heterodoxies<sup>26</sup> in our source suggests that the sage, in both instances, had the same ultra-pious groups in mind that wanted to be stricter than the Rabbis.

The only pious Jews of whom we know that they were accused of addressing some invocations to the sun were the Essenes. The famous passage of Josephus<sup>27</sup> records: "Before the sun is

<sup>22</sup> *Sifra*, *Shemini* III.1., ed. Weiss 49b; *TB Hulin* 67a. On the Karaites' identical laws, see below n. 56.

<sup>23</sup> It is noteworthy that the *Tosefta* (*Terumoth* XI.6, 41<sup>15</sup>) states explicitly: אוכל אדם דגים וחגבים בין חיים ובין מתים ואינו חושש "A man is allowed to eat fish and locusts whether they are alive or dead without any hesitation." This is in opposition to the law stated in the same place of the sectarian document (p. 12, l. 13. See above n. 20), which forbids the use of living fish and locusts, as already noted by Poznanski. (See Lieberman, *Tosefeth Rishonim* I, p. 57). A. Büchler (*JQR* III, 1913, p. 444) pointed out that a Jew of the fourth century once declared in the town of Tyre that fish ought to be slaughtered before they are used as food. He was ordered to be flogged by a famous Rabbi of that time. See *Bereshith Rabba* VII.2, ed. Theodor-Albeck, p. 50 and parallels referred to in the notes *ibid.* See also below n. 56.

<sup>24</sup> See *ibid.* מנחה בכורים *ad loc.*

<sup>25</sup> As a matter of fact the regular daily Jewish benediction before *Shema'* contains a formula similar to the one pronounced over the sun at the beginning of its cycle: ובטובו מחדש בכל יום חמיד מעשה בראשית "And in His goodness He steadily renews the Creation every day." Comp. *Siddur R. Saadia Gaon*, Jerusalem 1941, p. 13 and notes *ibid.* See also *TB Hagigah* 12b.

<sup>26</sup> I. e. the filtering of wine and pronouncing a benediction over the sun.

<sup>27</sup> *Bel. iud.* II.8.5, 128. Comp. Lightfoot quoted below, n. 30.

up they utter no word on mundane matters, but offer to it certain prayers etc., as though entreating it to rise."<sup>28</sup> Emil Schürer<sup>29</sup> is undoubtedly right in rejecting the opinion of "most Jewish scholars" who surmise that Josephus was speaking of the *Shema'* which was to be read at sunrise. However, these scholars maintained that the reference in Josephus was not to the *Shema'*, but to the benediction over the luminaries recited by the Pharisees every morning at dawn.<sup>30</sup>

The text of this benediction was quite fluid at an even much later period than the time of Josephus, and its early form is unknown to us. A *Genizah* fragment of this benediction<sup>31</sup> concludes as follows: "קומי אורי כי בא אורך וכבוד ה' עליך זרח בא", "Arise, shine, for thy light is come and the glory of the Lord has risen upon thee"<sup>32</sup> (Is. 60.1). Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Who createst the luminaries." We certainly cannot insist on the basis of this text that such a prayer was actually recited during the first century. But we may safely assume that the same spirit which prompted the Jews in the middle ages to insert this verse of Isaiah (60:1) into their benediction over the light and luminaries could well have prompted the Essenes in a much earlier period.

Every morning at dawn the Jews offered prayers of thanks for the light which was bestowed upon them,<sup>33</sup> and there is nothing in the way of assuming that the Essenes recited a prayer

<sup>28</sup> ὡσπερ ἰκετεύοντες ἀνατεῖλαι. (Comp. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae* I, p. 124: δεῦρό μοι ὁ ἀνατέλλων κτλ.). Nothing of this kind is reported of the Therapeutae; see Lightfoot, *ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> *Geschichte* etc. II<sup>4</sup>, p. 675.

<sup>30</sup> Comp. *Mishnah Tamid* V.1 and the comments in *TP Berakhoth* I.8, 3c and *TB ibid.* 11b. Regardless of what the benediction referred to in that *Mishnah* might have been it is obvious that the Rabbis of the third century took it for granted that the benediction over the luminaries was already recited during the Second Commonwealth. Comp. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, (London, 1876), p. 374.

<sup>31</sup> Published by J. Mann in the *Hebrew Union College Annual* II, p. 292.

<sup>32</sup> The same verse is included in this benediction in other ritual texts. See *Manhig Tephilah*, 31, ed. Berlin, 12a; A. Schechter, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy*, p. 57; Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst*, p. 20.

<sup>33</sup> Comp. also *Sap. Sol.* XVI.28. But there is no mention of specific thanks for the light.

in behalf of the sun<sup>34</sup> in which they utilized the same verse in Isaiah (60.1) as found in the previously quoted text. This verse said at dawn could certainly be taken by Josephus as a real invocation of the sun "as if entreating it to rise."<sup>35</sup> However, whatever the particular prayer of the Essenes may have been, it is evident that it had something to do with the sun. It can therefore be plausibly concluded that in condemning some benediction over the sun our Rabbi had the heterodoxy of a similar sect in mind.

Source II states clearly that the use of El<sup>36</sup> both at the beginning and at the conclusion of a benediction<sup>37</sup> is a heterodoxy.<sup>38</sup> In my commentary *ad. loc.*<sup>39</sup> I remarked: "With those people in mind who were careful not to mention the substitute for the Tetragrammaton even in prescribed benedictions, the *Mishnah*<sup>40</sup> ordained that a man greet his fellow with [the use of] the Name of the Lord. However I do not know for certain of whom the Rabbis were thinking." Happily we are now in a position to identify them. They were Jewish secterians.

The author (or the authors) of the so called Manual of Discipline consistently avoids the use of the Tetragrammaton<sup>41</sup> and employ El in its place.<sup>42</sup> Moreover we even find<sup>43</sup> that they recited a benediction beginning with the formula: *ברוך אתה אלהי*, thus omitting the regular use of the substitute for the Tetragrammaton. Hence we may safely conclude that this Jewish heterodoxy is already spoken of in the *Tannaitic* writings.

<sup>34</sup> Or mentioned the sun specifically instead of light and the luminaries in general.

<sup>35</sup> For a similar situation comp. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, p. 142 ff. and p. 209.

<sup>36</sup> See above n. 10.

<sup>37</sup> I. e. to avoid even the substitute for the Tetragrammaton.

<sup>38</sup> For regardless of the tradition in *TP* (see above n. 9) all sources agree that such a benediction was recited by certain people. The tradition in the *Tosefta* and the one in the *Palestinian Talmud* disagree only on whether this way of formulating the blessing stems from heterodoxy or from ignorance.

<sup>39</sup> *Tosefeth Rishonim* I, p. 31.

<sup>40</sup> *Berakhoth* IX, end.

<sup>41</sup> See also ed. Burrows, plate VI, bot. ff., and ed. Schechter, p. 15, top.

<sup>42</sup> The author (or authors) of the *הוריות* seems to have been less scrupulous in this respect.

<sup>43</sup> Ed. M. Burrows, plate XI, l. 15.

However, it can hardly be assumed that these sectarians never resorted to the Name either for reading or writing the Law. It is only in prayers (and perhaps also in quoting from the Bible) that they avoided the Name. Once we realize this, another old rabbinic tradition takes on meaning.

We read in the *Tosefta*:<sup>44</sup> אומרין טובלי שחרין קובלנו עליכם פרושין פרושין קובלנו עליכם שאתם מזכירין את השם בשחרית בלא טבילה. אומ' פרושין קובלנו עליכם שאתם מזכירין את השם מן הגוף שיש בו טומאה "The *Morning Bathers* said: We charge against you, O Pharisees, that you mention the Name without previous ritual submersion [for this purpose]. Said the Pharisees: We charge against you, O *Morning Bathers*, that you mention the Name when your body holds ritual uncleanness."<sup>45</sup>

We learn from this exchange that according to the *Morning Bathers* one is not allowed to mention the Name without previous submersion, regardless of whether one is ritually clean or unclean.<sup>46</sup> The Pharisees pointedly retorted: How do you ever resort to the use of the Name<sup>47</sup> when your bodies are always unclean. Where is your consistency?

In the parallel *Mishnah*<sup>48</sup> a similar discussion between a *Galilaeen* heretic<sup>49</sup> and the Pharisees is recorded. It is therefore more than likely that the *Galilaeen* heretics in the *Mishnah* and the *Morning Bathers* in the *Tosefta* are none other than the two sects mentioned by Hegesippus<sup>50</sup> together with the Essenes: 'Ἐσ-σαῖοι, Γαλιλαῖοι, 'Ἡμεροβαπτισταί κτλ. "Essenes, Galilaeans, Hemero-baptists<sup>51</sup> etc." Once again (as in the previous sources)

<sup>44</sup> *Yadaim* end, according to cod. Vienna; see Lieberman, *Tosefeth Rishonim* IV, p. 160.

<sup>45</sup> I. e. semen.

<sup>46</sup> Just as an even ritually clean person was not allowed to enter the Temple without previous submersion for that purpose. See *TP Yoma* III.3, 40b. Comp. also below n. 63.

<sup>47</sup> I. e. even when reading or writing the Law. <sup>48</sup> *Yadaim* IV.8.

<sup>49</sup> מין גלילי. This is the reading of Lowe, Kaufmann, *Genizah* fragments and others. Our modern editions read: צדוקי גלילי, A Galilaeen Sadducee. This reading is a correction by the censor.

<sup>50</sup> Eusebius, *hist. eccl.* IV.22.7. Comp. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, London, 1876, pp. 402, 406 ff.

<sup>51</sup> The latter were correctly identified with our *Morning Bathers* by Graetz,

we have come across sects of extremists<sup>52</sup> which followed stricter regulations than the Rabbis regarding the mention of the Name. Adding this fact to the previous discussion concerning the group which insisted on filtering wine and vinegar we realize that in the second century at the latest a Jewish heterodoxy was in existence which indulged in such acts of ultra-piety.

We have indicated above that these requirements are found in one of the sectarian documents.<sup>53</sup> Jewish scholars have already called attention to the great similarity between the Karaite laws and those found in the so-called Damascus Covenant, also pointing out their relation to Zadok's book mentioned by Al-Qirqisani.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, all the laws of that particular passage<sup>55</sup> were adopted by the Karaites.<sup>56</sup> It is more than likely that the latter were in possession of these sectarian writings. Prof. Paul Kahle's theory<sup>57</sup> about the discovery of the cave in the eighth century and the sale of part of its contents to the Jews is very credible.

In the light of this the following passage assumes special importance. Rabbi Moses Taku<sup>58</sup> relates:<sup>59</sup> וכבר שמענו מרבוחינו כי ענן המין וחביריו היו כותבין דברי מינות ושקר וטומנים בקרקע, ואח"כ היו מוציאים אותם ואומרים כך מצאנו בספרים קדמונים,

*Geschichte der Juden* III<sup>2</sup>, Note 10, p. 468. The former are mentioned by Josephus (*Antiq.* XVIII. 1. 2. 6, 23-24) and Acts V.37.

<sup>52</sup> Josephus *ibid.* states explicitly that the Galileans generally followed the doctrines of the Pharisees. But as extreme fanatics they were counted among the heretics by the Rabbis. Comp. above, n. 19. See also Acts *ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> See above n. 20.

<sup>54</sup> See the detailed discussion by Büchler in *JQR* III, 1913, p. 442 ff.; *ibid.* 431 ff.

<sup>55</sup> Pertaining to water insects, locusts, extracting the blood from fish etc.

<sup>56</sup> See Schechter *ibid.*, p. LI, n. 20 Comp. *Eshkol Hakofer* f. 67b, 89b (comp. above n. 23), 90a (sect. 235, end, 236, beginning), 133a (sect. 361, beginning), 136d (s. v. חטאתי II); *Sepher ha-Mitzwoth, Adereth Eliyyahu* 69d, 70a (comp. above, n. 23); *The Book of the Wars of the Lord* by Salmon ben Yeruhim, ed. Davidson, (New York 1934), p. 105, and n. 17 *ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> *Vetus Testamentum* vol. I, No. 1, p. 45 ff.; comp. the article of O. Eissfeldt referred to in n. 1, *ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> Flourished around the first half of the thirteenth century. He probably drew this tradition from an earlier source.

<sup>59</sup> כתב חמים in *Ozar Nechmad* of Blumenfeld, III, p. 62.

“And we have heard from our teachers that the heretic Anan<sup>60</sup> and his friends used to write down heresies and lies and *hide them in the ground*. Then they would take them out and say: *This is what we found in ancient books.*” It is quite evident that this claim of the Karaites could not possibly be invented by the Rabbis: they had absolutely no reason for crediting the Karaites with the contention that they found their doctrines in previously hidden books. The Rabbis had a good tradition to this effect, and they charged that Anan and his friends themselves wrote the books which the Karaites subsequently unearthed.<sup>61</sup>

Hence it is obvious that according to the rabbinic tradition the Karaites maintained that they found their teachings in ancient books which were hidden in the ground. If the theory about this finding is true, similarities in style between Karaite writings and the Sectarian documents become both understandable and significant. And it is through the activity of the Karaites that parts of these documents came to the Genizah in Egypt, as correctly suggested by Prof. Kahle.

The heterodoxies survived through the middle ages, and the excessive fear and awe of the Tetragrammaton even left its mark on a practice by orthodox Jews. It was customary among the scribes in the twelfth century to leave blank spaces for the Tetragrammaton<sup>62</sup> in the scroll of the Law; these were inserted by them later, after a ritual submersion.<sup>63</sup> The custom most probably goes back to a much earlier date,<sup>63a</sup> but the famous medieval scholar who speaks of it felt quite indifferent to it. At all times certain groups were to be found among the Jews, who strove to be stricter than the Rabbis; the latter tried to check their excessive zeal, but not always with success.<sup>64</sup> Some-

<sup>60</sup> I. e. the father of the Karaite heresy in the second half of the eighth century.

<sup>61</sup> In the ninth century?

<sup>62</sup> Perhaps they inserted dots in these places in order not to confuse them with the prescribed blank places.

<sup>63</sup> See *Sepher ha-Eshkol*, ed. Albeck, p. 162. Comp. above n. 46. For a similar custom of the scribes, see מני מצרים in *JQR* IX, 1897, pp. 28–29; *Sepher Hassidim*, Berlin 1891, p. 420, sect. 1762.

<sup>63a</sup> See above n. 46.

<sup>64</sup> See Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, p. 136 ff.

times the Rabbis fought this ultra-piety, but generally ignored it. It was only when these extremists took on the character of a sect that the Rabbis styled their opinion as *דרך אחרת*, heterodoxy, a somewhat milder judgment than outright *מינות*, heresy.

Finally a few words are in place on the language of the documents discovered in the region of the Dead Sea. The Hebrew, of course, is not the same as in the *Mishnah*. But there is absolutely nothing which compels us to declare them late writings. Immediately upon the receipt of the first publication of part of these texts I wrote my opinion to Prof. Sukenik of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem to this effect.<sup>65</sup> The subsequent publications of the documents only confirmed this conviction.<sup>66</sup>

The truth is that in addition to rabbinic literature the Jews possessed Hebrew hymns of a religious character cast in a style different from what we find in the *Mishnah*. In illustration we may quote the lovely acclamation of the Ark ascribed by the Rabbis<sup>67</sup> to the Philistine cows (I Sam. 6.12): *רומי רומי השיטה החנופפי החנופפי ברוב הרדייך*<sup>68</sup> *המחושקה בריקמי זהב המהוללה בדביר ארמון המעולפת מבין שני הכרובים*. Certainly this style is not what we generally identify as rabbinic.

A Rabbi of the third century remarked:<sup>69</sup> "Israel was not dispersed before it broke up into twenty-four sects of heretics." Some of these sects that flourished during the Second Commonwealth were probably not far removed either from the Essenes or from the Pharisees.<sup>70</sup> They were extremists with respect to certain parts of the Law, while they may have slighted other parts of it. It is to one of these sects that the origin of the scrolls of the cave is to be traced.

<sup>65</sup> This letter was the source of Prof. Sukenik's reference to me in the *New York Times*.

<sup>66</sup> See now the excellent analysis of the Hebrew and its grammatical forms in these writings by Ch. Yalon in *Kirjath Sepher* XXVII, p. 163 ff.

<sup>67</sup> *Bereshith Rabba* LIV.4, ed. Theodor-Albeck, p. 581; see the variants and the parallels referred to in the notes *ibid*.

<sup>68</sup> Comp. the style of the acclamation in *Megiloth Genuzoth* ed. Sukenik I, p. 21: *רומה רומה אל אלים והנשא בעוור*.

<sup>69</sup> *TP Sanhedrin* X.6, 29c. The Rabbi apparently refers to the first dispersion. But this was the usual way of the Rabbis to apply later events to earlier situations. <sup>70</sup> See above n. 52.