ish religious trends during the first Christian millennium that manifest themselves in a variety of ideologies that were, for their part, unenthusiastic about rabbinic developments. It would have been natural for Talmudic Judaism to have played down the importance of alternative traditions and condemned alternative literature, perhaps not always with success. During periods of literary expansion, such as the one represented by the classic Cairo Genizah texts, the drive toward the adoption of written, and therefore authoritative and perhaps syncretistic, versions may have been one of the factors leading to the temporary acceptance within the Talmudic communities of a greater variety of compositions than that sanctioned in some earlier or later contexts.

[*See also* Ben Sira, Book of; Damascus Document; Levi, Aramaic; *and* Tobit, Book of.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beit-Arié, Malachi. *Hebrew Codicology: Tentative Typology of Technical Practices Employed in Hebrew Dated Medieval Manuscripts.* Rev. ed. Jerusalem, 1981. One of a number of important books by Beit-Arié on various aspects of the study of Hebrew manuscripts.

Blau, Joshua, and Stefan C. Reif, eds. *Genizah Research after Ninety Years: The Case of Judaeo-Arabic.* University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 47. Cambridge, 1992. A collection of essays that exemplifies the range of subjects written in one of the Jewish languages represented in the *genizah*.

Goitein, S. D. *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Genizah.* 6 vols. including the index volume by Paula Sanders. Berkeley and London, 1967–1993. An outstanding study of Oriental Jewish life in the Middle Ages based on *genizah* sources.

Kahle, Paul. *The Cairo Genizah.* 2d. ed. Oxford, 1959. Outdated in some respects and out of print, but not difficult to obtain and certainly important for the history of *genizah* research.

Khan, Geoffrey. "Twenty Years of Genizah Research." In *Encyclopedia Judaica Year Book 1983/1985,* edited by Geoffrey Wigoder, pp. 163–170. Jerusalem, 1985. A detailed assessment of recent *genizah* research and publication.

Lambert, Phyllis, ed. *Fortifications and the Synagogue: The Fortress of Babylon and the Ben Ezra Synagogue, Cairo.* London, 1994. An attractive collection of essays and plates on all aspects of the history of Ben Ezra as a building and a community in medieval and modern times.

Reif, Stefan C. *A Guide to the Taylor-Schechter Genizah,* 2d. ed. Cambridge, 1979. A useful booklet briefly introducing the history and contents of the collection, with some plates. Out of print, but still available online.

Reif, Stefan C. *Published Material from the Cambridge Genizah Collections: A Bibliography, 1896–1980.* Geniza Series, 6. Cambridge, 1988. Details of the books and articles published on the Cambridge Genizah, indexed according to classmark, author, and title.

Reif, Stefan C. "Aspects of Mediaeval Jewish Literacy." In *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe,* edited by Rosamond McKitterick, pp. 134–155. Cambridge, 1990. A survey of the written material used by the Oriental Jewish Communities in the early Middle Ages and how it came to be extensive.

Reif, Stefan C. "Jenkinson and Schechter at Cambridge: An Expanded and Updated Assessment." *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 32 (1992), 279–316. A critical account of the efforts of two major figures in the first decade of the *genizah* story.

Reif, Stefan C. "The Cairo Genizah and Its Treasures, with Special Reference to Biblical Studies." In *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in the Historical Context,* edited by Derek R. G. Beattie and Martin J. McNamara, pp. 30–50. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series, 166. Sheffield, 1994. A summary of the *genizah's* importance for many aspects of biblical study.

Reif, Stefan C. "One Hundred Years of Genizah Research at Cambridge." *Jewish Book Annual* 53 (1995–1996), 7–28. A survey of the changing fortunes of the Cambridge Genizah material since its acquisition in the 1890s.

Richler, Benjamin. *Hebrew Manuscripts: A Treasured Legacy.* Cleveland and Jerusalem, 1990. A popular but informed introduction to the subject, with plates and samples of handwriting, and a chapter on the Cairo Genizah by Robert Brody.

Richler, Benjamin. *Guide to Hebrew Manuscript Collections.* Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Section of Humanities. Jerusalem, 1994. A most useful reference tool, providing details of all the major collections and personalities, as well as their history, with specific treatment of the *genizah* finds.

STEFAN C. REIF

CALENDARS AND MISHMAROT. The momentous importance that attaches to "proper chronology" and Temple watches (*mishmarot*) in the conceptual world of the "Community of the Renewed Covenant" is evinced by fragments of some twenty calendrical documents (4Q320–330, 4Q335–337, 6Q17), the tailpiece of a calendar preserved in one manuscript of Miqtsat Maʿasei ha-Torah[a] (4Q394; hereafter MMT[a]), and Otot (4Q319); a detailed exposition in Temple Scrolls[a and b] (11Q19–20); and calendar-related references in major works of the Qumran community—the Rule of the Community (1QS), the Damascus Document (CD), Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab), Psalms[a] (11Q5; hereafter 11QPsalms[a]), Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400–407; 11Q17; and Mas1k) and other works, which presuppose this calendrical system. The covenanters' messianic-millenarian expectations depended upon a divinely ordained sequence of periods in history (*qitsei*; Pesher Habakkuk [1QpHab vii.12–13]), or eternal periods (*qitstsei ʿolamim* or *qitsei netsaḥ*; Hodayot[a] [1QH[a] ix.26–27] [i.24–25]; iv.16; War Scroll [1QM i.8–9]), which were expected to culminate in the "cutoff period" and establishment of the fervently awaited "new [age]" (*qets neḥ eratsah va-ʿasot ḥadashah*; Rule of the Community [1QS iv.25]).

The covenanters' calendrical works can be divided into four major categories.

Chronographical Schedules. These would include enumerations of days, weeks, months, and annual quarters in the Qumran community's 364-day solar calendar year and rotas of the annual cycle of "holy seasons"—Sabbaths and festivals. No document comprises all facets of the covenanters' calendar. The itemized roster of David's daily, Sabbath, and festival psalms in 11QPsalms[a] (11Q5 xxvii) comes indirectly closest to a comprehensive circumscription of it. However, by collating and combin-

ing various features extracted from diverse sources, a full picture of the Qumran community's calendar can be reconstituted (see Table 1).

Unlike the Jewish lunisolar calendar of 354 days, the covenanters' solar year holds 364 days (fifty-two weeks) and can be subdivided into four quarters of three months (thirteen weeks or ninety-one days each). The first two months of a quarter (*tequfah*, a term also used in rabbinic parlance) number thirty days each. The last month of the quarter, that is, the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth months of the year, has one *yom nosaf* ("additional day") to which is attached a special cultic significance, and thus numbers thirty-one days. This basic structure is captured in the fragmentary but still restorable opening lines of what appears to be a mnemonic calendrical composition (6Q17 i.1–2): 1 "[The first month, in it 30 days; the] second, in it 30 [days]; 2 [the third month, in it 31 days]; and complete are the days [of the quarter]."

In this document and others, for example the Biblical Chronology (4Q559), figures are not spelled out but are expressed in numerical symbols. These are known from weights and Hebrew inscriptions of the First Temple period and from Aramaic papyri of the fifth–fourth centuries BCE from Elephantine in Egypt: a slanted stroke (\) signifies one; a hook (¬) stands for the number ten; two superimposed hooks (∃) indicate the number twenty. In some cases, the numbers three and four are presented as units of slanted strokes in opposite directions (/\\, /\\\).

Months are indicated by ordinal numbers, as in the ancient Israelite tradition (e.g., *Gn.* 8.4, 8.13, 8.14; *Ex.* 12.1; *Lv.* 23; *Hg.* 1.1; *Zec.* 1.1) and as occasionally seen in *Maccabees*, and not by Babylonian month names, which the returnees from the Babylonian exile are said to have brought back with them (J.T., *R. ha-Sh.* 1.56d) and which occur predominantly in postexilic books (e.g., *Zec.* 1.7; *Est.* 3.7, 3.13; *Neh.* 2.1), or by Canaanite appellations, some of which are preserved in biblical texts pertaining to the preexilic period (e.g. *Ex.* 13.4, 23.15, 34.18; *Dt.* 16.1; *1 Kgs.* 6.1, 6.37, 6.38, 8.2). However, Babylonian month names do occur in the fragmentary Zodiology and Brontology (4Q318) and the month name *Shevat* is mentioned once in a small fragment of Historical Work[c] (4Q333). In several Qumran documents the number of days in each of the recorded months is given. At times, these details are combined with a summary reference to the number of days in an annual quarter.

The sequence of the annual quarters parallels the progression of the four major agricultural seasons in the Rule of the Community: "the seasons of reaping to [that of] summer [fruits]; the season of sowing to the season of [cutting] green fodder" (1QS x.7). These terms echo the designations of the agricultural seasons in *Amos* 7.1–4 and 8.1–2 and in the Gezer Calendar (c.900 BCE). The beginnings of the quarters, possibly observed as festivals and marked by special prayers (cf. Liturgical Prayers [1Q34 and 34[bis]], *Jub.* 6.23–25), coincide with the onsets of the astronomical seasons—vernal equinox, summer solstice, autumnal equinox, and winter solstice—which are paraphrastically referred to in *1 Enoch* 82.16–19: "these are the signs of the days . . . glowing heat and dryness . . . all the trees bear fruit . . . the wheat is ripe for harvest . . . the trees produce their fruits ripe and ready . . . and all the fruits of the earth are gathered in."

The covenanters' calendrical documents are not in almanac form. Only "holy seasons" are recorded and secular workdays are altogether omitted. This schema appears in fragments of an item, which seems originally to have contained thirteen extremely narrow columns with lines of between three and ten letters and spaces (MMT[a] [4Q394 i–ii]). In this document the dates of every single Sabbath throughout the year are registered, together with the dates of the covenanters' harvest festivals for the (New) Wine, the (New) Oil, and the "Wood Offering" (cf. Reworked Pentateuch[c] [4Q365 23.9]), which occur at intervals of fifty days and do not have an explicit biblical basis but are seemingly derived from pertinent scriptures

CALENDARS AND MISHMAROT. TABLE 1. *The* Enoch/Jubilees/*Qumran Solar Calendar.*

	MONTHS		
DAYS OF THE WEEK	1, 4, 7, 10	2, 5, 8, 11	3, 6, 9, 12
Wednesday	1, 8, 15, 22, 29	6, 13, 20, 27	4, 11, 18, 25
Thursday	2, 9, 16, 23, 30	7, 14, 21, 28	5, 12, 19, 26
Friday	3, 10, 17, 24	1, 8, 15, 22, 29	6, 13, 20, 27
Saturday	4, 11, 18, 25	2, 9, 16, 23, 30	7, 14, 21, 28
Sunday	5, 12, 19, 26	3, 10, 17, 24	1, 8, 15, 22, 29
Monday	6, 13, 20, 27	4, 11, 18, 25	2, 9, 16, 23, 30
Tuesday	7, 14, 21, 28	5, 12, 19, 26	3, 10, 17, 24, 31

(*Nm.* 18.12; *Dt.* 18.4; *Neh.* 10.40, 10.35). In addition, summaries of the number of days in each annual quarter and of the total 364 days in the year are given:

> The twenty-third of it [the second month] is a Sabbath. The thirtieth [of it] is a Sabbath. The seventh of the third [month] is a Sabbath. The fourteenth of it is a Sabbath. The fifteenth of it is the Festival of Weeks. The twenty-[fir]st of it is the Sabbath. The twenty-eighth of it is a Sabbath. After it, the first and second day [of the week] a day is added and the quarter terminates [with] ninety-one days. . . . [The twenty-fir]st of it [the sixth month] is a Sabbath. The twenty-second of it is the Festival of the [New] Oil.

The 364-day system ensures the smooth rotation of the annual cycle of the holy seasons. The first and fifteenth days of the first month of each quarter fall invariably on the fourth day of the week. On this day God created the luminaries (*Gn.* 1.14–19), which are the indispensable bases of all calendrical schemata. The Sabbaths always fall on the same monthly dates, and each festival falls on the same weekday. The offering of the Passover lamb is celebrated as a separate feast late Tuesday afternoon on the fourteenth of the first month, and the festival of Passover is celebrated on Wednesday, the fifteenth of the month. Shavu'ot is observed on Sunday, the fifteenth of the third month (cf. *Jub.* 15.1, 16.13, 44.1–5), fifty days after Sunday, the twenty-sixth of the first month, which follows upon the first Sabbath (*Lv.* 23.11–16) after the Passover festival. Thus the date of Shavu'ot is aligned with the dates of Passover on the fifteenth of the first month and Sukkot on the fifteenth of the seventh month. Ro'sh ha-Shanah, on the first of the seventh month, and Sukkot, on the fifteenth, fall again on a Wednesday. Yom Kippur is observed on Friday, the tenth of the seventh month, immediately before the ensuing Sabbath. The covenanters probably hailed this propinquity as the most accurate realization of the term *shabbat shabbaton*, which designates this day in the Priestly code (*Lv.* 16.31, 23.32), presumably taking it to mean "double Sabbath" or "one Sabbath after the other."

In the documents of the Qumran community, only the first days of the week-long festivals of Passover and Sukkot are recorded. There is no mention of the last day designated throughout the Hebrew Scriptures (*Ex.* 12.16; *Lv.* 23.8, 23.36; *Nm.* 28.25, 29.35; *Dt.* 16.8; *Neh.* 8.18; *2 Chr.* 7.9). The last holy seasons fall in the seventh month of the covenanters' calendar: Ro'sh ha-Shanah on the first, Yom Kippur on the tenth, and Sukkot on the fifteenth. Ḥanukkah and Purim, which depends on the biblical book of Esther that is not extant among the Qumran finds of biblical books, observed by mainstream Judaism in the ninth and the twelfth months respectively, are not listed. [*See* Festivals.]

The fragments of chronological schedules discovered at Qumran are remains of documents or scrolls (e.g., Calendrical Document A [4Q320] and Calendrical Document B[a] [4Q321]) that contain a variety of calendrical rota and provide chronographic guidelines for the conduct of the individual and the community as a socio-religious entity. The correct observance of Sabbaths and festivals and the efficacy of ritual, foremost the sacrificial acts, depend on accurate timing. Since the schedule of sacrifices in the Jerusalem Temple was adjusted to the lunar year of 354 days, which mainstream Judaism followed, the covenanters abstained from participating in the Temple service. They filled the resulting void in their religious life by instituting prayers that were to be offered at prescribed times every day of the month, every Sabbath, and every festival by humans on earth and by angels in heaven (e.g., 1Q34; 4Q286–293, 400–407, 434–444, 449–457, 507–509).

An interesting consequence of the Qumran calendar is Annie Jaubert's thesis that the presentation of the Last Supper in the Synoptic tradition as the celebration of the Passover meal on the Tuesday evening of Holy Week conforms with its fixed date in the solar calendar of 364 days. In distinction, the *Gospel of John* dates the beginning of Passover to the Friday evening, presumably in accordance with the lunar calendar of mainstream Judaism. Critics have taken exception to the thesis on several counts. It has been argued that it clashes with the reports that Jesus and the disciples observed the festivals regularly in accord with the orthodox Jewish calendar and that adherence to a sectarian calendar would have totally divorced him and his followers from the mainstream community.

Mishmarot. This is the second category into which the covenanters' calendrical works can be divided. The covenanters considered their abstention from the Jerusalem Temple only a temporary state of affairs. They awaited fervently the rebuilding of a new Temple in which their own priesthood would conduct the holy service in accord with their solar calendar and their ritual rulings (Temple Scroll[a] [11Q19], New Jerusalem [1Q32]). The various tables of priestly "watches" or "courses"—the *mishmarot* cycle—relate to this area of cultic concern. The genesis of the schema is traced back in the Otot scroll to the very beginning of the world: "Creation [was] on the fourth [day] of Ga[mul]" (4Q319 i.11). This concept is echoed in Calendrical Document A; an account of the Creation culminates in a reference to the fashioning of the great luminaries on the fourth day (cf. *Jub.* 2.8–9). Only the closing remark, which speaks of the moon's "appearing from the east . . . in the midst of heaven . . . from evening until morning" (4Q320 1.1–3), is preserved. The cosmic event is immediately linked to a roster of concordant dates in the

lunar and the solar calendar, with corresponding days in a three-year cycle of priestly watches, which opens (1.3–5): "On the fourth in the week [of service] of the sons of Gamul, in the first of the month, in the first year (2.i.1, 5 [the sons] of Gamul at the head of all years"). Through this linkage, the covenanters' system of *mishmarot* becomes a salient feature of the creation of the cosmos.

Mishmarot lists fall into several subcategories that answer to the particular requirements of the priestly hierarchy. Some are enumerations of the names of the priestly watches that serve a one-week rotation every half-year. Their names accord with the biblical roster of twenty-four priestly families (*1 Chr.* 24.7–19), although this roster causes difficulties when applied to the fifty-two weeks in the solar year of 364 days. The covenanters solved the problem by establishing a six-year cycle with a staggered rotation system. The four weeks by which the solar year exceeds the lunar year are covered by three watches that serve three times and two that are on duty for an additional half-week, one at the beginning of the year, and one at its end:

> Gamul [second half of his service] Delaiah Maaziah Joiarib Jedaiah Ḥarim Seorim Malkiah Mijamin Haqqots Abiah Jeshua Shekaniah Eliashib Jaqim Ḥuppah Jeshbeab Bilgah Immer Ḥezir Happittet Petaḥaiah Jehezkel Jakin Gamul Delaiah Maaziah Joiarib Jedaiah Ḥarim Seorim Malkiah Mijamin Haqqots Abiah Jeshua Shekaniah Eliashib Jaqim Ḥuppah Jeshbeab Bilgah Immer Ḥezir Happittet Petaḥaiah Jehezkel Jakin Gamul Delaiah Maaziah Joiarib Jedaiah [first half of his service].

This arrangement is reflected in the War Scroll (1QM ii.1–2): "The fathers of the community are fifty-two. The major priests shall be appointed after the high priest and his deputy in twelve courses to serve constantly before God. And twenty-six heads of courses shall serve in their appointed term." This seemingly baffling statement actually summarizes the turns of duty of twenty watches that served semiannually and covered forty weeks and of four that served three times and covered twelve weeks, fifty-two weeks in all; their "heads" are the "fifty-two fathers of the community."

In *1 Chronicles* 24.7–19 the priestly watches are listed by name and ordinal number: "the first [is] Joiarib, Joiada the second . . . Maaziah the twenty-fourth." In the Qumran community rosters, only the names of the *mishmarot* are given (Calendrical Document F[a] [4Q328 2, restored]). The ordinal numbers one through twenty-four of the biblical roster were presumably dropped because they did not tally with the twenty-six-watch system based on the solar calendar.

In some documents, years, quarters, months, and the first day of a quarter are identified by the name of the first priestly watch then on duty. In Calendrical Document F[a] and Calendrical Document F[b] (4Q329) a list of *mishmarot* that served at the beginning of the years in a six-year cycle is followed by a roster of priestly watches that officiated at the onset of each quarter:

> [In the first year Gamul, in the second Jedaiah, in the third Miyamin, in
> the fourth Shekaniah in the fifth Jeshbe]ab, in the sixth Happittet
> These are the (watches at the) beginnings of the years
> In the first [year] Gamul Eliashib Maaziah [Ḥuppah]
> [in the] second Jedaiah Bilgah Se[o]rim Ḥe[zir]
> [in the third] Miya[min Petahaiah Abi[ah Jakin
> [in the fourth Shekaniah De]laiah Jaqim Joia[rib
> [in the fifth Jeshbeab Ḥarim Immer] Malkiah
> in the si[xth Happittet Haqqots Immer Jeshua]

Calendrical Document A (contains a fragmentary register that details names of the *mishmarot* that served at the beginnings of the months in a given year, together with the number of days in each month: "the second thirty [Jedaiah], the third [thirty] one [Haqqots], the fourth thirty [Eliashib]." Calendrical Document C[d] (4Q324[a] 1.ii.3) specifies: "the fourth day [in] Malkiah this is the first in the tenth month" (cf. 4Q324[a] and Calendrical Document C[c] [4Q324 1.5]). Calendrical Document D (4Q325) lists the fifty-two annual Sabbaths that are named after the watches that enter the Temple on Saturday afternoon and begin their duties on Sunday morning, together with the "Beginnings of the Months," the special festivals of the "First Wine," the "First Oil," the "Wood Offerings," and the biblical "Festival of the (First) Grain," but without mentioning other biblical festivals. In contrast, Calendrical Document B[a] (4Q321 2.ii–iv) presents a roster of the first watch on duty in every single month of a six-year cycle, next to a list of the annual biblical festivals and the names of the *mishmar* in whose week of service each falls. Calendrical Document A (4Q320 4.ii), restored on the strength of evidence culled from other documents, does not record the covenanters' special festivals:

1 The first year (of the six-year cycle) <vacat> its feasts:
2 On the 3rd (day) in the week of the sons of Maaziah [falls] the Pesaḥ
3 On [the 1st in] Jeda[iah] the Swinging of the [Omer]
4 On the 5th in Seorim the [Second] Pesa[ḥ]
5 On the 1st in Jeshua the Feast of Weeks
6 On the 4th in Maaziah the Day of Remembrance
7 [On the six]th in Joiarib the Day of Atonement
8 [On the 10th in the] seventh <vacat>
9 [On the 4th in Jedai]ah the Feast of Booths

It should be noted that there is no mention between lines 2 and 3 of the Festival of Unleavened Bread, which falls on the fourth service day of Maaziah. Further, if the proposed text restoration is correct, the Day of Atonement—

and only this day—is identified by a calendrical date, the tenth day of the seventh month, in addition to the day on which it falls in the week of Joiarib.

Calendrical Document G (4Q329[a] 1) contains remains of a roster that pertains ostensibly to the "holy seasons" in one year of a six-year cycle but in fact records only the names of the priestly watches in whose week of service Passover falls:

> [The first year its festivals, on the third day in] the week of [Maaziah the Passover; the seco]nd (year) its fe[stivals, on the th]ird [day in Seorim the Passover; the th]ird (year) its festivals, on the third (day) [in the week of Abiah the Passov]er; the fourth (year) its festivals, on the third (day) of [Yakim the Pass]over; the fifth (year) its festivals, [on the third (day) of Immer the Passover]

In all *mishmarot* texts the dating by the name of a priestly watch and the day in the weeks of its service pertains to recurring features of the annual cycle of holy days. Only in the tiny fragment of Historical Work[c] (4Q333) is a one-time event dated in this fashion: "(x) killed (y) on the fif[th day] in Jedaiah."

Synchronization Tables. The third category into which the calendrical works of the community can be divided consists of synchronization tables of two phases of the moon's monthly revolution in a six-year cycle, identified by days in the week of service of the pertinent priestly course and by concordant dates in the solar year (4Q320 1.i–iii). In Calendrical Documents B[a] and B[b] (4Q321 and 4Q321[a]), the first phase, [a], is defined by date alone, the second, [b], by date and the otherwise unknown term *duqah* or *duqo[h]*. Most scholars (including J. Baumgarten, J. T. Milik, and J. VanderKam) derive the term from the words *duq* or *diq* ("exactitude") while S. Talmon connects it with *daq* (thinness). Calendrical Document B[a] (4Q321 i.1–2) illustrates this schema: "a, On the second [day] in [the week of] Abijah [which falls] on the twenty-fifth [of the eighth lunar month]; and *duqah*; b, on the third day in Miyamin [which falls] on the twelfth in it [the eighth solar month]." The alignment of only two specific days in every lunar month with dates in the solar calendar does not evince an intention to synchronize the solar year with the lunar year, singling out the propitious nights of the new and the full moon, as is the prevailing opinion. Rather, the two phrases pertain to the unfavorable phases of the moon's waning and total eclipse. These ominous days and dark nights are identified by dates in the solar calendar so that the covenanters would beware of them.

The terminology of calendrical and *mishmarot* texts is marked by a manifest dependence on biblical linguistic usage. Months are identified by numerals rather than by appellations. The prevalent employment of the word *qets*, signifying "period" rather than "end," parallels the Biblical Hebrew *'et* ("time") and *mo'ed* ("seasons") found in *Ezekiel* and *Daniel* (e.g. *Ezek.* 7.6, 21.30, 21.34; *Dn.* 12.6–7, 8.19, 11.27, 11.35). The entrance of a priestly watch into the Temple on Saturday afternoon is called *bi'at yeda'yah* in Calendrical Document C[b] and Calendrical Documents C[d–f] (4Q323, 4Q324[a–c]). This technical term echoes the biblical appellation of the incoming temple guard (*ba'ei ha-Shabbat*), which spells the outgoing contingent (*yots'ei ha-Shabbat*; *2 Kgs.* 11.7, 11.9). The completion of a time segment of a year or quarter is defined by derivatives of *shlm: ve-shalmah ha-shanah* ("the year is complete" in MMT[a] [4Q394 3–7.i]), *be-hishalem ḥoq tiqqunam* ("when the statute of their [the festivals] norm is completed" in Rule of the Community [1QS x.6–7]), and possibly *mo'ed shillum[am]* ("the time [or festival] of their completion (in Festival Prayers[c] [4Q509 i.3]). This use of *shlm*, which also underlies diverse translational references to the solar calendar in *1 Enoch* 82.6 and *Jubilees* 6.30 and 6.32, appears to derive from *Isaiah* 60.20: *ve-shalmu yemei evlekh* ("the days of your mourning shall be ended").

Otot. Timetables of the Otot, the fourth category of Qumran calendrical works, cover fifty-year periods (jubilees) and are found in the Otot scroll (4Q319), in fragments of astronomical treatises in which the phases of the moon are recorded (4Q335–336), in Phases of the Moon (in Cryptic A script; 4Q317), and in Zodiology and Brontology (4Q318), which bear resemblance to the astronomical discourses in the Book of the Luminaries in *1 Enoch* 72–82.

The Calendar Controversy. The schism between the covenanters and mainstream Judaism is deeply rooted in the calendar controversy. The major features of the Qumran ephemeris are identical with those of the solar calendar propagated in *1 Enoch*'s Book of the Luminaries (*1 En.* 72–82) and *Jubilees*.

1 Enoch and Jubilees. According to *1 Enoch*, "The sun and stars (the moon is significantly omitted!) will bring in the years exactly so that they do not advance or delay their position by a single day unto eternity; but complete the years with perfect justice in 364 days" (*1 En.* 74.12; cf. 72.32).

This calendar is traced back to Enoch in Pseudo-Jubilees[c]: "He wrote [down] everything [concerning the] heavens and the ways of their hosts, [the mo]nths" (4Q227 2), "the days of appointed times in the four parts of the year" (*Jub.* 5.23; cf. *2 En.* 40.6), stating that "all the days . . . will be . . . fifty-two weeks" (*Jub.* 6.30). Enoch is said to have taught these details to his son Methuselah (*1 En.* 82). This knowledge was then divinely imparted to Noah,

who transmitted it to his descendants: "Now you command the Israelites to keep the years in this number—364 days. Then the year will be complete" (*Jub.* 6.32).

In Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252 i–ii), as in the version of the Noah episode in *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 6.23–27), the story of the flood unfolds in accord with this timetable. The successive stages of the deluge, detailed in *Genesis* 7.6–8.19, are fitted into a framework of dates from the seventeenth of the second month in the sixth-hundredth year of Noah's life (i.3–4) to the seventeenth (the Masoretic Text says the twenty-seventh) of the second month in the next year, so that Noah left the ark after exactly 364 days, at the completion of one year (4Q252 ii.2–3).

The prologue of *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 1.4, 1.25, 1.29) reports that the calendar was transmitted down to the generation of Moses, engraved on "heavenly tablets" that were given to him on Sinai together with the tablets of the Decalogue:

> Moses remained on the mountain for forty days and forty nights while the Lord . . . related to him the divisions of all the times. . . . Now you write all these words which I tell you . . . what is to come during all divisions of time . . . in the weeks of their jubilees until eternity. . . . The angel of the presence . . . took the tablets [which told] of the divisions of the years . . . for the weeks of their jubilees, year by year in their full number.

The authors of *Jubilees* and the Book of the Luminaries extol the immutability of the sun, which never increases or decreases, favoring it over the instability of the moon, which is subject to a monthly process of waxing and waning (*1 En.* 73–74). The preeminence of the 364-day solar calendar is demonstrated by the fact that in this ephemeris the festivals always occur on the same days of the week, whereas in the 354-day lunar calendar they do not, and special computation is required to determine the day on which a festival will fall in a given year.

The opposition to the lunar calendar is at the very heart of the covenanters' controversy with mainstream Judaism, but since both the sun and the moon were divinely created, the moon too must be given attention (cf. Calendrical Document A [4Q320]). The author of the Rule of the Community (1QS x.4–6) indeed mentions the moon in the Song of the Seasons but seems to deny it any role in matters calendrical, which are exclusively tied to the sun. God had created the sun, "the great (luminary) for the Holy of Holies . . . for the beginning of appointed days . . . at the new years and at the period of their appointed times."

The author of *Jubilees* discusses the moon in reference to light and darkness, day and night, but at the same time he does not assign it any role in the revolution of the appointed seasons:

> And on the fourth day he (God) made the sun and the moon and the stars. And he set them in the firmament of heaven so that they might give light upon the whole earth. . . . And the Lord set the sun as a great sign upon the earth for days of Sabbaths, months, feast (days), years, sabbaths of years, jubilees, and for all the (appointed) epochs of years . . .

God then warned Noah:

> All the Israelites will forget and will not find the way of the years. They will forget the first of the month, the season[s] and the Sabbath[s]; they will err in respect to the entire prescribed pattern of the year. . . . There will be people who carefully observe the moon . . . it is corrupt (with respect) to the seasons. . . . Everyone will join together both holy days with the profane and a profane day with the holy day. . . and will not make a year (exactly) three hundred and sixty-four days.
>
> (*Jub.* 6.36–38)

This warning is echoed in Pseudo-Moses[e] (4Q390 i.8–10): "they will forget ordinance and appointed time, and Sabbath and covenant. And they will violate everything, and they will do what I consider evil. Consequently, I will hide my face from them. I will hand them over to the hand[s] of their enemies and deliver them to the sword" (cf. *Jub.* 1.12–14).

In contrast, praising God's mighty deeds at Creation, the author of Psalms 8.4–5 mentions the moon and the stars but omits any reference to the sun: "When I look up at thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, set in their place by thee, what is man that thou shouldst remember him?" In Psalms 104.19 the moon is explicitly lauded as the divinely appointed source of the seasonal cycle: "Thou hast made the moon to mark the seasons." *Ben Sira* also praises the role accorded to the moon at Creation; his praise is couched in terms that bring to mind the covenanters' calendrical vocabulary: "The moon prescribes the periods [*'itot*], [his is] the rule over appointed time [*qets*] and an everlasting sign [*'ot 'olam*]. His [is every] festival [*mo'ed*] and from him [every] feast [*ḥag*]" (*Sir.* 43.6–7).

To the advocates of the solar calendar adherence to the lunar ephemeris meant walking "in the feasts of the Gentiles, after the errors and their ignorance" (*Jub.* 6.37). Rabbinic tradition turned the accusation around: "Israel reckons by the moon and the Gentiles reckon by the sun" (*Mekhilta de-Rabbi Yishma'el,* Tractate Pisḥa, ed. J. Z. Lauterbach, 1933). The Sages stressed the exclusive legitimacy of the lunar calendar by quoting Psalm 28.5:

> Because they regard not the works of the Lord nor the operations of his hands he shall destroy them: "the operation of his hands," these are the new moons, as is written, "he appointed the moons for seasons" (Ps. 104.19) . . . ("he shall destroy them") these are the heretics who do not reckon either ap-

> pointed days or periods. . . . He will destroy them in this world and will not build them up in the world to come."
>
> (*Midrash Psalms*, 1947, ed. Buber, p. 230)

Minor discrepancies between the covenanters' calendar and the *1 Enoch/Jubilees* ephemeris may have arisen from a variety of factors: scribal mistakes in the textual transmission of the apocryphal books or their original Hebrew texts, the translators' incomplete understanding of the ancient time register, or inaccurate renditions in the Greek and/or Ethiopic translations. Long before the discovery of the covenanters' writings, R. H. Charles cast doubt on the reliability of *1 Enoch* in matters calendrical: "The chronological system of this book is most perplexing. It does not in its present form present a consistent whole and probably never did" (Charles, p. 149). In contrast, the covenanters' calendar is wholly consistent. In some instances, Qumran texts actually enable us to recover an original Hebrew technical term that evidently underlies an Ethiopic reading or to resolve a textual difficulty and emend a misconceived calendar in *1 Enoch* or *Jubilees*.

There is, though, a telling difference between the covenanters' calendrical documents and calendar-related statements in the pseudepigraphal books. The authors of the pseudepigraphal books never tire of stressing the "indisputable" superiority of the 364-day solar calendar, holding it up as the only legitimate Jewish calendrical system, or of disenfranchising the 354-day lunar calendar that the mainstream community followed. Again and again they outline the essential principles of the solar calendar and its basic structure but do not delve into details of its application in daily life. The pseudepigraphal books are addressed to indeterminable groups of the "Enoch circles" type and not to a structured community that geared its everyday life and cultic observance to the 364-day solar calendar. In contrast, the authors of the Qumran calendrical documents give less attention to solar doxology, dwelling instead on select features that have an evident bearing on actualities of communal organization and cultic life, such as the Sabbaths and festivals. In their writings, the bitter calendar controversy of Second Temple period comes into full light. Whereas the pseudepigraphal books theorize, the Qumran documents breathe actuality.

A stemmatic arrangement of passages in the Damascus Document brings to the fore the dependency of the covenanters' calendrical system on the calendar propagated by *Jubilees* and the latter's dependency on *1 Enoch*. In the Damascus Document, the Book of Division of Times, undoubtedly the Book of *Jubilees* as we know it or a close version of that work, is juxtaposed to the Book of Moses: "Therefore a man shall impose upon [himself] by oath to return to the Law of Moses for in it everything can be learnt. And the exact statement of the epochs of Israel's blindness to all these, behold it can be learned in the Book of Division of Times into their Jubilees and Weeks" (CD xvi.1–4). This juxtaposition appears to echo a pertinent statement in the prologue of *Jubilees*: "These are the words regarding the divisions of the times of the law and of the testimony, of the events of the years, of the weeks of their jubilees throughout all the years of eternity as he related [them] to Moses on Mt. Sinai when he went up to receive the stone tablets."

The above reference in the Damascus Document proves that when the Damascus Document was written (by the middle of the second century BCE), *Jubilees* was already considered an authoritative source for calendrical matters. The book could not have attained such a distinctive status unless its teachings had been known for a considerable length of time—not less than two or three generations—and unless the intrinsic opposition to the lunar calendar that it reflects was also already in full force (*Jub.* 6.32–38). The author of *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 4.15–18) traces the roots of his solar calendar to the antediluvian patriarch Enoch (cf. Pseudo-Jubilees^{c} [4Q227]) and to the book of *Enoch*:

> He (Enoch) was the first of mankind . . . who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky in accord with the fixed pattern of their months so that mankind would know the seasons of the years. . . . The weeks of the jubilees he related, and made known the days of the years; the months he arranged, and related the sabbaths of the years, as we had told him.

The reliance of *Jubilees* on *Enoch* in calendrical matters implies that in the author's days the Book of the Luminaries was as much appreciated as *Jubilees* was when the Damascus Document was composed. We may therefore conclude that the composition of the Book of the Luminaries cannot be dated later than the second half of the fourth century BCE.

Introduction of the lunar calendar. Thus the solar calendar of 364 days was not the covenanters' innovation but rather was rooted in Jewish tradition. In light of the Qumran discoveries, Annie Jaubert theorized that the biblical solar calendar was in fact identical with the covenanters' 364-day ephemeris. The application of this calendar to the dates in the biblical literature has surprising results. During their years of wandering in the desert following the Exodus from Egypt, the Israelites are credited with avoiding travel on Sabbaths and festivals by breaking camp on Sunday or after a "holy season" and arriving at the next station on Friday or before another "holy season." Although critics have pointed out events in the biblical sources that cannot be accommodated in this system, the theory still has merit.

The ten-day difference between the lunar and solar cal-

endars necessitates periodical adjustments to keep the lunar and solar years from being thrown out of kilter. But nothing in the biblical or covenantal literature indicates that adjustments were effected systematically on the basis of astronomical computations. It has been suggested that Calendrical Document A (4Q320 2.i–iii) implies that a serviceable concordance was achieved through adding one month of thirty days at the end of every third lunar year. But this conclusion is doubtful. The author merely records in detail the loss of ten days per year in the lunar calendar vis-à-vis the solar year, without ever hinting at a need for, or the existence of, a fixed practice of intercalation. The author of *1 Enoch* similarly summarizes the difference between the two calendars for periods of three, five, and eight years, again without giving a reason for doing so (*1 En.* 74.10–17). We must therefore assume that, if intercalation was practiced at all, the lunar year was realigned with the solar year only when the divergence between them had become too great. Likewise, the Qumran documents do not contain any information concerning a calibration of the 364-day solar year with the true solar year of 365 days and six hours. Presumably intercalation was practiced by calibrating units of weeks and not of months, so as to maintain the proper functioning of the *mishmarot*. The 364-day calendar is kept in step with the seasonal year by adding one week every seven years and possibly by adding two weeks every twenty-eight years.

The question of whether the covenanters counted the day from the evening before, as in the lunar calendar of mainstream Judaism, or from the morning, as could be expected in solar ephemeris is still debated. Relying on the Daily Prayers scroll (4Q503), in which schedules proceed from evening to sunrise, some scholars reason that the covenanters followed a lunar calendar and that the day began for them with sundown. Others presume that the lunar calendar was introduced into the Jerusalem Temple during the Second Temple period. No definite information on this can be elicited from the sources at our disposal. The hypothesis that it occurred in the days of the Seleucid emperor Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who in approximately 167 BCE imposed the lunar calendar on the Jerusalem Temple, has little merit. It is highly improbable that the Jewish leadership and the sacerdotal establishment would have willingly submitted to a heathen ruler's imposition of such change in the Temple schedule. It stands to reason that the introduction of the lunar calendar into the Temple occurred at a much earlier date and that it was connected with an internal rift in Judaism. At some juncture in the fourth or third century BCE, a rival priestly house that adhered to the lunar calendar ousted the officiating priesthood that followed a solar ephemeris. The founding fathers or forerunners of the Qumran community remained loyal to the deposed priestly house, persevered in their adherence to the ancient solar calendar, and dissented from the community that acknowledged the new priesthood and acquiesced in the scheduling of Temple services according to the lunar calendar.

The considerable number of chronographic rota and calendar-related statements from the Qumran site stands out in comparison to texts discovered at various other Judean Desert sites. Remains of biblical books, apocryphal and liturgical compositions, and historical documents have turned up at Masada, Wadi Murabba'at, Naḥal Ḥever, and Naḥal Ṣe'elim. But not a single fragment of a calendrical work was found at any one of these sites. The covenanters' intense preoccupation with the issue of the calendar has no parallel in Hellenistic, early Christian, or rabbinic reports about schismatic communities in Judaism at the turn of the era. The singular proliferation of calendar-related materials evinces their importance in the covenanters' communal and private life and highlights the pivotal role of the calendar in their increasingly hardening confrontation with mainstream Judaism. The 364-day solar calendar was the most significant and conspicuous boundary marker that separated the Qumran community from the other socio-religious enclaves during the Second Temple period.

The Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest. An early stage of the calendar controversy appears to be reflected in Miqtsat Ma'asei ha-Torah (MMT). The writer adduces a series of legal-cultic statutes over whose interpretation he and the addressees are divided, foremost among them being the 364-day calendar. It is significant that in the editors' reconstruction of MMT^{a} (4Q394 3–7.i) this list is headed by the end of an account of a 364-day solar calendar. "[The twenty-eighth in it (viz. the twelfth month) is] a Sabbath. Un[t]o it after [th]e Sa[bbath the first and second day (of the week) a day] is [ad]ded. And the year is complete (in) three hundred and si[xty-four] days."

In MMT^{c} the writer matter-of-factly states that because of these halakhic differences "we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the people" (4Q396 7–8). The rather conciliatory tone suggests that when MMT was composed, the covenanters were intent on winning others over. However, their estrangement from the mainstream community progressively intensified. Concomitantly, Qumran authors criticized their opponents' views and standards of behavior with an increasing passion and bitterness. It is remarkable that of all the theological and legal differences that come to the fore in the covenanters' writings, the calendar controversy emerges in Pesher Habakkuk as the crucial issue in the direct confrontation between the Teacher of Righteousness and his opponent the Wicked Priest. The words of the biblical prophet, "Woe

to you who make your companions drink from the cup of your wrath, making them drunk" (*Hb.* 2.15), are interpreted in Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab xi.4–8) as a proleptic reference to the Wicked Priest's pursuit of the Teacher of Righteousness to his (and his followers') "abode of refuge" (*abet galuto*) (literally "the place of his [self-imposed] exile")—Qumran: "at the appointed time of their rest, the Day of Atonement, he appeared before them to confuse them and to cause them to transgress the Day of Fasting," forcing them to eat and drink on that day. It is evident that the Wicked Priest would not have violated the holiest day of the year by traveling from Jerusalem to the shores of the Dead Sea. We must therefore conclude that his Day of Atonement did not coincide with the covenanters' "fast day of their rest" and that their observances of the holy seasons throughout the year were likewise differently timed.

The Wicked Priest rightly viewed the covenanters' adherence to a solar calendar as an act of religious and civil rebellion and set out to nip it in the bud. His violent interference brought their opposition to mainstream Judaism to a climax: "One may no longer join the house of Judah. Each must stand on his watchtower" (CD iv.11–12). The author exhorts "all who were brought into the covenant," to whom God had revealed "hidden things in which all Israel strayed—his holy sabbaths, the glorious appointed times, his righteous testimonies" (CD iii.13–15). They are "not to enter the sanctuary to light his altar in vain" (CD vi.11–12), so as not to be like their adversaries who offer sacrifices at the wrong times. Rather, the members of the Qumran community are admonished "to make known [the difference] between the holy and the profane . . . to observe the Sabbath day in its exact detail, and the appointed times and the day of the fast as ordained by those who entered the [re]new[ed] covenant in the land of Damascus" (CD vi.17–19). The rift is final: "the fence is built, the boundary extends far" (CD iv.12).

Rabbinic calendar controversy. The Yom Kippur episode related in Pesher Habakkuk invites comparison with a report in the Mishnah (*R. ha-Sh.* 2.8–9) of a calendar controversy between Rabban Gamliel II, leader of the Sanhedrin at Yavneh and Rabbi Joshua ben Ḥananiah at the end of the first century CE. Although astronomical computations of the moon's orbit were available (*B.T., R. ha-Sh.* 25a), the high court officially announced the onset of the new month when two reliable witnesses affirmed that they had actually sighted the new moon. On the strength of such a statement, Rabban Gamliel II proclaimed the beginning of the new month, evidently the first month of the year (Tishrei), and thus fixed the entire annual cycle of festivals. Rabbi Dosa ben Harkinas, himself a prominent sage, declared the witnesses to be liars because his own observation proved that on the crucial night the moon was still full: "How can one say of a woman that she has given birth and on the next day she is still visibly pregnant." Rabbi Joshua invalidated the men's evidence and demanded that the proclamation of the new moon be deferred. But Rabban Gamliel stood by his resolution. Apprehensive lest Rabbi Joshua's dissenting opinion cause a rift in the community, with some following Gamliel's decision and others fixing the holy days in accord with Joshua's opinion, Gamliel ordered Joshua to present himself before him in Yavneh on the day on which, according to Joshua's computation, Yom Kippur fell, carrying his staff and his purse, so as publicly to desecrate his Day of Atonement. The rather similar episodes differ however on two points. While Rabbi Joshua's dispute with Rabban Gamliel pertained to differences regarding the lunar calendar that both men followed, the clash between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest revolved around the lunar versus solar controversy. And whereas Rabbi Joshua followed the counsel of Rabbi Dosa ben Harkinas and acted as ordered, thus preserving the unity of Israel, the fact that the Teacher of Righteousness persevered in his adherence to a nonconformable ephemeris put the final touch on the Qumran community's schismatic dissent from mainstream Judaism.

[*See also* Miqtsat Ma'asei ha-Torah; Pesher Habakkuk; Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers; *and* Qumran, *article on* Archaeology.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The Calendar." In *Studies in Qumran Law*, pp. 101–144. Leiden, 1977.

Buber, Martin, ed. *Midrash Psalms*. New York, 1947.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Oxford, 1912.

García Martínez, Florentino. "Calendars and Priestly Rotas." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, pp. 451–455. Leiden and New York, 1994.

Herr, Moshe David. "The Calendar." In *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural, and Religious Life and Institutions*, edited by Shmuel Safrai et al., vol. 2, pp. 834–864. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Assen, Amsterdam, and Philadelphia, 1976.

Jaubert, Annie. "The Calendar of Qumran and the Passion Narrative in John." In *John and Qumran*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, pp. 62–76. London, 1972.

Lauterbach, J. Z., ed. *Mehkilta de-Rabbi Yishma'el*, Tractate Pisḥa, vol. 1, pp. 18–19. Philadelphia, 1933.

Milik, J. T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, translated by J. Strugnell, pp. 107–113. London, 1959.

Nitzan, Bilhah. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, translated by Jonathan Chipman. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 12. Leiden and New York, 1994.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Gezer Calendar and the Agricultural Cycle of Ancient Canaan." In *King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel*, pp. 100–103. Jerusalem, 1986.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Calendar of the Covenanters of the Ju-

dean Desert." In *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies*, pp. 147–185. Jerusalem, 1989.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in the Light of Qumran Literature." In *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies*, pp. 186–199. Jerusalem, 1989.

VanderKam, James C. "The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar: A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypotheses." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979), 390–411.

Van Goudoever, J. *Biblical Calendars*. Leiden, 1959.

SHEMARYAHU TALMON

CANON. The term "canon" is derived from the Greek word *kanōn,* which in turn is related to the Hebrew *qaneh,* meaning a reed, a measuring instrument. It eventually acquired the sense of norm and in that meaning was used by Christians, beginning in the fourth century CE, to designate the list of inspired, authoritative books that made up the church's Bible. These constituted a norm in the sense that books on that list defined faith and practice and were the final authorities for settling matters in dispute. There appears to have been no corresponding term in Judaism in the Second Temple period, and thus, in asking which books were included in a canon at that time, one runs the risk of anachronism. Yet, while the term "canon" is not attested in the Jewish texts, the concept of inspired, authoritative books was present because many compositions document the idea that for the authors some works possessed supreme authority in the sense of defining teachings and practices and refuting opponents.

Definitions. Discussions of canon, especially in relation to Qumran, tend to be at cross-purposes owing to a lack of clear definitions, and so it is important to distinguish between an authoritative text, a book of scripture, the process toward formation of the eventual canon, the Bible, and the canon.

An authoritative text is a text (e.g., a law code or a sacred book) that a community, secular or religious, acknowledges to hold authority over the members; it is a guide for the conduct of life to which all are accountable. A book of scripture is a sacred authoritative text which, in the Jewish or Christian context, the community acknowledges as having authority over the faith and practice of its members. The process toward formation of the canon ("the canonical process") is the long journey from the community's first acknowledgment that a certain sacred text is binding for faith and practice to the final, largely agreed-upon decision that the collection of certain books, and only those books, is universally and permanently binding. The Bible, in the singular, usually carries the implication of a codex, that is, a book with a front cover, a back cover, and a defined table of contents, as opposed to the form that the scriptures would have had in the Qumran period, a collection of individual scrolls. Although the plural term *"ta biblia ta hagia"* (the holy books) does occur, for example, in *1 Maccabees* 12.9 in a subordinate clause, it seems to denote simply a collection of sacred books available (as in the Prologue to *Ben Sira*), not a restricted collection; at that time *Enoch* and *Jubilees,* for example, may well have been envisioned as part of that collection, but *Daniel* may not have been.

The term canon, though it is used loosely in a number of ways, is a religious *terminus technicus* with a specific meaning used over a long history. It means the established and exclusive list of books that hold supreme authoritative status for a community. There are three aspects of the techinical use of "canon" that are important (see Ulrich, 1992): (a) "Canon" represents a reflexive judgment; that is, the community may long guide its life according to certain authoritative books, but it is not until questions are raised, debates held, and communal or official agreements made defining the exact contents that a canon properly so called comes to be; (b) It concerns books, not the specific text form of a book; for example, it is the *Book of Jeremiah* that is canonical or "defiles the hands," regardless of whether it is the earlier, short edition as witnessed in the Septuagint or the later, longer, and rearranged edition witnessed in the Masoretic Text; (c) It denotes a closed list; the formation of the canon "was a task, not only of collecting, but also of sifting and rejecting" (Metzger, 1987). "The crucial element is the question of *closure*. . . . A 'canon' is thus by definition a way of setting *limits* to the books recognized as holy" (Barton, 1996).

When it is used in the context of Qumran, the question usually concerns one of two aspects: whether a certain work was acknowledged as having authoritative status as sacred scripture, or whether there existed a canon, that is, an acknowledged list of books with authoritative status as sacred scripture. This dichotomy gets to the root of the confusion: the active sense of "canonical" as *norma normans*, an authoritative book that governs faith and practice, in contrast to the passive sense as *norma normata*, the authoritative list of those books which do, in conscious exclusion of those which do not, hold supreme status as governing faith and practice. The answer to that first question is certainly positive. It is clear that certain works were long since established and acknowledged as possessing this status. But that certain books exercised authoritative status does not mean that there was a canon yet. The answer to the second question is negative: there is no evidence in the scrolls (or in wider Judaism prior to the fall of the Temple), of a considered, inclusive-and-exclusive list. The period from the early existence of some