STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH [92]

The Dead Sea Scrolls

Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts

Edited by

SARIANNA METSO,

HINDY NAJMAN, AND

EILEEN SCHULLER

BRILL

The Dead Sea Scrolls:
Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate editors

Peter W. Flint
Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 92

The Dead Sea Scrolls

Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts

Edited by

Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller

Editorial Assistance

Nicole Hilton, Julia Lauwers, Eva Mroczek, Jeremy Penner, and Jonathan Vroom

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Dead Sea scrolls : transmission of traditions and production of texts / edited by Sarianna Metso.
p. cm. — (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah ; v. 92) Includes index.
"This volume originated at a co-organized conference in November of 2009 in Toronto, Ontario. This was in conjunction with the exhibit 'Words that Changed the World' held at the Royal Ontario Museum and co-sponsored by the Israel Antiquities Authority"—Introd.
ISBN 978-90-04-18584-5 (hardback : alk. paper)
1. Dead Sea scrolls—Congresses. 2. Qumran community—Congresses. I. Metso, Sarianna. II. Title. III. Series.

BM487.D4498 2010
296.1'5—dc22

2010018054

ISSN 0169–9962
ISBN 978 90 04 18584 5

CONTENTS

Introduction and Acknowledgements vii
Abbreviations xiii

Tradition and Innovation in the Dead Sea Scrolls 1
John J. Collins

Moses Trumping Moses: Making the Book of *Jubilees* 25
James C. VanderKam

Some Translation and Copying Mistakes from the Original Hebrew of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* 45
James L. Kugel

Why Nabonidus? Excavating Traditions from Qumran, the Hebrew Bible, and Neo-Babylonian Sources 57
Carol A. Newsom

The Emergence of Aramaic and Hebrew Scholarly Texts: Transmission and Translation of Alien Wisdom 81
Mladen Popović

Shared Traditions: Points of Contact Between S and D 115
Charlotte Hempel

Aspects of the Physical and Scribal Features of Some Cave 4 "Continuous" Pesharim 133
George J. Brooke

Some Thoughts About the Diffusion of Biblical Manuscripts in Antiquity 151
Emanuel Tov

Assessing Emanuel Tov's "Qumran Scribal Practice" 173
Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar

The Evolutionary Production and Transmission of the Scriptural Books 209
Eugene Ulrich

Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The "Voice of the Teacher" as an Authority-Conferring Strategy in Some Qumran Texts 227
Florentino García Martínez

Index of Modern Authors 245
Index of Primary Texts 249
Subject Index 269

INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Over the last 60 years, a tremendous amount of work has been completed on the preservation of the fragments, on the reconstruction and interpretation of the texts, and on our understanding of the contexts in which they were composed, read, and hidden. However, in order to understand what this corpus can teach us about the production and reception of Jewish texts at this formative time, there is still more that we need to consider in the field of biblical, qumranic and pseudepigraphic studies.

The essays in this volume consider the following questions:

How were Jewish texts produced and transmitted in late antiquity? What role did scribal practices play in the shaping of both scriptural and interpretive traditions, which are—as the Scrolls show so decisively—intimately intertwined? How were texts assembled from a variety of earlier sources, both oral and written? Why were they often attributed to pseudonymous authors from the remote past such as Moses and David? How did the composers of these texts understand the enterprise in which they were engaged?

This volume hopes to further current debates about Qumran Scribal Practice and the transmission of traditions in Jewish Antiquity. It is published with the conviction that the transmission of traditions and the details of scribal practices—so often treated separately—should be considered in conversation with each other.

Overview of Essays

John Collins introduces our volume with a subtle and complex treatment of what constitutes "tradition." Collins points out that, if we are to understand the tradition, we *also* need to understand the nature of the collection that is being transmitted. Tradition does not consist solely in texts, but also includes practices, rituals and culture. Collins develops this point by considering what happens to older scriptural traditions at Qumran in various interpretive scrolls. After a brief discussion of sectarian ideology, he discusses pseudepigraphic texts,

Torah, revelation, and pesher. Collins explains how the older scriptural traditions that are read and interpreted in the Scrolls are not simply interpreted. In the hands of the authors of the Scrolls, the inherited traditions are transformed in innovative ways that reflect a new way of thinking about ancient texts. Even when we consider pesher (a kind of literature where we might expect a more straightforward distinction between interpretation and text), an interpretation of the lemma often transforms the text, produces a new tradition and, thereby generates new scripture. The transformative ways in which new texts are interpreted at Qumran illuminate the dynamic and creative character of Jewish antiquity. Collins claims that concepts of authority continue to change in later Second Temple traditions in the hands of the Rabbis and beyond. Additionally, the gradual emergence of commentary can be marked as explicit interpretations of authoritative scriptures appear with increasing frequency.

James VanderKam shows us how, in ancient Jewish texts, biblical traditions can be transformed by their placement within new interpretive contexts, even when the wording is unchanged. *Jubilees* is a prime example. According to *Jubilees*, there was already a First Law, which was transmitted inerrantly. Yet *Jubilees* offers a new context for pentateuchal materials. In VanderKam's view, the author of *Jubilees* does not seek to replace the First Law. Instead, he is proposing an inspired supplement to Genesis and Exodus. But how could anyone be expected to believe that Moses wrote *Jubilees* when a Torah of Moses was already established? The author of *Jubilees* handles the problem by claiming to include not only the First Law, but also an additional written, Mosaic revelation, given at Sinai. This bonus revelation is not inscribed on stone, earthly tablets, but rather in the heavens. It is of divine origin and transmitted by the Angel of the Presence. It conveys what the scriptural material "actually intended to convey." Hence, tradition can be transmitted and applied to spiritual and ritual life only if scripture is recontextualized alongside its authoritative interpretation.

James Kugel's essay focuses on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The question of the Greek, Hebrew, Christian, or Jewish origin of these texts has been much debated. Using six illuminating examples of how scribes read (or misread) and copied (or miscopied) details in the text, Kugel argues that underlying the Greek text of the *Testaments* is a Hebrew original. On this view, "the *Testaments* started off

as a Hebrew composition sometime in the late second or early first century B.C.E. It contained the spiritual last will and testament of each of Jacob's twelve sons." We have of course a Hebrew fragment of the testaments from Qumran, 4Q215 *Testament of Naphtali*, but Kugel hypothesizes that the whole text must have existed in Hebrew. Investigations of this sort can shed much light on processes of transmission by reinforcing our conviction that the two foci of this volume—the details of scribal work and broader reflections about the transmission of traditions—are inextricably connected.

Carol Newsom explores the transmission of traditions with particular attention to the Danielic tradition, which she discusses in conversation with the Nabonidus literature. She argues that the numerous narratives about Nabonidus within Jewish traditions reflect divisions within the Jewish community about whether to support Nabonidus. Instead of arguing for the literary dependence of the Danielic tradition on the Nabonidus literature, Newsom prefers to characterize the evidence she has assembled as "cognitive blending." She suggests that the memory of the Nabonidus inscription would have been formed through public recitations and retellings. It could have been passed on in an oral mode of transmission, which would have allowed for variation. We do not need a particular source of influence; rather, we need a context for familiarizing a community with the narrative. She suggests that we have a blending of "two serious narratives—one concerning Nabonidus' strenuous attempts to foster the worship of the Moon God and the other concerning divine healing of a king. . . ." In order to understand the transmission of traditions, we need to first understand the context in which they are produced and how they function within a society. By considering a range of evidence, we can trace the blending of traditions over a long period of time. This essay has significant implications for how we should think about reconstructing the interpretive developments of scriptural traditions.

Scientific writing is evident in some of the Enochic texts and in the scholarly lists from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Mladen Popović explores ways of reconstructing the sources. To be sure, foreign scholarly traditions are drawn upon. But in Enochic texts these foreign traditions are integrated into an apocalyptic context that is characteristic of Second Temple Judaism, whereas in lists from Qumran this was not the case. Popović argues that scholarly materials were either pseudepigraphically attributed to important figures from the distant, Jewish past, or

were transmitted in terse, anonymous lists. After exploring other views, Popović ultimately suggests that Jewish scribes may have been trained in the Babylonian academies, but that positive, concrete evidence for this is lacking, suggesting a socio-historical context for how traditions might have been transmitted and developed across cultures.

After having worked for many years on the distinctions between S and D, Charlotte Hempel now calls for a study of the redactive integration of the sources. Hempel focuses on the narrative framework that S and D share, while also suggesting that we should consider the possibility that they could have been performed in a liturgical context. Just as rewritten scripture expands and develops pentateuchal traditions, S and D recast non-pentateuchal legal traditions. It is unlikely, Hempel suggests, that the learned, sophisticated tradents of these texts would have distinguished between their approach to rewriting pentateuchal materials and their approach to reworking the S/D traditions; her conclusion stands as an invitation for scholars who specialize in these two kinds of texts, usually considered in isolation from one another, to learn from each other's work.

George Brooke focuses on scribal features of what scholars have come to call continuous pesharim in order to determine who might have produced them, how they were received, and what their function might have been. Brooke's essay tries to understand the use and function of pesher in ways that force us to rethink the authoritative status of biblical texts. In addition, he discusses the status of new interpretations embedded in continuous pesharim. While these pesharim make claims to prophetic status, they do not present themselves as *biblical* prophecy. Thus, they distinguish between the biblical text and its interpretation. Brooke proposes that variations in scribal practices, e.g., the writing of the tetragrammaton, indicate distinct functions of texts within the community, helping us to determine whether the texts in question claim scriptural or another sort of authority.

Emanuel Tov discusses what we can know about the number of texts in circulation in ancient Israel, their origins, and their patterns of distribution. Throughout the essay, Tov emphasizes that our lack of textual evidence reinforces the theory that in the pre-exilic and exilic periods there were very few copies of biblical books available. Moreover, he reinforces claims, made by Haran and Lohfink, that while the books of scripture were being established as such, they were limited

to single Temple copies. The rise in copies of scripture at Qumran should not be used to generalize about an earlier period in Israelite history. Instead, Tov argues that the number of manuscripts in circulation increased significantly in the last centuries B.C.E.

Eibert Tigchelaar reconsiders Tov's criteria for establishing a "Qumran Scribal Practice." Tigchelaar observes that "Tov appeals to statistical data, rather than to linguistic reconstructions" in his theory on Qumran Scribal Practice. Second, Tigchelaar challenges Tov's presupposition that there were standard orthographic practices at Qumran. If the orthographies were not standardized, then can the claim be substantiated that there are norms associated with particular qumranic spellings? Furthermore, Tigchelaar argues that "though there may be a special scribal practice, this cannot be connected exclusively to a Qumran community…." He also questions whether Tov's reconstructed scribal practices can sustain the distinction, between sectarian and non-sectarian texts. He wants to understand variations in scribal practices as part of a spectrum. Tigchelaar concludes that Qumran Scribal Practice does not provide definitive information about whether a particular text or set of texts are sectarian or non-sectarian.

Eugene Ulrich's essay reflects broadly on the development and emergence of scriptural traditions, both oral and written. He presents an evolutionary overview of the history of the production of biblical traditions. Ulrich's comprehensive picture touches what he calls "the main stages in the chronological growth of the biblical books," i.e., composition, redaction, transmission and reception. Throughout the essay, he emphasizes the pluriform nature of the textual traditions and demonstrates the intimate relationship between the development of traditions, and the growth and development of scriptural books. The paper ends with the striking formulation: "Canon is the ultimate act of reception."

Florentino García-Martínez calls upon scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls to reconsider the collection of scrolls as a whole, and to stop asking whether texts are "sectarian" or "non-sectarian." He suggests that this distinction, like the classification of texts as "biblical" or "nonbiblical," should be abandoned. One way to think about the collection as a whole is to note the various ways in which the voice of the Teacher is invoked. Such invocations confer authority upon many of the scrolls and should be compared to invocations of Mosaic authority.

The voice of the Teacher anticipates the eschatological future, draws upon the prophetic past, and authorizes the readings of the teacher's present, which reveal the hidden sense of scripture. Summarizing his proposal, García Martínez writes: "If we want to talk of the 'Qumran Bible,' we should thus not only go beyond the 'canonical divide' but also beyond the 'sectarian divide,' and we should consider each composition of the whole collection on its own; then, on the basis of the partial and accidental evidence which has reached us, we should decide in each case the authority each single book may have had for the group that put the collection together. From this perspective, 'the voice of the Teacher' should be understood to be as strong a claim as 'the voice of Moses' or the revelation through the Prophets."

* * *

This volume originated at a co-organized conference in November of 2009 in Toronto, Ontario. This was in conjunction with the exhibit "Words that Changed the World" held at the Royal Ontario Museum and co-sponsored by the Israel Antiquities Authority. We thank the head exhibit curators who worked with us on the conference: Dan Rahimi, Executive Director, Gallery Development at the Royal Ontario Museum and Risa Levitt Kohn, Professor, Religious Studies Department, Director of the Jewish Studies Program at San Diego State University and Guest Curator for the Dead Sea Scrolls Exhibition at the Royal Ontario Museum. The conference was made possible by many gracious donors. In particular we want to acknowledge our co-organizer Alex Gropper and our fundraising chairs, Miguel Singer and Barry Zagdanski, as well as the support of the UJA Federation of Toronto, St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, McMaster University and York University.

We also acknowledge Nicole Hilton and Eva Mroczek for their careful proofreading and suggestions for improvement of the papers. Many thanks to Jeremy Penner for his help with the primary text index, and to Jonathan Vroom for helping with the modern authors index. Julia Lauwers also provided invaluable assistance with the editing and preparation of the volume.

We are grateful to the editors of the STDJ series for their acceptance of this volume into their prestigious series, in which we are honored to be included. We also thank Mattie Kuiper of Brill for her editorial support and guidance.

Sarianna Metso, University of Toronto
Hindy Najman, University of Toronto
Eileen Schuller, McMaster University

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations used are according to *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies.* Edited by P. H. Alexander, J. F. Kutsko, J. D. Ernest, S. A. Decker-Lucke, and D. L. Petersen. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.

TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

John J. Collins
Yale University

In the introduction to the classic study of *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm defined tradition as "a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past."[1] The definition admits of refinement.[2] Traditions of thought and belief are no less important than practices in shaping values and norms. Tradition, by its nature, develops, and consequently changes, but it nevertheless presupposes a certain degree of continuity over time. This continuity is essential to the sense of identity that tradition confers. It provides a sense of order and stability, and it also proves a framework within which innovation can occur. In the words of Karl Popper, "traditions have the important double function that they not only create a certain order or something like a social structure, but that they also give us something upon which we can operate: something we can criticize and change."[3]

In the case of ancient Judaism, one of the ways in which tradition was articulated was in a corpus of writings that was accorded authoritative status. One of the many ways in which the Dead Sea Scrolls have contributed to our understanding of ancient Judaism is by providing a snapshot of this process, as it developed in the last centuries before

---

[1] Eric Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," in *The Invention of Tradition* (ed. E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1–14. The definition is on p. 1.

[2] Marcel Sarot, "Counterfactuals and the Invention of Religious Tradition," in *Religious Identity and the Invention of Tradition* (ed. J. W. van Henten and A. Houtepen; Assen: van Gorcum, 2001), 21–40 (22–28). Sarot compares Hobsbawm's view of tradition with that of Karl Popper, "Towards a Rational Theory of Tradition," in *The Rationalist Annual* 66 (1949): 36–55, repr. in Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge* (3d ed.; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), 120–35.

[3] Popper, "Towards a Rational Theory of Tradition," 50; Sarot, "Counterfactuals," 25.

the turn of the era. It is now generally agreed that it is anachronistic to speak of a canon in this period. But it is also generally agreed that the Torah of Moses, or the Pentateuch, and also the books of the prophets, enjoyed a special status, at least by the time the Scrolls were written in the last two centuries B.C.E. Exactly what that status entailed, however, is not always clear. In fact, the Scrolls document several different ways in which these authoritative writings could be construed. As George Brooke has noted, "It is no longer possible to argue that tradition is passed from one generation to another along single trajectories. Intelligent readings of the evidence…demand that the pluralities of early Jewish tradition are taken seriously. No longer is it possible, even if it ever was, to read back interpretative norms in a direct way from one age to another."[4]

The Nature of the Scrolls Collection

At the outset, it may be well to clarify our understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a collection. It has long been customary to refer to the corpus as "the Qumran library," and Hartmut Stegemann, in particular, has argued that the Scrolls belonged to "the central library of the Qumran settlement."[5] Libraries were rare in antiquity, but became more common in the Hellenistic period.[6] The great palace library of Asshurbanipal and the famous library of Alexandria were exceptional. In the Near East, libraries were often associated with temples. These were usually of modest size. The largest known Mesopotamian temple library had about 800 tablets.[7] The temple library at Edfu in Egypt had a catalogue with 35 titles.[8] It is generally assumed that there was

---

[4] George J. Brooke, "The Formation and Renewal of Scriptural Tradition," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. C. Hempel and J. M. Lieu; JSJSup 111; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 39–59 (47).

[5] Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 80–5.

[6] Armin Lange, "2 Maccabees 2:13–15: Library or Canon?" in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology* (ed. G. G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér; JSJSup 118; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 156–64.

[7] Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 2007), 240. On Mesopotamian libraries see Olof Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500–300 B.C.* (Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 1998).

[8] Van der Toorn, ibid. Vilmos Wessetzky, "Die Bücherliste des Tempels von Edfu und Imhotep," *Göttinger Miszellen* 83 (1984): 85–9.

a library in the Jerusalem temple. 2 Maccabees (2:13–16) claims that such a library was established by Nehemiah and restored by Judas Maccabee. The reliability of this account is open to question, especially with regard to Nehemiah, but it may be taken as evidence that there was some collection of books in the Jerusalem temple. Other evidence for a temple library in Jerusalem is scant indeed.[9] There are scattered references in Josephus to books laid up in the temple,[10] and he claims that the records of the Jewish people were assigned to chief priests and prophets.[11] But he also says that the number of "justly accredited books" was only twenty two.[12] The spoils when the temple was captured included a copy of the Jewish Law (*J.W.* 7.150), which was laid up in Rome in the Temple of Peace (*J.W.* 7.162). Josephus claims that Titus allowed him to take some sacred books when the temple was destroyed (*Life*, 418). All of this would suggest that the temple library in Jerusalem was very modest in size.

The existence of a major library in a place like Qumran would be surprising, but then the discovery of the Scrolls was surprising in any case. One could perhaps explain the library by the priestly character of the *yaḥad*, which seems to have viewed the community as a substitute temple,[13] or suppose that the priestly members brought their manuscripts with them. But the size of the supposed library in the wilderness is anomalous enough that we should consider possible alternative explanations.

It is generally acknowledged that the texts found in the Scrolls cannot all have been authored at Qumran. The collection includes many texts, including those we know as biblical, that were composed before the site was occupied in the Hellenistic period, and before the

---

[9] Yaacov Shavit, "The 'Qumran Library' in the Light of the attitude towards Books and Libraries in the Second Temple Period," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise et al.; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 299–315 (303).

[10] *Ant.* 3.1.7 (38); 5.1.7 (61). Roger T. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 84.

[11] *Ag. Ap.* 1.29.

[12] *Ag. Ap.* 1.31.

[13] So David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford, 2005), 217–20, who regards Qumran as an extension of priestly book-culture. So also Lange, "2 Macc 2:13–15," 160–61, who argues that "the Qumran library resembles ancient Near Eastern temple libraries because of the particular character of the Qumran community as a spiritual temple."

sectarian movement originated, on any reckoning. It is also recognized that not all the nonbiblical texts are necessarily sectarian compositions. Moreover, it is remarkable that "among the Qumran manuscripts very few individual scribes can be identified as having copied more than one manuscript."[14] The idea that locus 30 at Qumran was a scriptorium, proposed by de Vaux,[15] now seems doubtful to many scholars.[16] Emanuel Tov has identified a group of 167 nonbiblical and biblical texts which reflect an idiosyncratic scribal practice, including distinctive orthography and morphology.[17] He argues that this group includes virtually all commonly agreed upon sectarian writings and so refers to it as "the Qumran scribal practice." But there are exceptions and anomalies: he acknowledges seven or eight sectarian texts (including two manuscripts of the *Serek*, some pesharim and one manuscript of 4QMMT) that do not follow this practice, while some that do, such as 4QQoh[a], predate the settlement at Qumran.[18] He also grants that "the texts written in the Qumran scribal practice could have been penned anywhere in Palestine," although he claims that "they were probably written mainly at Qumran."[19] The latter claim is unfounded, even if one were to grant that the scribal practice was peculiar to the *yaḥad*. Moreover, the number of texts following the supposed Qumran scribal practice is less than one fifth of the entire corpus. Tov then supposes that the corpus includes many texts "which were presumably taken there from elsewhere."[20]

The provenance of the Scrolls is a separate issue from the question of whether they constituted a library. Most libraries are made up of books composed elsewhere. There is another possibility, however, that deserves consideration. Many of the Scrolls may have been brought

---

[14] Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 22; Cf. Michael O. Wise, "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran," in *Thunder in Gemini* (ed. M. O. Wise; JSPSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 103–51 (124).

[15] Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Schweich Lectures; London: Oxford, 1973), 29–33.

[16] See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 15.

[17] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 261–88.

[18] Ibid., 262. See also Dong-Hyuk Kim, "Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov's 'Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004): 72–81, and Tov's "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's Paper on 'Tov's Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004): 359–60.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 261.

from elsewhere to be hidden in the wilderness and preserved from destruction in time of war. The obvious occasion is the great revolt of 66 C.E. It is possible that some Scrolls were also hidden in the caves earlier, around the turn of the era, as Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra has suggested.[21] I would still argue that the collection as a whole has a sectarian character, since it conspicuously lacks anything that could be considered Pharisaic, and contains very little that could be pro-Hasmonean, with the possible but controversial exception of the "Prayer for King Jonathan."[22] But if the Scrolls were brought to Qumran from various settlements of the *yaḥad*, this might explain the presence in the collection of different, even contradictory, copies of the *Serek* or *Community Rule*.[23] Rather than suppose that different editions of the Rule were preserved simultaneously in a single community, we might suppose that not all communities had the latest or fullest edition of the text.

Even if many scrolls were brought from elsewhere, Qumran must have had some library, if indeed it was a settlement of the *yaḥad* at all, and I assume that it was. Study of the Torah was a significant factor in the *raison d'être* of the sect, and a community that was devoted to study probably had some other texts as well. But it is now apparent that the Dead Sea Scrolls cannot be viewed only as the library of an isolated settlement. Many of these texts circulated more widely. They may not constitute a random sampling of Judean literature around the turn of the era, but they are representative of a broader segment of the population than the inhabitants of Qumran.

The Sectarian Ideology

The sectarian movement reflected in the Scrolls, both the "new covenant" of the *Damascus Document* and the *yaḥad* of the *Community Rule*, had as its *raison d'être* the proper observance of the Torah of Moses. The person who wished to join the new covenant in the *Damascus Document* "must impose upon himself to return to the law

---

[21] Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *DSD* 14/3 (2007): 313–33.

[22] On the Prayer for King Jonathan see my discussion in *Beyond the Qumran Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 118–20.

[23] Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad. *A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 183–90.

of Moses with all his heart and soul" (15:12). He must also impose the oath of the covenant on his son, when he reaches the age of enrollment (15:5–6). Equally, in the *Serek* or *Community Rule*: "whoever enters the council of the community . . . shall swear with a binding oath to revert to the Law of Moses, according to all that he commanded, with whole heart and soul, in compliance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and interpret his will and to the multitude of the men of their covenant . . ." (1QS 5:7–9).

This centrality of the Torah was not a peculiarity of the *Damascus Document*, or of the *yaḥad*. The attempt to make the Torah central to the tradition goes back to Deuteronomy and Josiah's reform. Ezra is said to have attempted to impose it in the Persian era, and Nehemiah to have instituted a renewed covenant based on it.[24] In the Hellenistic age its centrality was recognized by Gentile observers such as Hecataeus.[25] When the Seleucids conquered Jerusalem in 198 B.C.E., the "ancestral laws" recognized by Antiochus III were probably some form of the Mosaic Torah.[26] By the first century B.C.E., it is clear that even opposing parties agreed on the centrality of the Torah, even as they disagreed on its interpretation. This is apparent in 4QMMT, which is apparently addressed to a leader of Israel. Even if we lay aside the controversial supposed reference to a tri-partite canon,[27] the whole treatise presupposes that both the author and the addressee accept the authority of the Torah. There is also a third party, which also accepts its authority, but interprets it differently. I accept the view that the

---

[24] Michael Duggan, *Covenant Renewal in Ezra-Nehemiah (Neh 7:72b–10:40): An Exegetical, Literary and Theological Study* (Atlanta: SBL, 2001).

[25] Hecataeus of Abdera, apud Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica* 40.3; Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences, 1976), 1.20–35.

[26] Josephus, *Ant.* 12. 142; Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999, originally published by the Jewish Publication Society in 1959), 83.

[27] Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V. Miqṣat Maʿaśe Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 58–9; Composite text C 10. The reconstruction is questioned by Eugene Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–14. Ulrich proposes as "a cautiously reconstructed text": "we have [written] to you so that you may study in the book of m[. . . pr]ophets and in d[. . . ." A reference to "generation and generation" in the following line has sometimes been read as a reference to Chronicles, but this is gratuitous. See also Hanne von Weissenberg, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (STDJ 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 204–6.

"they" of MMT is most probably the Pharisees.[28] There is, in any case, no doubt that the Pharisees, no less than the "new covenant," accorded central importance to the Torah. The importance accorded to it in the Scrolls, then, might seem to be unremarkable.

But in fact the focus on the Torah as law in the sectarian Scrolls, while it was not without precedent, was to some degree a departure from tradition. Not all of Jewish tradition was Torah-centric. When Ben Sira, in the early second century B.C.E., equated wisdom with the Torah of Moses, he was departing from the tradition of Proverbs and Qoheleth, which do not refer to the Torah explicitly at all. Even 4QInstruction, the major wisdom text found at Qumran, which alludes to the Torah in various ways, does not thematize it, or refer to it as the ultimate source of wisdom.[29] More significantly for our topic, the Scrolls themselves include a corpus of literature, most of it in Aramaic, which deals with the stories and traditions that we now find in the Pentateuch but does not have the legal, halakic, focus that we find in the Scrolls.[30] This literature is generally, but not necessarily always, older than the clearly sectarian texts, which are all in Hebrew.

Pseudepigrapha in the Scrolls

Among the texts that clearly were not composed at Qumran, or by members of the *yaḥad*, are texts such as the books of *Enoch, Apocryphal Levi*, and *Jubilees*, some of which were known before the discovery of the Scrolls. Many of these texts are in Aramaic, and they are representative of the tradition, or traditions, inherited by the sectarian movement known from the Scrolls. Many of the Aramaic works found at Qumran deal with primeval history and the patriarchs; others like the Daniel pseudepigrapha and the tales from the Persian court are

---

[28] Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 98.

[29] See the recent review of this issue by Matthew J. Goff, "Recent Trends in the Study of Early Jewish Wisdom Literature: The Contribution of 4QInstruction and Other Qumran Texts," *Currents in Biblical Research* 7 (2009): 377–416 (393–5). For the evident use of Torah in 4QInstruction see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Halakhic Elements in the Sapiential Texts from Qumran," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling and R. A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 89–100.

[30] See Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, eds., *Les texts araméens de Qumrân* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

set in the Diaspora. These books do *not* typically deal with Moses, the history of Israel or the Prophets (unless Daniel or Enoch be so categorized). Moreover, many of the Aramaic scrolls are dated early. Some of the fragments of the Testament of Amram date to the second century B.C.E., and Puech argues that the composition must be prior to *Jubilees*.[31] The extant Aramaic sections of *1 Enoch* and the Book of the Giants are plausibly dated before the Maccabean revolt. Not all the Aramaic literature is necessarily so early. 4Q245 provides a list of High Priests that extends into the Hasmonean era, at least as far as Simon, possibly as far as Aristobulus I.[32] But the fact remains that much of the Aramaic literature found at Qumran comes from a time before the formation of the sectarian movement known from the Scrolls.

Two features of this early literature are noteworthy. One is the use of pseudepigraphy—the appeal to the authority of figures such as Enoch or Levi. The second is the lack of focus on the law of Moses. The latter feature is especially conspicuous in light of the centrality of the Torah in the main sectarian texts.

The attribution of books to venerable figures from ancient times is evidently a strategy to enhance the authority of their contents. The phenomenon was common in the ancient Near East. The standard version of the Epic of Gilgamesh presents it as an autobiographical account of Gilgamesh, and there are similar pseudo-autobiographical accounts of Naram-Sin and Sargon.[33] There was a tradition of pseudepigraphy in Egyptian wisdom literature. Pseudepigraphy can be viewed as a way of inventing tradition, to borrow Hobsbawm's terminology.[34] The contents of the early Enoch literature may have been quite novel in the Hellenistic period, but they were presented as dating from before the Flood. This is not to deny that the authors of these works drew on

---

[31] Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte IV.22. Textes Araméens. Première Partie 4Q529–549* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 285–7.

[32] So Michael O. Wise, "4Q245 and the High Priesthood of Judas Maccabaeus," *DSD* 12 (2005): 313–62 (244). The so-called 'Son of God' text, 4Q246, must also, in my view, be assigned to the post-Maccabean period, probably to the first century B.C.E., in view of its probable dependence on the Book of Daniel and its espousal of royal messianism. The manuscripts of 4Q540–541 have been dated around 100 B.C.E., and the composition need not be much older.

[33] Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 34.

[34] Cf. the comments of Brooke on "inventing the past" in apocalyptic literature in "The Formation and Renewal of Scriptural Tradition," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling and R. A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 89–100 (51–53).

traditional materials. The *Book of the Watchers*, for example, surely displays familiarity with materials known to us as biblical, and probably incorporates some older stories about Asael and Shemihaza, but we do not know at what point those stories originated. But as far as rhetorical strategy was concerned, the authors of the books of Enoch did not wish to claim novelty at all. Rather, they wanted to claim great antiquity, and the prestige attendant thereto.

Where these authors made use of older traditions, did they regard these traditions as authoritative? Not necessarily. Armin Lange distinguishes here between literature and scripture. In his view, the paradigm shift takes place in the second century B.C.E., after the Hellenistic reform and the Maccabean revolt.[35] The author of Daniel chapter 4 surely knew some form of the tradition preserved in the *Prayer of Nabonidus*. He found this story useful and malleable for his purpose, but it is not apparent that he accorded any authority to it. Texts such as the Book of Giants may use the book of Genesis as a jumping off point, but the relationship is tangential. Even the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which follows the biblical story to a greater extent, uses it freely, and does not attend to the details of the text. The Aramaic texts from Qumran seldom if ever appeal to older literature as normative. Even the book of Tobit, which refers respectfully to "the law of Moses," uses this phrase broadly to refer to traditional custom rather than to specific laws or a specific book.[36] All the Aramaic texts presuppose traditions about figures who are mentioned in what became the Hebrew Bible (although the Daniel mentioned in the book of Ezekiel bears little resemblance to the hero of the Aramaic writings). But they treat the inherited tradition with considerable freedom.

The Aramaic texts from Qumran certainly allude to traditions now found in the Hebrew Bible and draw on them in various ways, but they are not Torah-centric. There has been some debate recently as to the status of the Torah in the early Enoch literature, as reflected

---

[35] Armin Lange, "From Literature to Scripture: The Unity and Plurality of the Hebrew Scriptures in Light of the Qumran Library," in *One Scripture or Many? Canon from Biblical, Theological, and Philosophical Perspectives* (ed. C. Helmer and C. Landmesser; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 51–107 (103–6). See also Eugene Ulrich, "From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text's Authoritativeness," *DSD* 10 (2003): 3–25.

[36] See my essay, "The Judaism of the Book of Tobit," in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology* (ed. G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér; JSJSup 98; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 23–40.

in the *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of the Watchers*. As George Nickelsburg has written:

> the heart of the religion of 1 Enoch juxtaposes election, revealed wisdom, the right and wrong ways to respond to this wisdom, and God's rewards and punishments for this conduct. Although all the components of 'covenantal nomism' are present in this scheme, the word *covenant* rarely appears and Enoch takes the place of Moses as the mediator of revelation. In addition, the presentation of this religion is dominated by a notion of revelation—the claim that the books of Enoch are the embodiment of God's wisdom, which was received in primordial times and is being revealed in the eschaton to God's chosen ones.[37]

It is not that the authors were not familiar with what we call the books of Moses. Several of the works relating to primeval and patriarchal history are parabiblical, in the sense that they paraphrase and elaborate stories known to us from the Bible.[38] But this literature also testifies to a form of religion that is less centralized, less exclusively focused on Moses, than what emerged in later centuries.

This is not to deny that some circles in Judaism were Torah-centric in the period before the Maccabean revolt. While Ben Sira was a wisdom teacher rather than an exegete, his deference towards the Torah is eloquent testimony to its cultural importance.[39] But that importance seems to have attained a new level in the period after the Maccabean revolt. The revolt itself is presented in 1 Maccabees as a defence of the Torah against those who wished to abrogate it. In the words attributed to Mattathias, "Far be it from us to desert the law and the ordinances." (1 Macc 2:21. The actual motivations of the rebels were undoubtedly more complex, but that need not detain us here). When the Hasmoneans came to power, they at least paid lip-service to the Torah, and sectarian disputes about the correct interpretation

---

[37] George W. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?" in *Hesed Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs* (ed. J. Magness and S. Gitin; BJS 320; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 123–32 (129).

[38] Philip S. Alexander ("The Enochic Literature and the Bible," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* [ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2002], 57–69) takes the *Book of the Watchers* in *1 Enoch* as an example of "rewritten Bible," and argues that it implies that Genesis was "in some sense authoritative" (65). The nature of the authority, however, is debatable, and the focus on Genesis, as distinct from the Moses traditions, is significant.

[39] See the discussion in my book, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 42–61.

impinged directly on affairs of state, as can be seen from the fluctuating relations of the Hasmoneans with the Pharisees in the early first century B.C.E.

The focus on the Torah in the sectarian Scrolls, then, is more innovative than it might at first appear. It is not a peculiarity of the sect. It was a focus shared with other sectarian movements, and even with the Hasmonean rulers. But if the pseudepigraphic books of Enoch and Levi are at all representative of circles from which the early sectarians came, there was a break with what we might call the proto-sectarian tradition. The break should not be exaggerated. The older literature was still preserved and copied, and does not seem to have been repudiated. But the sectarians no longer produced "revelations" in the name of Enoch or Levi. What we find in the new covenant and in the *yaḥad* is not Enochic Judaism, but very decidedly Mosaic Judaism.

The Torah Rewritten

The ascendancy of the Torah as law is reflected in such works as *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*, both of which are widely believed to predate the formation of the new covenant. *Jubilees* purports to give the revelation dictated to Moses by the Angel of the Presence (*Jub.* 1:27; 2:1). It is a rewriting of Genesis and part of Exodus that retrojects the observance of the Torah into the primeval and patriarchal periods. The *Temple Scroll* is presented as the words of God to Moses, and is in large part a harmonization of the Priestly and Deuteronomic laws. Like the pseudepigraphic writings, these works were exercises in the invention of tradition, while at the same time affecting deference and conformity. In the words of Hindy Najman:

> On the one hand, they retold biblical stories in ways that resolved apparent inconsistencies or solved puzzles for their readers. On the other hand, they wove their own versions of law, temple ritual, calendrical system and covenant, along with the very words of already authoritative traditions, into a single seamless whole. Thus they claimed, for their interpretations of authoritative texts, the already established authority of the texts themselves.[40]

[40] Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJ Sup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 45.

Both these texts appeal to the revelation at Sinai, unlike the early Enoch literature, but *Jubilees* also acknowledges pre-Sinaitic revelations, and refers to the heavenly tablets as the ultimate deposit of truth.[41] Both *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*, however, claim to present a higher revelation, which is surely meant to provide an authoritative guide to the interpretation of the Torah, even if it is not intended to replace it.[42] *Jubilees* makes a clear distinction between Torah and "testimony," often the "testimony of the heavenly tablets" (the distinctive interpretation advanced in *Jubilees*?),[43] but there is no such distinction in the *Temple Scroll*, which is presented simply as divine revelation. Not even *Jubilees*, however, makes the kind of distinction between text and interpretation that we will find in the sectarian writings from Qumran.

The Sectarian View of Revelation

The sectarian texts from Qumran neither appeal to the authority of an ancient patriarch nor attempt to reformulate the Sinai revelation. Instead they claim to have a new revelation as to how the Sinai revelation should be interpreted. This alleged revelation is a factor in the origin of the sectarian movement. According to the *Damascus Document*:

> But with those who remained steadfast to God's precepts, with those who were left from among them, God established his covenant with Israel forever, revealing to them hidden matters in which all Israel had gone astray: his holy Sabbaths and his glorious feasts, his just stipulations and his truthful paths, and the wishes of his will, which man must do in order to live by them. (CD 3:12–15)

---

[41] Hindy Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and its Authority Conferring Strategies," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410. See also Florentino García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243–60, and especially James L. Kugel, "On the Interpolations in the Book of Jubilees," *RevQ* 24 (2009): 215–72, who argues that the heavenly tablets are only found in passages that are interpolated.

[42] On this issue see Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 41–69.

[43] See the essay of James VanderKam in this volume. See also Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 282–91 (290).

Even though the recipients of this revelation had remained steadfast, they did not know all that they needed to know from tradition. As Lawrence Schiffman especially has argued,

> The sect divided the law into two categories—the *nigleh*, "revealed," and the *nistar*, "hidden." The revealed laws were known to all Israel, for they were manifest in Scripture, but the hidden laws were known only to the sect and were revealed solely through sectarian exegesis.[44]

There was, then, a common tradition, the *nigleh*. But this alone was not sufficient. It should be noted here that the sectarians do not claim to have a superior chain of tradition, or indeed that the *nistar* could be known from tradition at all, although it may now become a new tradition in sectarian circles. Equally, they do not claim that the true understanding was revealed to some ancient figure whose writings they now, miraculously, possessed, or even to Moses himself, as in *Jubilees*. Rather, the inadequacy of tradition is acknowledged, or at least it is viewed as a broken chain.

The Role of the Teacher

In some sectarian writings, the Teacher of Righteousness had a crucial role in mediating the new revelation. According to CD 1, God "raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness, in order to direct them in the path of his heart." The Teacher is most probably identical with the figure called "the Interpreter of the Law" in the exposition of Num 21:18 in CD 6:3–10:

> The well is the law, and those who dug it are the converts of Israel, who left the land of Judah and lived in the land of Damascus . . . and the staff is the Interpreter of the Law . . . And the nobles of the people are those who come to dig the well with the staves that the staff decreed . . . until there arises one who teaches justice at the end of days. (CD 6:3–10)

The figure elsewhere known as the Teacher of Righteousness, and who is clearly a figure of the past in the *Damascus Document*, should be identified with the Interpreter of the Law in this passage, rather than with the figure who was still to come at the end of days.[45]

---

[44] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 247.

[45] Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT, 1983), 124; "The Teacher of Righteousness at the End of Days," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 313–17,

From this it would seem that the Teacher is regarded as the source and authority for the halakah of the *Damascus Document*. Again, in CD 20:31–32 those who abide by the "first ordinances" are said to "lend their ears to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness." Moreover, in the pesharim the Teacher is credited with knowledge of the mysteries of the end-time. God told Habakkuk to write down the things that were to come upon the last generation, but he did not make known to him the fulfillment of the end-time. The phrase "that he who reads it may run" is applied to the Teacher, "to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets."[46] The same pesher refers to those who

> do not believe when they hear all the things that [are to come] upon the last generation from the mouth of the priest in whose [heart[God put [understand]ing that he might interpret all the words of His servants the prophets, through [whom] God foretold all the things that are to come upon his people…[47]

In light of these passages I have in the past suggested that the reason for the absence of pseudepigraphy in the sectarian texts was that the authority of the Teacher rendered appeal to primeval and patriarchal authorities unnecessary.[48] Steven Fraade has objected that "not a single Qumran sectarian scroll is explicitly attributed to the authorship of the Teacher, nor is the Teacher mentioned all that often in those scrolls, notwithstanding the enormous industry of modern scholars to intuit his identity and role from them."[49] It is indeed remarkable that all the major sectarian scrolls are anonymous, including the section of the Hodayot that is often, and plausibly, designated as Teacher Hymns.

---

argued that the reference is to an earlier figure, and that the Teacher is the figure referred to as "one who teaches justice at the end of days" in CD 6:11. See my critique of this position in "Teacher and Messiah? The One Who will Teach Righteousness at the End of Days," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. E. C. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame, 1994), 193–210; also Michael Knibb, "The Teacher of Righteousness—A Messianic Title?" in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (ed. P. R. Davies and R. T. White; JSOTSup 100; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 51–65.

[46] 1QpHab 7:1–5.

[47] 1QpHab 2:7–10.

[48] John J. Collins, "Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 43–58 (56–7).

[49] Steven Fraade, "Interpretive Authority at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 46–69 (49).

An Oral Tradition?

Samuel Byrskog argues that it is

> likely that there were channels besides the written records by which the Qumranites could recognize the traditions from the Teacher. They did not think of the Teacher as merely a wisdom teacher uttering anonymous sayings. Their interpretative activity and their salvation depended on hearing his voice.… There were presumably oral means of communicating the traditions' attachment to the Teacher.[50]

In fact, the sectarian Scrolls are remarkable for their emphasis on *written* transmission, an emphasis that has also been noted in the book of *Jubilees*.[51] But however the sectarian traditions were transmitted, it is clear that that they were more extensive than what we now possess in written form.

The centrality of Torah study is emphasized again and again in the rule books. The famous passage in 1QS 8 that cites Isa 40:3, about going into the wilderness to prepare the way of the Lord, adds

> this is the study of the Torah which he commanded through Moses, that they should act in accordance with all that has been revealed from time to time and in accordance with what the prophets revealed by His holy spirit.[52]

It is apparent that members needed to study more than the text of the Torah. On admission, the new member had to swear an oath to abide not only by the Torah of Moses but also by "all that has been revealed from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests, who are the keepers of the covenant and interpret his will and to the multitude of the men of the community."[53] He must also be instructed in all the rules of the community (1QS 6:13–15). According to the *Damascus Document*, a person whose deeds did not conform to "the explanation of the law in which the men of perfect holiness walked" should be shunned by the community, "for all the holy ones of the Most High have cursed him."[54] Shemaryahu Talmon claims that "the Covenanters routinely

---

[50] Samuel Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community* (Con Bib, NT series 24; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994), 151–2.

[51] Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing," 381–88.

[52] 1QS 8:12–16.

[53] 1QS 5:8–10. There is no reference to the Sons of Zadok in 4QS^{b} and 4QS^{d}.

[54] CD 20:6–7.

committed to writing their own extrapolations of biblical laws, as well as entirely new *yaḥad* statutes, such as Sabbath observances and purity injunctions,"[55] but we probably have to reckon with some oral tradition too. We are not told, however, that this tradition consisted of the teachings of the Teacher.[56] At most, the Teacher may have inaugurated the tradition.

The main description of the study carried on in the *yaḥad* is found in 1QS 6:6–7:

> And in the place in which the ten assemble there should not be missing a man to interpret the law (איש דורש בתורה) day and night, always, one relieving another. And the Many shall be on watch together for a third of each night of the year in order to read the book, explain the regulation, (לדרוש משפט) and bless together.

The relation between the two statements in this passage has been the subject of some debate. Several scholars read the two statements disjunctively, as relating to different settings.[57] Alfred R. C. Leaney argued that the second passage "serves as a link between the regulations for small dispersed communities and similar regulations for the larger community at Qumran,"[58] and Sarianna Metso has taken a similar position.[59] Charlotte Hempel has argued that the two statements reflect different stages in the development of the community:

> Speaking very broadly the impression gained is that interpretative authority originated as a shared grassroots commodity that characterized the community from its earliest days in small groups. Over time the texts seem to testify to a restriction of access to the correct interpretation

---

[55] Shemaryahu Talmon, "Oral and Written Transmission in Judaism," in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (ed. H. Wansbrough; JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 121–58 (146).

[56] Talmon ("Oral and Written Transmission," 157–8) entertains the possibility that the parenetic speeches at the beginning of the *Damascus Document* derive from the Teacher, but adds: "if these speeches can indeed be ascribed to the Teacher, we may assume with much confidence that they were submitted to writing almost simultaneously with their oral delivery, or after a minimal lapse of time."

[57] See the discussion of this passage by Martin Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE–400 CE* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 32–33; Charlotte Hempel, "Interpretative Authority in the Community Rule Tradition," *DSD* 10 (2003): 59–80, especially 61–5.

[58] Alfred R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning* (London: SCM, 1966), 185–6.

[59] Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 133–5. Metso regards the regulations for groups of ten as anomalous in the Community Rule "which seems to mirror the circumstances of a larger Essene settlement" (135).

> of the law by referring to individuals and groups with privileged access and special revelations.[60]

It seems to me, however, that it is easier to read the two statements as complementary.[61] The nightly watch by the "Many" is in no way incompatible with a special role for an interpreter. The idea that "interpretative authority originated as a shared grassroots commodity" seems unlikely, since the passage in CD 6 clearly asserts the primacy of the original "Interpreter of the Law," who is presumably to be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness.[62] The very fact that an expert was needed in a group of ten strongly suggests that not every member of the sect would be able to interpret; not all members were necessarily able to read. We might imagine a scene where a literate member of the group read the text aloud, and all joined in the discussion. This is not just one official, since there must be at least one in each group of ten, and probably more, so that they can relieve each other. The parallel in CD 13:2–3 ("and in a place of ten, a priest learned in the book of HAGY should not be lacking; and by his authority all shall be governed") suggests, even if it does not require, that this role would be filled by a priest.[63] The "Many," then, are required to study the law, but there also seems to be a special role for an interpreter.

As Fraade also notes, the role of this "interpreter" brings to mind the "Interpreter of the Law" (דורש התורה) in CD 6, who is identified as the "staff" (מחוקק) of Num 21:18. This figure is usually, and plausibly, identified with the Teacher. The passage in CD 6 continues: "the nobles of the people are those who come to dig the well with the ordinances (מחוקקות) that the "staff" (מחוקק) ordained (חקק) for them." The implication seems to be that the original Interpreter of the Law established some principles of interpretation, which were then applied by the community. If we may assume continuity between the "new

---

[60] Hempel, "Interpretative Authority," 79–80. Her interpretation of the passage is in line with her broader views on the development of the sect. The idea of a priestly, Zadokite takeover at Qumran seems to me very dubious. "Sons of Zadok" is more likely to be an honorific title for the community than a reference to a specific group (cf. CD 4:3–4, and Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 60–5).

[61] So also Fraade, "Interpretative Authority," 67.

[62] If, as Davies proposed, the Interpreter belonged to the "parent community" before the advent of the Teacher, this would argue even more strongly against the idea that interpretative authority was originally a grassroots phenomenon.

[63] So also Johann Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation, vol. 1. From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (until 1300)* (ed. M. Saebø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 108–29 (115).

covenant" of the *Damascus Document* and the *yaḥad* of the *Serek*, then it would seem that each "interpreter of the law" in the various settlements or cell communities played the role of the original Interpreter, and also, incidentally, anticipated the role of the one who would teach righteousness at the end of days (CD 6:11).

Fraade has argued that in 1QS 6 "the Qumran sectaries are to accompany their reading of 'the book' with their study of *mishpat*, the latter most likely denoting the esoteric laws of the community. Even as the latter most likely derive by inspired exegesis from the former, they constitute a distinct component of the nightly curriculum."[64] If this is correct, there must have been an ancillary tradition of interpretation that was passed along in the nightly study sessions. While these sessions were communal, they were not entirely democratic; there was still a hierarchy, as there was in all aspects of life in the *yaḥad*. It also seems to me that the interpretive authority of the individual "interpreters of the law" still derived from that of the original Teacher, even if the latter was not credited as the author of any written compositions. But the focus in the Scrolls is on the Torah and its interpretation, not on the personal teaching of the Teacher.

A Distinctive View of Tradition

In this respect, the view of tradition and its transmission found in the sectarian scrolls contrasts sharply not only with the older (and later) pseudepigrapha, but also with that of the Pharisees and the later rabbinic sages. The rabbis claimed an unbroken chain of tradition all the way back to Moses: "Moses received Torah from Sinai and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the Elders, and the Elders to the Prophets, and the Prophets delivered it to the men of the Great Synagogue" (*'Abot* 1:1). Thereafter, the succession of sages is attested by names. While the Talmudic formulation of the Oral Torah may be relatively late, both the New Testament and Josephus attest to the importance the Pharisees attached to "the traditions of the fathers."[65] So, for example, we read in the Gospels that the Pharisees and scribes questioned Jesus

[64] Fraade, "Interpretive Authority," 57.

[65] Jacob Neusner, "Oral Torah and Tradition," in *Method and Meaning* (ed. J. Neusner; BJS 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979), 59–75 (69–70); Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 39–61.

as to why his disciples did not abide by "the tradition of the elders" (Mark 7:5), and Josephus tells us that "the Pharisees passed on to the people certain ordinances from a succession of fathers, which are not written down in the laws of Moses."[66] Whether the Pharisees necessarily relied on *oral* transmission is disputed, although no verifiably Pharisaic writings have yet come to light. But at least the Pharisaic reverence for the traditions of the fathers shows a very different attitude from the claim of new, ongoing, revelation that we find in the sectarian scrolls.[67]

Scripture and Interpretation

Another innovation that we find in the Scrolls may be related to this. This is the clear separation between text and interpretation that we find especially in the pesharim, but also in occasional instances of scriptural interpretation in other texts, notably the *Damascus Document*.[68] The distinction of text and commentary was in the spirit of the age. The earliest such commentaries are probably those of Aristobulus, writing in Greek in Alexandria in the second century B.C.E. But the Scrolls provide the earliest sustained examples in a semitic language, although an instance of the clear separation of scripture and interpretation can be found already in Daniel 9, in the case of Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy weeks.[69] The fact that such explicitly exegetical literature begins to appear after the Maccabean revolt testifies to the changed status of scripture in this period.[70]

How far these commentaries are controlled by exegetical concerns is a matter of dispute. No doubt the authors believed that they were unveiling what the texts "really meant." George Brooke has argued

---

[66] *Ant.* 13.297–8. See Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 51.

[67] James VanderKam ("Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* [ed. S. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 464–77) points out that "their Essene opponents from Qumran and those who produced the Damascus Document consistently insulted them by using epithets that highlight abuse of speech—something that is not the case for their treatment of other enemies" (477).

[68] See Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).

[69] Daniel is said to have perceived "in the books" the number of years prophesied by Jeremiah. Cf. Ezra 1, which refers to the fulfillment of the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah.

[70] Lange, "Hebrew Scriptures," 101.

that in the continuous pesharim "the scriptural text takes priority. It can be played with, adjusted, punned, reordered, but it is the control. Secondly, the commentary . . . is carefully constructed with all manner of allusions primarily to other scriptural texts which have not only suitable vocabulary but also suitable literary contexts of their own."[71] But he also notes that when the pesharim are read with due attention to their literary allusions, "an ideological and theological *Tendenz* emerges."[72] The pesharim are not a disinterested exercise in literary interpretation. Their *Tendenz* has to do with establishing and reinforcing the identity of the community. Jutta Jokiranta argues that "the power of the pesher is to place the wicked enemies of its own nation on the same line as the Gentile enemies and oppressors."[73] The labels and identifications used in the interpretations "justify the group's existence and claims by juxtaposing the most relevant out-groups as the opposites of the in-group."[74] The fact that they are linked to scriptures gives them the aura of divine sanction. Moreover, the pesharim help witness to, and help construct, a distinctive tradition of interpretation, which is essential to sectarian identity. In the words of Maxine Grossman: "From a sectarian perspective, the ability to understand a text—to really know what it is saying—would separate a sectarian from an outsider, and a higher-ranking sectarian from a new volunteer. Understood in this way, textual interpretation becomes not only a marker of insider status but also a process for its formation, confirmation and internalization."[75]

The pesharim witness to sectarian tradition in another respect. They interpret prophecy by correlating it with events and figures from the history of their own time. They presuppose an historical narrative that

---

[71] George J. Brooke, "The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Methods of Investigation*, 339–52 (350).

[72] Ibid.

[73] Jutta Jokiranta, "Pesharim: A Mirror of Self-Understanding," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. de Troyer and A. Lange; SBL Symposium Series 30; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 23–34 (31).

[74] Jutta Jokiranta, "Social Identity Approach: Identity-Constructing Elements in the Psalms Pesher," in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Popović; STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 85–109 (97). Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts," in ibid., 23–31.

[75] Maxine Grossman, "Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and 'Insider' Status," in *Defining Identities*, 1–11 (4).

is never spelled out in narrative form. References to the Wicked Priest and Lion of Wrath, and even to the Teacher, are allusive in character and presuppose that readers are familiar with an account of events that is not provided in the pesharim, or anywhere else in the Scrolls, for that matter. Presumably there was an oral tradition that preserved the memory of key events in the formation of the sect. Such a tradition would undoubtedly have been tendentious and not objective history, if such a thing exists. It is not the purpose of the pesharim to narrate that history, but rather to inscribe the sectarian view of history in the prophetic texts, and give that account an aura of divine authority. But they presuppose an account of the sectarian view of history that has not been preserved in written form and must have been passed along in oral tradition.

The distinction between text and interpretation that we find in the pesharim, and elsewhere in the Scrolls might seem to have the advantage of preserving the integrity of the biblical text, and to a degree, it has. Armin Lange has argued that

> for the time from Jason to Pompey, no evidence exists that argues for group specific canons. On the contrary, the evidence suggests a gradual growth of heterogeneous collections of authoritative writings common to all groups of ancient Judaism. The boundaries of the collection that was later called writings and the boundaries of the collections designated as Moses and prophets were still fluid.[76]

One could argue, of course, that to speak of canons at all in this period is anachronistic, but the issue is whether different groups regarded different corpora of writings as authoritative. Here it seems to me that Lange's claim needs to be qualified. It is true that different groups, Hasmoneans, Pharisees, Essenes, agreed that certain scriptures were authoritative, chiefly the Torah of Moses, but also the prophets and probably the psalms. This is the presupposition of 4QMMT, which appeals to a leader of Israel, probably a High Priest, on disputed matters of interpretation. There is some reason to believe that the sectarians of the Scrolls regarded additional texts, such as *Jubilees*, as authoritative.[77]

---

[76] Lange, "From Literature to Scripture," 98.

[77] See James C. VanderKam, "Questions of Canon Viewed Through the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 91–109 (107). VanderKam notes that fourteen copies of *Jubilees* have been identified among the Scrolls and that it is quoted once as an authority, but also that its views are opposed in some instances.

I am not aware that we have any reason to think that the Pharisees, or the Hasmoneans, for that matter, would have accepted an argument based on *Jubilees* as authoritative. But at least there was a common corpus of authoritative scriptures, even if the boundaries and the text of these scriptures was still fluid.

But the fact that one could appeal to common scriptures is no guarantee that agreement, or even meaningful dialogue was possible. We do not have a response to the overture of 4QMMT, but according to 4QpPs[a] fragments 1–10, col. 4:8–9, the Wicked Priest sought to murder the Teacher "and the Torah which he sent to him." Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell made the attractive proposal that the document in question is none other than the text we know as 4QMMT,[78] and the proposal has been taken up by such diverse scholars as Michael Wise and Hanan Eshel.[79] If this is correct, then it would seem that the High Priest was not impressed by the fact that the author of MMT revered the same scriptures as his opponents. Tom Stoppard remarked forty years ago, in his play *Jumpers*, that in an election it is not the voting that matters, but the counting. Similarly in a halakic dispute, the decisive factor was not the Scripture that was cited, but the way it was interpreted.

Conclusion

The Dead Sea Scrolls provide some of our earliest examples of explicit interpretation of authoritative scriptures. In the process, they shed some interesting light on the workings of tradition. On the one hand, the scriptures seem to provide a recognized anchor in the past, and to provide a measuring stick (canon?) of fidelity. On the other hand, the claim of revealed interpretation quite openly breaks with the traditions of the recent past, and provides a license for the invention of new tradition in the name of revelation and interpretation. In fact, tradition

[78] Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V.*, 175.

[79] Michael O. Wise, *The First Messiah* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999), 65–8; Hanan Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein; SBL Symposium Series 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1996), 53–65; idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 46–7.

is never a matter of simply passing on a *traditum*. While it provides continuity with the past in various ways, not least in the language it provides, it also gives us something upon which we can operate, which we can adapt, criticize, and change,[80] even while maintaining the illusion of stability and the assurance it provides.

[80] Cf. Popper, above, n. 4.

MOSES TRUMPING MOSES: MAKING THE BOOK OF *JUBILEES*

James C. VanderKam
University of Notre Dame

The Book of *Jubilees* should be a helpful example of the way in which an author could produce a book in the Second Temple period. One reason is that the writer attached an introduction to his work—an introduction that is explicit about fundamental aspects of the book and that, wonder of wonders, has survived to our day. It would have been extraordinarily helpful had other ancient writers been so informative about what they were doing. In his introduction to the body of the composition, he offers details about the major components of the book and about the purpose it was to serve, and from those data we are able to infer something of the way in which he went about his labors.

In this paper I will first sketch the contents of the introduction to *Jubilees* and will then address two issues: the problem the author faced and the ways in which he handled it.

The Introduction

The introduction to the Book of *Jubilees* consists of the short Prologue and ch. 1. Both are attested in the fragments of 4Q216; as a result, both were parts of the book as far back as we can trace the text (late second century B.C.E.).[1] These stand before the long retelling of the scriptural story from creation to Sinai found in chs. 2–50. The Prologue and 1:1–4 inform the reader that the scroll he has picked up contains revelations given to Moses at Mt. Sinai. A close reading of the text shows that the author adheres to the wording of Exod 24:12–18 for the setting of the book, that is, the material in *Jubilees* was revealed to Moses

[1] For 4Q216 and an analysis of the script in which it is copied, see James C. VanderKam and Józef T. Milik, "4QJubilees[a]," in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. J. C. VanderKam; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 1–22. Columns 1, 2, and 4 preserve Hebrew text from the Prologue and ch. 1.

during his first forty-day stay on the mountain. For whatever reason (see below), he does not employ Exodus's wording for Moses's second forty-day period at the summit.

Second, he dates the revelation to the day after the making of the covenant—"[d]uring the first year of the Israelites' exodus from Egypt, in the third month—on the sixteenth of this month…" (1:1).[2] The disclosures to Moses took place in the warm afterglow of that great event, an event that occurred on the festival of weeks (3/15), the holiday of the covenant and covenant renewals in *Jubilees*. Apparently we are to imagine that the revelations continued over the forty days mentioned in Exod 24:18 // *Jub.* 1:4, although in the sequel the text makes no reference to the passing of days or weeks during the disclosures.

Third, the writer supplies several summaries of what his book contains. The Prologue begins with one of them: "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.…" Events and chronological units are prominent in this opening sentence, and here we meet the terms *law* and *testimony* for the first time. The second summary comes in 1:4 where some of the same terms recur: "Moses remained on the mountain for 40 days and 40 nights while the Lord showed him what (had happened) beforehand as well as what was to come. He related to him the divisions of the times—of the law and of the testimony." *Jubilees* 1:5–25 reproduces a conversation in which God predicts Israel's apostasy from the terms of the covenant just concluded and Moses intercedes. Once the exchange runs its course, the Lord addresses an order to Moses: "Now you write all these words which I tell you on this mountain: what is first and what is last and what is to come during all the divisions of time which are in the law and which are in the testimony and in the weeks of their jubilees until eternity—until the time when I descend and live with them throughout all the ages of eternity" (1:26). Finally, the Angel of the Presence, the immediate revealer in almost the entire book, "took the tablets (which told) of the divisions of the years from the time the law and the testimony were created—for the weeks of their jubilees, year by year

[2] Translations, with a few modifications, are from James VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 587–88/ Scriptores Aethiopici 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), vol. 2. Citations of the Ethiopic text are from vol. 1.

in their full number, and their jubilees from [the time of the creation until][3] the time of the new creation…" (1:29; see also v. 27).

In sum, the Angel of the Presence will disclose to Moses on Mt. Sinai a comprehensive history, from first to second creation, with chronological divisions for the time of the law and testimony. Especially the last two terms—law and testimony—demand clarification (see below).

The Problem

The author, writing at some point around the middle of the second century B.C.E., sets before the reader a bold claim: his book contains information revealed to Moses centuries before—at Mt. Sinai no less. In a sense one could say that this was no shocking assertion since *Jubilees* rewrites Genesis and the first half of Exodus, and by the time it was written down it may have been generally accepted that Moses had written that history as God revealed it to him. But *Jubilees* is claiming more—that Moses had received at Sinai some material other than what one now finds in Genesis 1–Exodus 24 and that one could access the other material in the present book, in fact, that Moses had written his book at angelic dictation. Why should anyone believe that? How could this second-century re-writer of Genesis-Exodus claim for himself or convince his contemporaries that his book was anything other than a much later rehashing of the familiar scriptural stories? Why should anyone think *Jubilees* expresses more than one smart person's possibly mistaken opinion about what God revealed at Sinai?

A central part of the problem was that the Torah already existed in written form (even the most radical of Pentateuchal source critics would agree about this) and held a prominent, apparently authoritative position at the time. It described the revelations to Moses at Sinai and contained a record of them—both the history and the laws. So it was impossible to pretend that the Pentateuch did not exist when everyone knew it did and copies were available. Our writer could not get away with claiming that *Jubilees* was the only recorded version of the Sinaitic revelations. He could not even tell others that the Pentateuch just would not do, whereas *Jubilees* was the authoritative record

[3] For the textual issue here, see VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:6–7.

of the revelation. And, as it turns out, that is not what he had in mind. He neither ignored the Pentateuch nor tried to replace it. Rather, he worked with it and with the other traditional literature to convey the truth about them as he understood it.

The writer had to acknowledge the existence of the Torah but also to show that God had made known to Moses more than what one reads in Genesis-Exodus or even Genesis-Deuteronomy. He makes it clear that he does acknowledge the existence of what he calls *the law* and recognizes that it was revealed. He certainly does not denigrate it. If we were to look at the situation historically, we could say that differences in interpreting the Pentateuch had arisen by his time and that the author wanted to defend his own reading as the correct one. But he wished to find a way to package his case more forcefully than that, presumably within the limits of what was acceptable in his society. How did he accomplish his goal?

Handling the Problem

In a sense, the procedure of the author was an exegetical one: he worked out his method and came to his conclusions on the basis of his reading of scriptural texts. As I reconstruct the steps of his argument—as I try to think his thoughts after him—it works this way.

a. Bonus Revelations at Sinai:

Exodus and other older literature suggested that Moses received more from God at Sinai than the law associated with his name. This may in fact have been uncontroversial at the time, as a number of ancient writers made related claims, although the evidence is later than the period when *Jubilees* appeared.[4]

The hints in the biblical text that God revealed more at Sinai are contextual and terminological. In fact, it is no simple task to decipher from the scriptural references exactly what God or Moses is supposed to have written at Sinai. Of the first set of tablets Exod 24:12 says they contained "the law and the commandment" or they are the two stone

[4] See, for example, the texts cited by James Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1998), 658–63, 698–701.

tablets of the covenant (31:18; 32:15; 34:27, 29; Deut 9:9, 11, 15). In Exodus one learns that the second set of two stone tablets contained the same words as the first pair (34:1; cf. Deut 10:2, 4); of the second pair it is said that God "wrote on the tablets the words of the covenant, the ten commandments [words]" (34:28; Deut 4:13; cf. 5:22; 10:4). However, there is a long tradition of claiming that more came to Moses in the forty days on Sinai than the brief Ten Commandments. God wrote the Ten Commandments on those two tablets but Moses too wrote something (Exod 34:28).

Exodus pictures God as revealing the Decalogue to the entire nation orally; this was followed by a private revelation of the Covenant Code to Moses (Exod 20:22–23:33) before the ratification rituals in 24:1–8. Only after their completion does Moses ascend the mountain to remain there for forty days. On the summit God wrote for him the Ten Commandments, but he and Moses had much more to discuss as all of Exodus 25–31 (on the tabernacle and its service with a concluding section on the Sabbath [31:12–17]) is placed in this setting. Moreover, passages such as Lev 26:46 ("These are the statutes and ordinances and laws that the LORD established between himself and the people of Israel on Mount Sinai through Moses") and 27:34 ("These are the commandments that the LORD gave to Moses for the people of Israel on Mount Sinai"; see also 7:38) proved that the revelation was far more comprehensive than the Ten Commandments plus Exodus 20–23 and 25–31.[5]

The Bible uses a variety of terms to describe what God revealed to Moses (the list and the references are not exhaustive, merely illustrative):

Two tablets of stone (Exod 24:12; 31:18)/of the covenant (32:15)
Law (Exod 24:12; Neh 9:14)
Laws (Lev 26:46; Neh 9:13)
Commandment (Exod 24:12)
Commandments (Deut 5:31; 6:1; Neh 9:13, 14)
Statutes (Lev 26:46; Deut 5:31; 6:1; Neh 9:13, 14)
Ordinances (Lev 26:46; Deut 5:31; 6:1; Neh 9:13)

What exactly did all of these terms include and signify?

[5] Some of the passages, of course, include the Sinai revelations given after the first forty-day stay on the mountain.

We know that at a later time some of these words were read in a broad sense to encompass far more than what is present in the Bible. Exodus 24:12 and Lev 26:46 were especially conducive to this end.

A much later passage that sums up what could be understood from the various scriptural terms for the revelation to Moses in Exod 24:12 is *b. Ber*. 5a where R. Shimon b. Resh Laqish says: "What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, 'And I will give you the tables of stone, the law and the commandment, which I have written, that you may teach them' (Ex. 24:12)? 'The tables' refer to the Ten Commandments. 'Torah' refers to Scripture. 'Commandment' refers to Mishnah. 'Which I have written' refers to the Prophets and the Writings. 'That you may teach them' refers to the Gemara. This teaches that all of them were given to Moses from Sinai."[6] It is of some interest that Exod 24:12, which seems to refer to written material alone as a basis for teaching, could serve as a scriptural support for tracing the oral law to Sinai. The Scholion to *Megillat Taʿanit* on Tammuz 14 refers to a Sadducean book of decrees and then to one possessed by Boethusians. Against the Boethusians' written compilations of laws the sages say: "Is it not written, 'The law and the commandment which I have written to teach them' (Ex. 24:12)? And it is written, 'And now write for yourself this song and teach it to the children of Israel; put it in their mouths' (Deut. 31:19). 'Teach it to the children of Israel,' this is Scripture, 'Put it in their mouths,' these are the laws (halakhot)."[7]

Similar conclusions could be drawn from Lev 26:46. In *Sifra Beḥuqqotay* 8 one reads: "These are the statutes and ordinances and Torahs [= Lev 26:46]: the statutes: this refers to the exegeses of Scripture. And ordinances: this refers to the laws. And Torahs: this teaches that two Torahs were given to Israel, one in writing, the other oral."[8]

Jubilees does not belong in the tradition that developed the doctrine of the oral law in that it does not claim that the bonus revelation at Sinai (whether in the first forty days or the second) was passed down by word of mouth. Our writer claims it was written—and written by

---

[6] Translation of Jacob Neusner, *The Babylonian Talmud* (22 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005), 1:20 (punctuation changed).

[7] Translation of Lawrence Schiffman, *Texts and Traditions: A Source Reader for the Study of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism* (Hoboken, N.J.: KTAV, 1998), 521.

[8] Translation of Jacob Neusner, *Sifra: An Analytic Translation* (3 vols.; BJS 138–40; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 3:375 (punctuation changed).

Moses. We should now look more closely at specific aspects of his presentation.

b. The Situation:

As we have seen, the writer of *Jubilees* situates the revelatory experience that resulted in his book at Mt. Sinai itself. Moses received the disclosures now recorded in the book during forty-day stay number one on the sacred mountain. What does our writer accomplish by locating them there and what claims is he making for his book by doing so?

1. Moses: For his putative author, the writer of *Jubilees* chose Moses himself, not another of the ancient heroes who were to pursue writing careers long after their time (Adam, Enoch, etc.). By using the name of Moses, he could count on the reader to make important associations and to have certain expectations. Among the associations would be law and covenant, and it would be assumed that Moses was one with whom God talked face to face. *Jubilees* thereby places itself within the trajectory of what Hindy Najman calls Mosaic discourse,[9] though it does so in a distinctive way. By the time *Jubilees* was written, Mosaic discourse had a long history; our author wanted to be a part of it but not as an epigone; he wanted to be the originator of the tradition. He was not seconding Sinai; he was initiating Sinai.

2. The First Stay on Sinai: By placing his revelation during the period envisaged in Exodus 24–32, the writer makes a bold but effective claim. In addition to the aura surrounding Sinai, there are two benefits that came from the move.

First, his revelation is the initial Sinaitic disclosure to Moses, one that happened at the time when the Lord gave the first pair of stone tablets to Moses. Those two tablets, however, were soon to suffer a violent end when Moses smashed them to pieces in Exod 32:19. Thus the field was left clear for the revelation of *Jubilees* as the only product of Moses's first forty-day stay on Sinai—a revelation that survived his furious descent of the mountain. The second set of tablets (Exodus 34) repeated the limited contents of the first but came at least forty days later.

---

[9] *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003). See especially pp. 41–69 for *Jubilees*.

Second, the assertion our author makes regarding timing and location is different from the one made in Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy does not claim to be prior to Sinai, nor perhaps does it boast of being superior to the revelations there.[10] It says that Moses himself presented the second law and did so on the plains of Moab more than thirty-nine years after his first ascent of Sinai (year 40 of the exodus, month 11, day 1; see Deut 1:1–5). There Moses expounded the law; it was not revealed to him.

3. Unimpeachable Transmission: Having Moses as author promised rich benefits for a Jewish text, but the writer of *Jubilees* reached beyond even the reputation of the great man to establish the extraordinary authority of his work. To do this he set up a chain of transmission that no one could fault.[11] The originator of the revelation was God himself. As in Exodus, God speaks directly to Moses in *Jub.* 1:5–26, but to disclose the remaining material in the large book he chose to use means other than face-to-face speech with Moses. From Exodus one could infer that the words written on the tablets by God were flawlessly transmitted, but the tablets seem to have held only a small amount of text, perhaps only the Ten Commandments. Why should one think the other data God told to Moses were reliably passed on? The author of *Jubilees* confronts the question directly.

First, he appeals to the heavenly tablets as the source of the material in *Jubilees* 2–50. In *Jubilees*, these tablets are a written, unchangeable, permanent depository of information under God's control.[12] It is his ultimate data bank, with all of the fixity, accuracy, and authority that the term implies. The celestial tablets should not be confused with the two tablets of stone. The writer carefully distinguishes the tablets of stone, containing law and commandment, from the heavenly tablets that tell of the divisions of all times of the law and testimony and the

---

[10] But see Marc Zvi Brettler ("'Fire, Cloud, and Deep Darkness' [Deuteronomy 5:22]: Deuteronomy's Recasting of Revelation," in *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* [ed. G. J. Brooke, H. Najman and L. T. Stuckenbruck; Themes in Biblical Narrative 12; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008], 15–29) who appeals to passages such as Deut 28:69 (Eng. 29:1) as suggesting the superiority of Deuteronomy's covenant to the one at Horeb, but the passage need not mean or imply that.

[11] See Hindy Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410.

[12] For an analysis of the subject, see Florentino García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frei, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243–60.

events in them. Moses does not take the heavenly tablets down the mountain with him; in fact, he never touches them.[13] As a result, he also does not smash them, nor do they need replacement like the two stone tablets.

Second, God orders an Angel of the Presence to dictate to Moses from the heavenly tablets. The angel therefore reads from the tablets and Moses records what he hears. The angel, a truly privileged figure as his title suggests, is modeled on the angel who goes before Israel's camp in Exod 14:19. He is a character of astonishing authority according to Exodus: for example, he is the one whom the Israelites must obey because the Lord's name is in him (Exod 23:20–22).[14]

As a result, it is difficult to imagine a more secure way in which to transmit information: from God, via the heavenly tablets to the Angel of the Presence who dictates to Moses who writes what the angel reads. There is no danger of contamination in this line of transmission, no worry about corruptions, text-critical problems and the like. The message of *Jubilees* is verbally inerrant.

c. The Components: Law and Testimony

Analyzing the major components that, according to the writer, make up *Jubilees* allows further insight into the way in which he handles the problem his situation forced upon him. The fundamental terms he employs are *law* and *testimony*. Pairing the two words is no accident and points to their scriptural source—Isaiah 8—the only place where the two figure together. A look at the passage will clarify why the author resorted to precisely these nouns.

Isaiah 8, with similar passages in the book, appears to have been a significant textual base for the author of *Jubilees*. The prophetic chapter and the accounts of Moses on Sinai are two scriptural places where the Lord tells a prophet to write and in both the object on which the writing is to appear is mentioned. In Isaiah 8 one meets the verb

---

[13] Ben Zion Wacholder, "Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 196 and throughout the essay (195–211). Cana Werman, "'The תורה and the תעודה' engraved on the Tablets," *DSD* 9 (2002): 77–79.

[14] James VanderKam, "The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees," *DSD* 7 (2000): 378–93.

העיד in v. 2 where the prophet has a document attested by reliable witnesses (עדים). Yet the two instances of תעודה later in the chapter do not appear related to this document which is a public one, not one sealed up. The Lord commands Isaiah: "Bind up the testimony, seal the teaching [= law] among my disciples. I will wait for the Lord, who is hiding his face from the house of Jacob, and I will hope in him." (8:16–17) The sense is that "…the message and instruction indicate a text written on papyrus, wrapped in cloth, and put for safekeeping in a jar or other container."[15] The prophet's message is to be taken out of the public sphere, after it was rejected, and confined to the limited circle of his disciples while the divine anger lasts—while he hides his face. In that way it will be available in written form through that time (with limited circulation) and in the future.

This is the situation that *Jub.* 1:4–8 presupposes. In these verses the Lord reveals his message to Moses and orders him to write it down so that the words may serve a judicial function in the future when the people stray from the Lord's way. The second use of the two terms—in Isa 8:20—seems to have been less central for the writer of *Jubilees*, although he presents them in the order found in v. 20 (they are reversed in v. 16).

The two nouns do not figure together there, but Isa 30:8–11 is another significant scriptural source for the author.[16]

> Go now, write it before them on a tablet, and inscribe it in a book, so that it may be for the time to come as a witness forever. For they are a rebellious people, faithless children, children who will not hear the instruction of the Lord; who say to the seers, "Do not see"; and to the prophets, "Do not prophesy to us what is right; speak to us smooth things, prophesy illusions, leave the way, turn aside from the path, let us hear no more about the Holy One of Israel."

---

[15] Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 243. "Message" and "instruction" are Blenkinsopp's renderings of the two terms under consideration.

[16] For the passages in Isaiah 8 and 30 relating to testimony, see Najman, "The Symbolic Significance of Writing in Ancient Judaism," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (ed. H. Najman and J. H. Newman; JSJSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 149–52. Commentators have regularly noted that Isaiah 8 is the basis for the two words in *Jubilees*. James Kugel thinks that the use of תעודה there gave the author the idea that there was an unknown ancient testimony and that he could present his book as such ("Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and the Hebrew of the Second Temple Period," in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* [ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 168–69).

The passage, one of the sources for the Qumran epithet "seekers of smooth things," again contains a command for the prophet to write and the writing is to be done on a tablet (לוח, as at Sinai). The purpose for reducing the message to writing is so that the recorded words will serve as a witness in the future. The reference to the future is clear enough in Isa 30:8 ("for the time to come" [ליום אחרון]), and the judicial function is explicit if one reads "a witness forever" with NRSV (minor revocalizing is required).[17] Their failure to heed the divine Torah is noted in v. 9.

1. Law: As experts have surmised, where the Geʿez *ḥegg* occurs, the Hebrew original was תורה (see 4Q216 II 13; VII 17). The term can refer to the Pentateuch (see 1:12; 23:16, 19, 26 for examples) in the author's usage. Naturally, he also employs it when referring to specific rulings (e.g., 2:29, 33, and frequently elsewhere). So, there is no doubt that he acknowledges the existence and importance of the Pentateuch in his book (however we are to imagine that, given the revelatory situation he pictures). Perhaps the most important passages for our purposes are the ones in which he unmistakably refers to the law and distinguishes the revelation in *Jubilees* from it.

One such passage is *Jub.* 6:22. In it, the angel is informing Moses about the festival of weeks, and he tells him that he has written the legislation about it in "the book of the first law": "For I have written (this) in the book of the first law in which I wrote for you that you should celebrate it at each of its times one day in a year. I have told you about its sacrifice so that the Israelites may continue to remember and celebrate it throughout their generations during this month—one day each year." The festival of weeks is never mentioned in the Hebrew Bible outside the Pentateuch. In the Torah it figures in each of the festival lists (Exod 23:16; 34:22; Lev 23:15–21; Num 28:26–31; and Deut 16:9–12), with its name appearing in all of them except Exod 23:16 and the sacrifices detailed in the sections in Leviticus and Numbers. According to *Jub.* 6:22 the Angel of the Presence says that he is, in some sense, the author of the legislation for the holiday found in Leviticus 23 and Numbers 28. The angel distinguishes the written source—to which he can refer—from his current revelation to Moses recorded in *Jubilees* 6.

---

[17] For the common revocalization, see Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39*, N.B. 415. It is supported by a number of Greek representatives and by the targum to the passage.

Jubilees 30:12 entails a similar conclusion but this time for a narrative portion of the Torah. *Jubilees* 30 builds upon Genesis 34, and the writer uses the information in it as a springboard for launching his invective against intermarriage between Israelites and people from other nations and to insure that his readers will entertain no wayward thoughts about the matter. As scholars have commented, the author very quickly summarizes the longer story in Genesis: *Jub.* 30:2–4 abbreviates the material in Gen 34:1–29. He spends far more time responding in 30:5–23 to the terrible possibility of mass intermarriages between the Shechemites and Jacob's family—a possibility raised by the negotiations in Gen 34:8–24 (the writer does not reproduce the negotiations but obviously knew of them, judging by his response).

As the angel addresses Moses on the subject, he says: "For this reason I have written for you in the words of the law everything that the Shechemites did to Dinah and how Jacob's sons said: 'We will not give our daughter to a man who has a foreskin because for us that would be a disgraceful thing'." The first part of what he claims to have written embraces everything the people of Shechem did to Dinah and the last part of what he says he wrote in "the words of the law" is a citation of Gen 34:14:

MT: לא נוכל לעשות הדבר הזה לתת את אחתנו לאיש אשר לו ערלה כי חרפה הוא לנו
EJ: 'i-nehub walattana la-sab' za-bo qwelfata 'esma ṣe'lat we'etu lana
LJ: non dabimus filiam nostram homini qui habet praeputium obprobrium enim est nobis.

The only unexpected term is *Jubilees'* reference to Dinah as *daughter*, though it is attested both by the Ethiopic and the earlier Latin translation.[18] The passage unmistakably identifies the verse in Genesis 34 as being included in the material the angel wrote. This is helpful information not only for identifying what the author of *Jubilees* understands by "the words of the law"—it includes narrative—but also for discerning the way in which he uses that law. For him in this instance, Genesis 34 serves as a kind of reference work to which he can direct the reader for more information than he here conveys. All of the deeds

[18] The term probably arises from the legal passage that lies behind the statement. See especially Lev 19:29 (regarding a daughter) and note also Lev 18:21; 20:1–5 (giving a child to Molech). I thank my colleague Tzvi Novick for this and other helpful suggestions regarding this essay.

of the Shechemites can be read there, unlike in *Jubilees*. The angel in *Jubilees* did not see fit to reproduce all of that painful but familiar narrative so he simply pointed the reader to the source, Genesis 34, where more detail could be found. In so doing, he casts no aspersion on Genesis for including such disgusting stories; it is a fuller (on this point, at least), completely reliable source of information. By referring the reader to Genesis 34, the author of *Jubilees* opens up more space for expounding the points he considered important. Here *Jubilees* does not replace Genesis; it uses and supplements it, adding clarification and reinforcing lessons to be learned from it.

Jubilees 30:21 raises a question about this way of analyzing the data. In it the angel tells Moses, after dealing at length with issues of marriage and purity: "I have written this entire message for you and have ordered you to tell the Israelites not to sin or transgress the statutes or violate the covenant which was established for them so that they should perform it and be recorded as friends." Here the material the angel declares he has written does not sound as if it is to be found in Genesis 34. It may be that we have in this verse another instance of the phenomenon that the Ethiopic text of *Jubilees* reflects the failure of the Greek translator to distinguish between *qal* and *hiphil* forms of the verb "to write." In this instance, the original text may well have said: "I have dictated this entire message to you…." The same is likely the case in *Jub.* 50:6, 13.[19]

So the author of *Jubilees* not only rewrites Genesis 1–Exodus 24; he also supplements it and offers the proper interpretation of it, spelling out the great lessons to be derived from it.

2. Testimony: One of the most intriguing words in *Jubilees* is *testimony*. Discerning what the writer means by it would be most helpful for grasping what he aims to do in the book. We now know that, unlike what earlier scholars had thought, the Hebrew term used in *Jubilees* is תעודה, not עדות.[20] As the parallel in Isaiah 8 suggests, the testimony is a written work that serves the kind of function it does in

[19] See James VanderKam, "The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees," *JSS* 26 (1981): 214–17.

[20] August Dillmann himself, the great authority on the Ge'ez language and the first editor and translator of Ethiopic *Jubilees*, suggested עדות and was, naturally, followed by others. See his *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae* (repr., Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970 [original 1865]), 338. Passages such as Exod 31:18; 32:15; 34:29 (the tablets of testimony) could be taken as support for this choice. The first scholar to suggest the correct Hebrew term was André Caquot ("'Loi' et 'Témoignage' dans le livre des Jubilés,"

the prophetic text—to prove and perhaps to warn. It documents a case by means of the information recorded in it.

The usages may be arranged under several headings, while some can be set aside as not central to the topic at hand. The ones not further considered here are the two occurrences in *Jub.* 29:8// Gen 31:47: in *Jubilees* the etymology of the place name *Gilead* is twice expressed—as "a mound as a testimony" and "the mound of testimony." The name may be related to the oath, sworn by Jacob and Laban, "that neither would commit an offense against the other on the mountain of Gilead with bad intentions" (29:7). The mound serves a warning function here, as the word *testimony* suggests elsewhere in the book.

More central to the present concerns are the other instances of *testimony* in *Jubilees*. A first feature to note about them is the vocabulary used with the word (some passages are included in more that one category).

Law and testimony together (Prologue; 1:4, 26, 29; 2:24, 33; 3:14): The usage is confined to the first parts of the book; they never figure together after 3:14. It is significant that they feature as paired terms in the Prologue and three times in the first chapter—the chapter that sets the stage for the remainder of the book. That they are a fixed pair also suggests their close relationship with each other.

Testimony and the heavenly tablets (1:29; 16:28; 23:32; 30:19; 31:32 [cf. 4:30: the testimony of heaven]): Testimony is something found recorded on the heavenly tablets, even if it does not exhaust their contents (1:29, where law and testimony are mentioned). Abraham celebrated the festival of tabernacles at its correct time "in accord with the testimony of the heavenly tablets." Information about events (23:32) and about individuals also may be found on them (30:19 [Levi]; 31:32 [Levi and Judah]).

The testimony is written: To express the idea that the testimony is placed on the heavenly tablets the author either utilizes the simple verb *write* (3:14; 4:18, 19 although a different testimony is meant; 6:12; 23:32) or he resorts to the verb *enter* (23:32; cf. 30:19; 31:32; 32:29). The form used for this entering is yāʿarregu = they cause to go up. The expression seems related to the use in Biblical Hebrew of עלה for placing material in a written record (see 2 Chr 20:34 [a *hophal* form is

---

in *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Maxime Rodinson par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis* [ed. C. Robin; Paris: Geuthner, 1985], 141–45).

used]). Its written character and placement on heavenly tablets ensure the durability of the witness offered.

In addition to the vocabulary found with *testimony*, one should examine the material contained in the testimony. Again, different types can be distinguished:

a. Chronology and Calendar: Many of the passages indicate that the testimony includes information about both the chronological system that undergirds the retelling of scriptural history and the calendar that arranges the sacred festivals.[21]

As for the chronological system, there are several places where one learns that the testimony incorporates many events. The Prologue indicates as much by specifying "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…." Or, 1:4, after mentioning that the Lord showed Moses what had happened and would take place, says that he "related to him the divisions of the times—of the law and of the testimony." Similar language figures in 1:26 and 29 where the period covered is from the first to the second or new creation. Directly after the eschatological prediction in *Jubilees* 23, the Angel of the Presence orders Moses to "write down these words because this is how it is written and entered in the testimony of the heavenly tablets for the history of eternity." Finally, according to 4:30 the equivalence of one day and one thousand years is found in the testimony of heaven (information suggested in Ps 90:4). The coverage appears to be extraordinarily comprehensive.

The festival calendar is likewise associated with the term *testimony*. The point becomes clear in ch. 6, the most extended statement about the subject of the holidays and the year. In 6:23 the angel tells Moses:

---

[21] George Brooke, "Exegetical Strategies in *Jubilees* 1–2: New Light from 4QJubilees[a]," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 52; Kugel, "Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," 168; Werman, "'The תורה and the תעודה' Engraved on the Tablets," 84–85 ("the preordained march of history"); and Martha Himmelfarb, "Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets: The Claim to Authority in the *Book of Jubilees*," in *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft* (ed. B. G. Wright; Scholars Press Homage Series 24; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 22–28. Michel Testuz had earlier offered an unusual variation regarding the chronological and calendrical contents of the testimony: for him testimony designated the period from the creation to the time of Moses, the exodus, and Sinai; it was followed by the era of the law, after which there would be a messianic age (*Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* [Geneva: Droz and Paris: Minard, 1968], 8, 168–74).

"On the first of the first month, the first of the fourth month, the first of the seventh month, and the first of the tenth month are memorial days and days of the seasons. They are written down and ordained at the four divisions of the year as an eternal testimony." The four memorial days that mark off the seasons are recorded and ordained and apparently serve the purpose of offering testimony. The rhetoric of being recorded and ordained points to the heavenly tablets, although the passage does not claim this information is written in a testimony. The year of 364 days is said to be associated with the testimony: if the Israelites adhere strictly to this calendar, the year and hence the festivals will take place at the proper times, then "everything will happen in harmony with their testimony." Here testimony seems to be the legislation for how the year is arranged and how the festivals have stipulated times—the only times when they may be celebrated. In fact, a festival day is, according to 6:37, a day of testimony, that is, a day designated for that holiday. In 32:29 the eighth day of Tabernacles is said to be entered in the tablets as an eternal testimony.

b. Laws: Testimony is also associated with individual laws.[22] The section regarding the Sabbath has two references to testimony. In 2:24, following legislation for the seventh day and the parallel between Jacob and the Sabbath, the angel asserts: "It was granted to these that for all times they should be the blessed and holy ones of the testimony and of the first law, as it was sanctified and blessed on the seventh day." It appears that "these" points to the Sabbath and Jacob, both of which are blessed and holy. The association between Sabbath law and testimony is made even more explicit in 2:33: "This law and testimony were given to the Israelites as an eternal law throughout their history."

A second law or set of laws tied with the testimony is the prohibition of consuming blood. "This testimony has been written regarding you to keep it for all times so that you may not at any time eat any

[22] Menahem Kister, "Two Formulae in the Book of Jubilees," *Tarbiz* 70 (2001): 294–95 (Hebrew). Kister, however, thinks that in the Second Temple period the term took on the meaning of law, command—something that is not attested for תעודה as nearly as I can tell. Michael Segal (*The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* [JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 282–313) makes a suggestion similar to the one Kister proposed and concludes that testimony refers to laws of the covenant—an idea that does not seem very likely to me. Caquot had argued that testimony designated a complement to the law of Moses found in Essene legislation ("'Loi' et 'Témoignage' dans le livre des Jubilés," 141–45).

blood of animals or birds throughout all the days of the earth. (As for) the person who has eaten the blood of an animal, of cattle, or of birds during all the days of the earth—he and his descendants will be uprooted from the earth."

c. Testifying: As the meaning of the term entails, the testimony functions to give evidence regarding something and to warn. The point comes to expression at a very early juncture in the book when God himself, having predicted Israel's apostasy, says to Moses: "Now you write this entire message which I am telling you today, because I know their defiance and their stubbornness (even) before I bring them into the land which I promised by oath to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: 'To your posterity I will give the land which flows with milk and honey'. When they eat and are full, they will turn to other gods—to ones which will not save them from any of their afflictions. Then the testimony is to correspond with this testimony" (1:7–8). Much of the wording in these verses comes from Deuteronomy 30–31, while the passage also echoes the situation in Isaiah 8. The permanently inscribed message that Moses writes will have the power to convict Israel in the future when they fall away from the covenant.

The writer understands the writings of Enoch to fall into the same category. Among his many firsts, Enoch was the pioneer author of a testimony. It is possible, given the wording of the section, that his testimony was understood to encompass both chronological/calendrical data and the events of all history. He wrote a testimony that included all of this material "and placed it upon the earth against all mankind and for their history" (4:19). As a matter of historical fact, the writings of Enoch were sources for the author of *Jubilees*, but in the rhetoric of the book itself they are not associated with the heavenly tablets—they were placed on the earth to be a testimony—and are thus distinct from *Jubilees*.

Enoch's role in this regard receives further elaboration in 10:17. Here again his work of recording deeds of people comes to expression: "(he [Noah]) who lived longer on the earth than (other) people except Enoch because of his righteousness in which he was perfect ([i.e.] in his righteousness): because Enoch's work was something created as a testimony for the generations of eternity so that he should report all deeds throughout generation after generation on the day of judgment." Enoch's ongoing labors, as he lived beyond his removal from the earth, allowed him to report all that humans did (see 4:23–24). It

could be that the record of future deeds in 23:32 gestures in the same direction, while Levi's characteristics of blessing and justice serve as a testimony in the heavenly tablets (cf. 31:32).

If one takes into account everything *Jubilees* says about the testimony, it appears that those scholars who identify *Jubilees* itself, less the introductory material in the Prologue and ch. 1, as the testimony are correct, though the book may not exhaust all that is present in the written testimony on the heavenly tablets.[23] There is no passage with which this conclusion conflicts, and it is compatible with each of them. The testimony overlaps extensively with Genesis 1–Exodus 24 (plus the laws) but is not coextensive with that segment of scripture, as those passages distinguishing the first law from it show. The testimony, it seems to me, embodies for the author what the scriptural material really means, what it actually intended to convey and that some have misunderstood with tragic consequences for the people of the covenant. The real meaning of Israel's sacred history and of how the creation is organized was revealed to Moses at Sinai when he received the other disclosures, though *Jubilees* enjoys a certain temporal precedent in that it is the only surviving product of Moses' first forty-day visit to the mountaintop. That testimony, recorded first on the heavenly tablets and now available in *Jubilees*, will document the justice of God when Israel goes astray from the covenant just concluded.

Success?

While modern readers, who can unravel the writer's procedure to some degree, may be skeptical about his claims to have recorded what the angel revealed to Moses on Mt. Sinai, some ancient readers took a different approach. We do not know in each case how they assessed what looks to us like a clear case of pseudepigraphy—a second-century author putting himself in Moses' place—but some held *Jubilees* in high esteem and used it for different purposes.[24]

---

[23] This is the conclusion of Wacholder, "*Jubilees* as the Super Canon," 195–211; Kugel, "Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," 168–69; and Werman, "'The תורה and the תעודה' Engraved on the Tablets," 77–79, although she also speaks of the law and the testimony as being copied by Moses into *Jubilees* (83–95).

[24] For a short survey of many of the relevant texts, see James VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 143–48.

a. *Jewish readers*

One can make a good case that *Jubilees* exercised influence and even authority for some early readers. A series of texts associated with Qumran document the case. The best-known example is CD XVI 1–4 where parallel statements suggest impressive authority for *Jubilees*:

> …therefore a man shall bind himself by oath to return to the Law of Moses, for in it all things are strictly defined. As for the exact determination of their times to which Israel turns a blind eye, behold it is strictly defined in the *Book of the Divisions of the Times into their Jubilees and Weeks*.[25]

The writer here refers the reader to two sources that contain the decisive word on the matter (he uses מדוקדק for both)—the Torah of Moses and *Jubilees*. The passage is extraordinarily suggestive; one wonders whether the writer of D is alluding to material from two Mosaic texts.

In other cases *Jubilees* could be the source for central teachings or themes in the Qumran texts. For example, its chronology of jubilee periods and weeks of years is well attested in the texts, although Daniel 9 is also a possible base for the system. At least *Jubilees* works it out more comprehensively than Daniel 9 does. Texts such as 4Q265 show what appears to be dependence on *Jubilees* for relating the law of Leviticus 12 to the chronology of the first couple in Eden,[26] and 1Q22 (with 4QDM) closely parallels the wording of *Jub.* 1:9, 14.[27]

Though *Jubilees* plays no role in Rabbinic literature, there is some indication that it survived in Jewish circles to the Middle Ages when it influenced a few midrashic texts. This usage—exegetical supplementation of the scriptural text—parallels the one attested in Christian works.

---

[25] Translation of Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1997), 137. Along with virtually all readers of *Jubilees*, I think the passage refers to *Jubilees* by its Hebrew title. Devorah Dimant has argued the contrary case, but offers no convincing evidence that the composition is anything but *Jubilees*. See "Two 'Scientific' Fictions: The So-Called *Book of Noah* and the Alleged Quotation of *Jubilees* in CD 16:3–4," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. P. Flint, E. Tov, and J. VanderKam; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 242–48.

[26] See Joseph Baumgarten, "Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (ed. G. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 3–10; Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 47–58.

[27] For the overlaps between the texts, see Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "A Cave 4 Fragment of Divre Mosheh (4QDM) and the Text of 1Q22 1:7–10 and *Jubilees* 1:9, 14," *DSD* 12 (2005): 303–12.

b. *Christian readers*

Jubilees was a resource for some Christian commentators on Genesis-Exodus and achieved authoritative status in one Christian community. The way in which it was primarily used, it seems, was as a supplement to fill in the gaps left by the text of Genesis-Exodus. The use of the text for this purpose can be traced from Epiphanius through the Byzantine chronographers.

Jubilees holds a regular place in canon lists for the Bible of the Abyssinian Church and was regularly copied on manuscripts containing the Pentateuch.

The usages of *Jubilees* in some Jewish and Christian contexts suggest that the writer achieved a measure of success in his attempt to set forth a genuinely Mosaic text, to give an inspired supplement to aid readers of Genesis-Exodus.

SOME TRANSLATION AND COPYING MISTAKES FROM THE ORIGINAL HEBREW OF THE *TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS*

James L. Kugel
Bar Ilan University

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs has a complicated history of composition. Some of this history is still in dispute, so I will begin by setting out briefly my own understanding of how this book came to be. I believe that the *Testaments* started off as a Hebrew composition sometime in the late second or early first century B.C.E. It contained the spiritual last will and testament of each of Jacob's twelve sons. A Hebrew fragment of this early form of the text has survived in the Qumran manuscripts, 4Q215 *Testament of Naphtali.* The book as a whole was apparently written by a supporter of the Hasmonean rulers of Judea, a fact evidenced in the frequent, laudatory references to Levi, the traditional ancestor of the Levitical Hasmoneans. This was the book's earliest form. At some later point, a copyist or editor, someone who apparently felt that the Hasmoneans' claim to hereditary kingship was unjustified, inserted here and there in these pro-Levi passages further references to the tribe of Judah, asserting that *it* was the proper tribe of kingship. These insertions are often clumsy and inconsistent (see, for example, *T. Reu.* 6:5–12); in them one can still see traces of the original author's blunt command to "obey Levi" in all things, which was then modified by this later editor to "obey Levi and Judah" together (*T. Sim.* 5:4–6, *T. Iss.* 5:7–8; *T. Dan.* 5:4, etc.). It was not that this editor was *anti*-Levitical; he merely felt that the tribe of Judah—and the family of David from within it—had been chosen by God for kingship in Israel (Gen 49:10, 2 Sam 7:8–16, etc.), and that the Levites ought therefore in principle to devote themselves to priestly things (*T. Jud.* 21:1–6). In this form the *Testaments* circulated in Hebrew in the first century B.C.E and beyond.

Sometime later, perhaps as early as the turn of the era, this already composite text was translated into Greek. But the Greek translation was anything but literal; its author often rewrote freely, sometimes

even inserting wholly new passages, many of them repeating the basic doctrines of Stoic philosophy (for example, *T. Reu.* 2:3–3:1). At a still later date, this Greek text acquired a number of specifically Christian interpolations (*T. Reu.* 6:8, *T. Sim.* 6:5, 6; 7:1, 2, etc.). There are thus, in my view, four layers to our present Greek *Testaments*, which survives in a number of medieval manuscripts and is represented as well in apparently secondary translations from Greek into Armenian, Slavonic, and other languages.[1]

The above reconstruction is hardly the only that has been put forward, however. Strikingly different is that of the *Testaments* scholar Marinus De Jonge, who for the past half-century or so has maintained that this book was a de novo Christian composition originally written in Greek in the second century C.E.[2] However, De Jonge also holds that this Christian author did not start from scratch; he was a "collector" who incorporated earlier, Hebrew material into his work. In effect, then, these two scenarios are less different than they might first appear: both share the idea that our current Greek text contains at least some material translated from Hebrew.

It is hardly my intention here to compare the merits of these competing views. Rather, what I wish to do is to focus on a few copying and translation errors that, according to either scenario, bear witness to the earlier, Hebrew stage of the *Testaments*. Such mistakes are far more numerous than the brief sampling given here; in fact, I have found similar errors in each of the twelve Greek testaments. In the following, however, I would like to focus on a few of these, both because they are interesting in their own right and because they may shed some light on the Greek translator. I will treat them in their order of appearance:

---

[1] This reconstruction is hardly my own alone, but derives from the work of many earlier scholars. For a history ofthat scholarship, see H. Donald Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), and particularly with regard to the second stage of the book's composition, 34–37.

[2] De Jonge has modified his views in some respects from time to time, though the basic claim of Christian authorship remains central to his understanding. See H. Donald Hollander and Marinus De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1985).

The House in Bethlehem

In recounting his sin with his father's concubine Bilhah, Reuben reports:

> For while Jacob our father had gone off to [visit] his father Isaac, when we were in Eder,[3] near to Ephrata, house of Bethlehem, Bilhah got drunk and lay down and fell asleep uncovered in the bedroom. (*T. Reu.* 3:13)

The phrase "near to Ephrata, house of Bethlehem" is somewhat strange. This is the reading (ms. b) favored by De Jonge in his critical edition;[4] other manuscripts read "near to Ephrata in Bethlehem," or "near to Ephrata, to Bethlehem"—both of these, in my opinion, attempt to improve on the *difficilior lectio.* But where did the "house" in ms. b come from? The toponym "Bethlehem" appears numerous times in the Hebrew Bible, but no particular "house" is ever associated with it—and Jacob and his family are certainly never said to reside in such a house. The reference seems, in fact, to derive from the report of Rachel's death just before the incident with Reuben and Bilhah; there, in Gen 35:19, Rachel is said to be buried "on the road to Ephrath—that is, Bethlehem."

It seems clear that the translator (or perhaps an earlier copyist of the Hebrew *Testaments*) copied the word Ephrata but then—perhaps because it came at the end of a line—mistook the first syllable of Bethlehem for the word for "house" (Hebrew *bayit*), and so wrote *house* in Greek (*oikou*). When his eyes saw the continuation of the Hebrew text, he realized his error and wrote *Bethlehem,* but he failed to erase "house." The other manuscript copyists must have detected this error and changed the text to "near to Ephrata in Bethlehem," or "near to Ephrata, to Bethlehem" in order to have it make better sense. But ms. b, the *difficilior lectio*, gives us a brief glimpse of the original Hebrew text being mistranslated or miscopied.

---

[3] Greek "Gader"—this is [Migdal] 'Eder, mentioned in the MT Gen 35:21, just before the Reuben-Bilhah incident. In the Septuagint version, Gader is mentioned instead in 35:16, just before the account of Rachel's death.

[4] Marinus De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978).

Answers Up to Heaven

The *Testament of Levi* reports on Levi's heavenly ascent, during which an angel explains to him the makeup of heaven, which consists of various levels:

> In it [i.e., the highest heaven], next [in rank] to Him, are the angels of the Lord's Presence, who serve and make atonement before the Lord for all the unwitting sins of the righteous, offering to the Lord a sweet savor, a reasonable and bloodless sacrifice. And in the lower heaven are the angels who carry the answers to the angels of the Lord's Presence. And in the one next to these are thrones and dominions, in which praises are always offered to God. (*T. Levi* 3:5–7)

The assertion that lower angels "carry the answers to the angels of the Lord's Presence" is particularly odd. In his commentary on the *Testaments*, R. H. Charles rightly observed that this reference to "answers" (Greek *apokriseis*, suggesting Hebrew *tešubot*) makes no sense here. From the overall context it would seem that these lower angels are not permitted direct access to God, so they carry *something* to those higher angels, the angels of the Presence, who then are allowed to bring that *something* to God directly. But what could it be?

Odd as it might seem at first, the "something" appears to be the repentance (*tešubah*) of sinners. Rabbinic writings preserve a tradition that human repentance reaches the heavenly throne itself: "Said R. Levi: Great is repentance, which reaches to the Heavenly Throne, as it is said, 'Repent, O Israel, all the way to the Lord your God' [a creative interpretation of Hosea 14:2]" (b. *Yoma* 86a). But still more apposite is the saying attributed to R. Yehudah ha-Nasi, of the last generation of *tanna'im*: "Said [R. Yehudah ha-Nasi], our holy teacher: Great is the power of repentance, for as soon as a person considers repentance in his heart, at once it [the repentance] rises upward—not for ten miles and not for twenty and not for a hundred, but for a journey of five hundred years—and not to the first heaven but to the second; and not [merely] *to* the second heaven, but [from there] it [gets to] stand before the Heavenly Throne; it is thus that Hosea says, 'Repent, O Israel, all the way to the Lord your God'" (*Pesiqta Rabbati* 44 [Friedmann ed. p. 185]).

With regard to this brief passage in the *Testament of Levi*, it is further to be noted how appropriate it is for these lower angels to be transporting the repentance of sinners to the angels of the Lord's Pres-

ence, since this passage specifically describes the latter as those "who serve and make atonement before the Lord for all the unwitting sins of the righteous."

Pregnant Sheep and Eblae

Later in the same testament, Levi explains why it was proper that the male inhabitants of Shechem be killed (as recounted in Genesis 34). They were guilty not only of the rape of Dinah, but of earlier crimes:

> And they persecuted our ancestor Abraham when he was a stranger [in Canaan], and they ill-treated his flocks when they were pregnant, and Eblae, his home-born one, they grievously tormented. (*T. Levi* 6:9)

The assertion that "they" (that is, the "Canaanites and Perizzites" whose numbers, according to Gen 34:30, apparently included the people of Shechem) persecuted Abraham "when he was a stranger" should perhaps be understood in the Hebrew sense of "*although* he was a stranger" and thus deserving of decent treatment; this was a particularly grave offense. The reference is not clear, but perhaps this alludes to Abraham's struggle to buy a burial plot for Sarah in Genesis 23, since there Abraham specifically notes, "I am a resident alien among you" (Gen 23:4). The further specification that they had ill-treated his flocks derives from Gen 13:7; the author interprets the casual mention that "the Canaanites and the Perizzites were then dwelling in the land" as nothing casual at all. Rather he understands it as implying that it was *they* who were responsible for the quarreling between Abraham's herdsmen and Lot's mentioned in the same verse. But what of the tantalizing detail that they had ill-treated Abraham's flocks when they were pregnant? This seems to be a simple mistake: The Hebrew text said that they ill-treated the flocks *when they had grown numerous* (Hebrew *nitrabbu*). This was essentially a restatement of Gen 13:5: "Lot, who went with Abram, also had flocks and herds and tents, so that the land did not permit them to dwell together, for their possessions *had become so great* that they could not stay together." But the verb *nitrabbu* was mistaken for, or miscopied as, *nit'abberu* (became pregnant). As for "Eblae," this name is quite unknown; it appears in different manuscripts of the *Testaments* as Ieblae, Iebal, Geblaen, Ieblaen, and so forth—none of them a recognizable name. It seems likely that the original Hebrew read simply "his servant," *'abdo*, which was

immediately glossed as *yelid beito*, "his home-born one." It was this apparently double reference that allowed the first element, *'abdo*, to be mistaken for a proper name, 'Ablo," which eventually morphed into Eblae and so forth.

The Friends of a Scholar

In the *Testament of Levi*, the author later describes the benefits that derive from devotion to the law (Torah):

> And now, my children, I command you: Fear the Lord and walk in simplicity according to His Torah. And teach your children to read as well, so that they may have understanding throughout their lives by reading God's Torah unceasingly. Everyone who knows God's Torah will be honored, and wherever he may wander, he will not be a foreigner. He will gain many friends—beyond [those of] his parents, and many men will desire to serve him and to hear the Torah from his mouth. (*T. Levi* 13:1–4)

The sticking point here is the claim that this Torah-scholar "will gain many friends—beyond [those of] his parents." For this to be true, one would have to assume that his parents did *not* study the Torah—an odd claim that is certainly not in evidence. In addition, however, one might wonder why the scholar's *parents*, rather than, say, his contemporaries, his friends, or even his siblings, are the subject of comparison—this makes the sentence seem still stranger.

This passage is actually paralleled by a longer one in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (*ALD*), on which it is ultimately based. There Levi says:

> And now, my sons <teach> reading and writing and teaching <of> wisdom to your children, and may wisdom be eternal glory for you. For he who learns wisdom will (attain) glory through it, but he who despises wisdom will become an object of disdain and scorn. Observe, my children, my brother Joseph [who] taught reading and writing and the teaching of wisdom, for glory and for majesty; and kings <he advised>… [and] do not be lax in the study of wisdom, [and do n]ot le[ave *her paths*]. A man who studies wisdom, all [h]is days are l[ong] and h[is repu]tation grows great. To every la[nd] and country to which he goes, he has a brother and a friend therein. He is [not a]s a stranger therein and not l[ike] a foreigner therein, and not like a scoundr[el] in it […Since all of them will accord] him honor because of it, [si]nce all wish to learn from his wisdom. [His] friends are many and his well-wishers are numerous. And

> they seat him on the seat <of> honor in order to hear his wise words. (*ALD* 13:4–10)[5]

In this passage, despite its greater detail, there is no mention of the sage gaining more friends than his parents, making that aspect of the Greek text even more unlikely. In fact, what happened is fairly obvious. The original Hebrew read *ḥaberim rabbim yiqneh mehorayah*: "he will acquire many friends from [his] teaching." (This basically paralleled the assertion in the ALD that "all will wish to learn from his wisdom.") But a copyist or the Greek translator misread the text and understood the last word in Hebrew as *mehorayw* "than his parents."

Note that the concept of "acquiring friends" here is reflected in m. *Abot* 1:6, "Appoint a teacher for yourself, and acquire a friend for yourself," where the sense is clearly a friend for the purpose of studying Torah together; cf. *Sifre Debarim* 305, "Let a man acquire a friend for himself who may study Torah with him, Mishnah with him, eat with him, drink with him, and reveal his secrets to him." It should be noted that the continuation of Levi's words in the Greek testament, "and many men will *desire to serve him* and to hear the Torah from his mouth," is also paralleled in rabbinic sources. Being a proper student of a rabbinic sage involved not merely studying his teachings but also serving him (Hebrew *mešammešim 'et ha-rab*): "Even if someone has studied Scripture and Mishnah but has not *served* scholars—that person is an ignoramus" (b. *Ber*. 47b), since there is no substitute for being in close, daily contact with a teacher. This allows the student to—as Levi ends this same sentence—"hear the Torah from his mouth," rather than his having to rely on secondhand citations from those students who *have* served him.

Useless Water

Toward the end of his testament, Asher warns his descendants:

> Do not, children, be like [the people of] Sodom, who did not recognize the angels of the Lord and perished forever. For I know that you will sin and will be given over into the hands of your enemies, and your land

[5] Jonas Greenfield et al., *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 105.

> will be made desolate and your holy places destroyed, and you will be scattered to the four corners of the earth. And you will be considered as worthless in the dispersion as useless water . . . (*T. Ash.* 7:1–2)

The first part of the passage is simple enough: Asher tells his children not to be like the people of Sodom, who "did not recognize the angels of the Lord," mistaking them for ordinary men. (This in itself is somewhat interesting, since the sin of the Sodomites is usually identified as either stinginess—and along with that, the failure to act as proper hosts—or sexual license.[6] Asher, however, seems to feel that their main mistake was getting caught, that is, not understanding that the intended victims of their criminality were actually angels; it is for that reason, he says, that they "perished forever.")

He then goes on to "predict" what the author of the *Testaments* surely knew as ancient history: that the time would come when Asher's descendants, along with the other inhabitants of the northern tribes, "will be scattered to the four corners of the earth" after the conquest of the Northern Kingdom by the Assyrians in 722 B.C.E. At that point, he says, "you will be considered as worthless in the dispersion as useless water." This is certainly puzzling. Why should Asher's children be considered worthless? And who, especially in the arid Near East, thinks that water can be worthless in any case?

Apparently behind this remark stand the words of Ps 58:8:

ימאסו כמו מים יתהלכו למו, ידרך חצו כמו יתמללו

The first words of this line pose a problem, basically the same problem as in Asher's remark: ימאסו כמו מים seems to mean "let them be despised like water," but that makes little sense. Apparently, the first word of this line must have been written (or at least have been understood as) ימסו, from the verbal root מס"ס, meaning to "melt away" or "dissolve."[7] That is indeed how the verse was understood in the Old Greek translation of the psalms: "They will *dissolve* [i.e., "melt away"] like water that flows through [the soil]." This is an altogether apt verse for what Asher is trying to tell his children: in exile they will be utterly

---

[6] See my *Traditions of the Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 331–34, 346–50.

[7] Because *aleph* had ceased to be a glottal stop in late- and post-biblical times, ימאסו and ימסו would have been pronounced identically. See E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1Q Isaiah[a])* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 498–500.

absorbed by the nations to whose land they will be sent and will dissolve there like water that flows into parched soil.

But if, in place of ימסו, the traditional Hebrew text of Ps. 58:8 had ימאסו, then it is easy to see how the author of the Hebrew *Testaments* might decide to have Asher, in alluding to that verse, adopt that same spelling in warning his descendants that "you will melt away like water in exile"—that is, he wrote תמאסו כמו מים and not תמסו. Sometime thereafter, the Greek translator of the *Testaments* read this line but failed to recognize the allusion to Ps 58:8; indeed, to him תמאסו quite naturally looked like it came from the common root for "despise, consider worthless," מא"ס. As a result, all the surviving texts have Asher tell his descendants: "And you will be considered as worthless in the dispersion as useless water." Thus Asher's apt simile of absorption was lost, a victim of faulty translation.

It should be noted that this may not be the only case in which the writing of the roots מס"ס and מא"ס are interchanged. Job's description of his physical suffering includes this remark: לבש בשרי רמה וגוש עפר; עורי רגע וימאס (Job 7:5), "My flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dirt, my skin congeals and melts [again]." About this verse Abraham ibn Ezra cites R. Moses (Gikatilla) as saying that "וימאס is from נמס and the *aleph* is in place of the *samekh*."[8] The same understanding apparently underlies some modern translations as well.[9] This approach was followed as well by Jewish interpreters of Ps. 58:8. The Aramaic targum translates the opening phrase יתמסון בחוביהון היך מיה, where יתמסון is derived from the root מס"י, "melt away," and this interpretation is followed by various medieval commentators, including Se'adya,[10] and ibn Janaḥ.[11]

---

[8] A parallel case, he suggests, is Isa 18:2, 7: אשר בזאו נהרים ארצו, where בזאו would presumably be interpreted as deriving from the root בז"ז. About this verse R. David Qimḥi observes: "[this is] like בזזו; the *aleph* is in place of the geminate." RaDaQ's wording, and that of the other medieval writers cited below, suggest that they may indeed have seen the *aleph* not as the result of some confusion or copying error, but simply as an alternate way of writing the geminate and/or weak verb. My thanks to Professor B. Septimus for pointing this out, as well as for the mention below of Se'adya and ibn Janah.

[9] The NJPS translation reads: "My flesh is covered with maggots and clods of earth; my skin is broken and *festering*." The NRSV: "…my skin hardens, then breaks out again."

[10] See Nehemya Allony, ed., *ha-Egron: Kitāb 'Uṣul al-Shi'r al-'Ibrānī* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language: 1969), 281.

[11] *Sefer ha-Shorashim* (ed. W. Bacher; Berlin: Hevrat Mekitse Nirdamim, 1896), 252.

Setho the Concubine

In his testament, Joseph recounts the multiple attempts made by Potiphar's wife to seduce him. Among others, he relates:

> Then, when her husband was away, she rushed toward me and said to me: I will strangle myself or throw myself into a well or over a cliff if you do not sleep with me! But realizing that the spirit of Beliar was tormenting her, I prayed to the Lord. I said to her, "Why are you so disturbed and upset? [Are you] blinded by sins? Remember that if you kill yourself, Setho, your husband's concubine—your rival!—will beat your children and destroy your memorial from the earth. Then she said to me: So you do love me! It is enough for me [to know] that you care about my life and my children's. I can still expect that my desire [for you] will be fulfilled. (*T. Jos.* 7:3–6)

The first question arising from this passage concerns the name "Setho." This is a rather strange name, which appears in the various Greek manuscripts in different forms: Setho, Isithoō, Asithō, etc. No such name is otherwise known in Greek or Hebrew. But the strangest thing is that Joseph mentions this concubine's name at all. The proper names of even important non-Israelites are frequently omitted. Potiphar, for example, is regularly referred to simply as "the Egyptian," while his wife is "the Egyptian woman."[12] So why mention "Setho"—who appears only here—by her proper name?

It seems likely that the original Hebrew text read something like: "…if you kill yourself, your husband's wife or mistress, your rival…" that is, *'išto 'o pilagšo šelliba'alek, ṣaratek*.[13] The idea is clear: if you kill yourself, your husband's other wife [either the wife that he has already married or the one whom he will marry after your death] or else his concubine, your rival…" But somehow, the common noun *'išto* came to be taken for a proper name (rather like *'abdo* in an earlier example). I suspect that a copyist is to blame here: if the word separa-

---

[12] This is true of most of this testament; Hollander and De Jonge have pointed out that the section from 11:2–16:6 is an exception: here Potiphar is referred to by name (Petephres) while his wife is called "the Memphian woman" rather than the "Egyptian woman" (*Commentary,* 393). As they demonstrate convincingly, this section was apparently appended to the *Testament of Joseph* sometime after its original composition.

[13] This use of the proleptic suffix in noun constructs, while occurring only once in biblical Hebrew (Song of Songs 3:7), is quite common in Mishnaic Hebrew, apparently influenced by the parallel Aramaic construction. See Edward Y. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982), 130.

tion between *'išto* and the *'o* that followed it was insufficient, it might indeed look like an unrecognizable Egyptian name, אשתואו *'išto'o*, which is rather close to Setho's variant forms, Isithoō and Asithō. Unhappily, the further reference to his "mistress, your rival" left the sentence altogether grammatically intact, reinforcing the impression that *'išto'o* was indeed a proper noun.

Joseph continues by saying that this woman "will beat your children and destroy your memorial from the earth." Here are two more translation errors: Hebrew *hakkot* means both "beat" and "kill"—but clearly the latter is intended, since the consequence is stated in the phrase that follows. That phrase, translated as "destroy your memorial," is a misunderstanding of Hebrew *zeker,* which means not memorial but "name." To "destroy [or "uproot," "erase," etc.] someone's name" was a Hebrew idiom meaning to leave the person without descendants: Exod 17:14; Deut 25:19, 32:26; Ps 34:17, 109:15; Prov 10:7; Job 18:17; Eccl 9:5; Esth 9:28.

These are only a few witnesses to the existence of a Hebrew text underlying our present Greek one. Others have been identified by other scholars as well as by the present writer.[14] However, no such evidence can ever be considered decisive with regard to the two competing hypotheses mentioned above concerning the process by which the *Testaments* came to be. While one side argues that the whole of the *Testaments* existed first in Hebrew, the other can always maintain that only certain portions of the *Testaments* were translated from various (otherwise unknown) Hebrew sources, but that the idea of a twelve-testament work only first occurred to the Christian author of the whole. Nevertheless, these few examples do give a somewhat clearer picture of the Greek translator at work. It might be said in general that this translator was quite good. He shows an excellent knowledge of even such relatively rare terms as *horeh* in the sense of *goneus*, "parent, progenitor." He may have been tripped up by *tešubah* only because the image was somewhat strange, or perhaps also because this word's meaning of "repentance" (rather than "return" or "reply" found in

[14] See, for example, Moses Gaster, "The Hebrew Text of One of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," reprinted in vol. 1 of *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Mediaeval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha, and Samaritan Archaeology* (3 vols.; New York: KTAV, 1971), 69–87; Gedaliah Alon, "Rabbinic Hebrew in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *The Linguistic Study of Biblical Hebrew: A Reader Selected from Tarbiz* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982), 212–218; also Kugel, *The Ladder of Jacob* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 169–85.

biblical Hebrew) was relatively new. He is, at the same time, rather uncritical of the Hebrew text he has received, even when it yields such nonsense as the scholar who has more friends than his parents, or Israel being considered as worthless as useless water. It is hoped that these observations may be of use to other scholars investigating this fascinating, if sometimes garbled, composition.

WHY NABONIDUS? EXCAVATING TRADITIONS FROM QUMRAN, THE HEBREW BIBLE, AND NEO-BABYLONIAN SOURCES

Carol A. Newsom
Emory University

One of the most fruitful places for examining the transmission of traditions and the production of texts is surely the literature associated with the figure of Daniel. Even before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, scholars explored the differences between the versions of Daniel found in the Masoretic Text of Daniel and the Septuagint, with its additional narratives and poems, as well as the different version of Daniel 4–6 in the Old Greek manuscripts. The Qumran finds showed that there was an even more extensive Danielic literature, with two compositions featuring Daniel making historical and eschatological predictions in a court setting (4Q243–244, 4Q245), and two compositions using language or motifs similar to those of Daniel 2 and 7 (4Q246, 4Q552–553).[1] The longstanding suspicion of scholars that Daniel 4 was originally a narrative about Nabonidus received additional support from the discovery of 4Q242 *Prayer of Nabonidus*.[2]

These texts are evidence both for the complexity of the Danielic tradition and the creativity of its authors, as they appropriated and recycled useful elements, combining them with usable bits and pieces from other literary and oral traditions in order to produce new compositions. Nowhere are we better positioned to examine this process

[1] For discussion of these texts see Peter W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint; 2 vols.; VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:329–67; and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The Formation and Re-Formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; 3 vols.; Waco, Tex.: Baylor, 2006), 1:101–30.

[2] The identification was originally suggested by P. Reissler, *Das Buch Daniel* (Kurzgefasster wissenschaftlicher Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften des alten Testaments 3/3/2; Stuttgart: Roth, 1899), 43, and by F. Hommel, "Die Abfassungszeit des Buches Daniel und der Wahrsinn Nabonids," *Theologisches Literaturblatt* 23 (1902): 145–50. The official publication of the *Prayer of Nabonidus* is John J. Collins, "Prayer of Nabonidus," in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G. J. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 83–93.

than with the texts that were originally associated with Nabonidus, for in addition to the Jewish narratives, we also have an extensive neo-Babylonian literature, including both Nabonidus' own self-presentation in his inscriptions and literary representations of Nabonidus by his enemies.[3] Although this material has been intensively studied, recent research on the historical Nabonidus may shed additional light on the composition and development of the Jewish Nabonidus literature. In addition, two questions have not heretofore received sufficient attention. First, to the extent that one can peer through the Jewish Nabonidus texts to the early stages of their composition, what can one say about the motivation for their composition and their possible function as social rhetoric? Second, since important comparative material exists, is it possible to develop a model that suggests how the authors of this literature actually produced new stories from their source material?

The Corpus of Jewish Nabonidus Literature

One of the initial issues to be explored is the extent of Jewish Nabonidus literature. The *Prayer of Nabonidus* is the one text explicitly identified with him. But within the canonical book of Daniel, Daniel 4 is widely agreed to be originally a Nabonidus story.[4] To this one can add Daniel 5, since it is a story about Nabonidus' son Belshazzar. It has also been suggested that other compositions of the Daniel cycle may have originated as stories about Nabonidus, notably Daniel 3. Although the details of the narrative do not correspond to anything actually done by either Nebuchadnezzar or Nabonidus, the erecting of a strange image and requiring worship of it may well preserve a parodic echo of Nabonidus' notorious championing of the moon god Sin.[5] Indeed, two of his most controversial actions were the installation of a new and non-traditional cult statue of the moon god in Sin's temple in Harran and his attempt to persuade the priests of Marduk

[3] These documents have recently been edited and translated by Hanspeter Schaudig, *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' des Grossen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften* (AOAT 256; Ugarit-Verlag: Münster, 2001).

[4] See n. 2.

[5] Martin McNamara, "Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel," *ITQ* 37 (1970): 144–48. See most recently Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "The Babylonian Background of the Motif of the Fiery Furnace in Daniel 3," *JBL* 128 (2009): 273–90.

that the Esagil temple in Babylon actually belonged to the moon god, because of the iconography of the lunar crescent found there.[6] In addition, Paul-Alain Beaulieu has recently argued that the motif of the fiery furnace in Daniel 3 is actually derived from a literary topos that was part of the Neo-Babylonian school curriculum. Together, these elements strongly suggest that the basic structure of the narrative may go back to the sixth century.[7]

The case for Daniel 2 as originally a Nabonidus narrative is weaker but not without plausibility. Of the Neo-Babylonian kings only Nabonidus had an interest in ominous and revelatory dreams or recorded them in his inscriptions.[8] Dreams, however, are not uncommon elements in Israelite and early Jewish storytelling, as the notable parallel of Pharaoh's dream in Genesis 41 demonstrates. Still, it is not the fact of the dream but the role it plays in the narrative of Daniel 2 that is suggestive. The narrative is dated to "the second year" of the king's reign, and it is thus quite likely that the king's distress at the ominous dream is intended to suggest anxiety as to the security of his reign. In Daniel, of course, the dream and its interpretation are a Hellenistic era composition, since they contain references to a sequence of kingdoms, ending with that of the Greeks (vv. 36–44). Some scholars have suggested, however, that this particular dream or elements of it are secondary, since its eschatological orientation contrasts quite sharply with the way in which the narratives in Daniel 1–6 in general tend to accommodate to gentile power by representing the kings as recognizing the power of the Judean god.[9] While any argument about an earlier version of Daniel 2 must be speculative, it is the case that Nabonidus, a usurper who was not part of the dynastic family, was anxious about the legitimacy of his kingship. In an inscription composed during his

---

[6] Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "Nabonidus the Mad King: A Reconsideration of His Steles from Harran and Babylon," in *Representations of Political Power* (ed. M. Heinz and M. H. Feldman; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 139.

[7] Beaulieu, "The Babylonian Background," 283–85.

[8] Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556–539 B.C.* (Yale Near Eastern Researches 10; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 218; Ehulhul Cylinder I.15–26 (Schaudig, *Inschriften Nabonids*, 416–17, 436); Harran Inscription I.11; III.1–2 (ibid., 488, 496; 493, 498); Babylon Stele VI–VII (ibid., 519–20, 525–26); Inscribed Bead (ibid., 545). Nabonidus' claims to revelatory dreams are ridiculed in the Verse Account V.10–11 (ibid., 569, 576).

[9] E.g., Reinhard Gregor Kratz, *Translatio Imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld* (WMANT 63; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 134–48.

first regnal year, Nabonidus himself reports an ominous dream he had concerning the conjunction of the moon (Sin) and the great star (Marduk). A "young man" in the dream tells him that "the conjunction does not involve evil portents."[10] Nabonidus goes on to report that in the dream Marduk "called him by name." The similarity to Daniel 2, which concerns an ominous royal dream interpreted by a young man in an agreeable fashion, is thus quite intriguing.

Scholars are generally in agreement that the various narratives in Daniel 2–6 originally circulated separately and were secondarily brought together to form a narrative cycle, for which chapter 1 was composed as an introduction.[11] Thus of the five core chapters (Daniel 2–6), four have a significant claim to have been originally composed about Nabonidus and his son Belshazzar.[12] These chapters, plus the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, amount to a striking amount of Jewish literature composed about this last king of Babylon. While the *Prayer of Nabonidus* continued to be copied as a Nabonidus text, the fact that the narratives in the actively redacted Daniel tradition were transferred to the more famous figure of Nebuchadnezzar is a good indication that Nabonidus' "shelf-life" as a figure of interest to Jews was relatively brief.[13] Thus, it is likely that Jews would only have *composed* literature about Nabonidus during or shortly after his reign.

Purpose and Function of the Jewish Nabonidus Literature

Why or for what purpose might such literature have been composed? And is the apparent function of the *collection* of Daniel narratives the

---

[10] Beaulieu, *Reign of Nabonidus*, 111; Schaudig, *Inschriften Nabonids*, 514–29, particularly 518–19 and 525.

[11] Klaus Koch, *Das Buch Daniel* (EdF 144; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980), 61–66; John Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 35–38. For a different view of the earliest Daniel book see Ranier Albertz, "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel," in *The Books of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1:183–97.

[12] An argument made already by Wolfram von Soden, "Eine babylonische Volksüberlieferung von Nabonid in den Danielerzählungen," *ZAW* 53 (1935): 81–89.

[13] Nor was Nabonidus a figure of interest to the Greeks. Although his book must be used with considerable caution, Ronald Sacks assembles the relevant information and draws the appropriate conclusion when he states that "to the Greeks, Nabonidus was nothing more than a name in a list" (*Images of Nebuchadnenezzar*, 2d rev. and exp. ed. [London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 2004], 97).

same as that of the originally independent compositions? The answer to this latter question, I would suggest, is partly yes and partly no. It is usually assumed that the story cycle took shape in the Persian period and received its final editing in the early Hellenistic period.[14] For about a generation after Lee Humphreys' influential article,[15] the collection was largely understood as modeling a "life-style for diaspora," that is, as optimistic narratives that suggest how the Jewish diaspora could participate in the opportunities of gentile society without compromising loyalty to their god. More recently, scholars have tended to interpret the narratives as literature of resistance against gentile imperial rule.[16] There is some truth to both interpretations, as the narrative collection performs a vital ideological function that is both accommodationist and resistant. It is resistant insofar as the narratives contest the kings' understanding of the source of political power, which in the case of the Persian kings was declared to be from Ahura Mazda.[17] But it is accommodationist in that, by narrating stories in which the kings come to recognize that rulership comes from the God of Daniel and his friends, the imperial rule is legitimated for Jews as representing the choice of their own God "who gives it to whom he wishes" (Dan 4:14). This complex representation of gentile imperial power makes good sense of the theological-ideological function of the narrative cycle. In part, it also serves as a plausible account of important functions of the individual narratives. For instance, concerning the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, Susan Ackerman has noted the significance of the particular affliction

[14] Collins, *Daniel*, 36.

[15] W. Lee Humphreys, "A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel," *JBL* 92 (1973): 211–23.

[16] Daniel Smith-Christopher, "Prayers and Dreams: Power and Diaspora Identity in the Social Setting of the Daniel Tales," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1:266–90; Matthias Henze, "The Narrative Frame of Daniel: A Literary Assessment," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 5–24; David Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions: A Satirical Reading of Daniel 1–6* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008).

[17] See the stereotypical statement in Persian royal inscriptions, exemplified by Darius' Behistun inscription: "I am Darius the Great King, King of Kings, King in Persia, King of countries, son of Hystaspes, grandson of Arsames, an Achaemenian…by the favor of Ahuramazda I am King; Ahuramazda bestowed the kingdom upon me" (Roland G. Kent, *Old Persian*; 2d rev. ed. [New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1953], 119). The Persian kings, however, did legitimate their kingship in Babylon and Egypt by reference to the native gods. See Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (trans. P. T. Daniels; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 43–45, 475–78.

that affects Nabonidus, "grievous boils" (*šḥn' b'yš'*). The affliction is distinctly linked to the god Sin in Mesopotamian tradition. Yet in the *Prayer of Nabonidus* "the idols" are powerless. "The God of Israel has thus usurped from Sin the ability to inflict and cure skin ailments."[18] What this type of interpretation does not explain, however, is why suddenly, in the reign of Nabonidus, there would have been an intense production of such literature. It is likely that something else was at stake in the origins of this literature, something that has to do not only with negotiating Jewish/gentile theo-political ideologies but also with an internal Jewish exilic debate.

One is hampered, of course, by the fact that the oldest versions of these narratives no longer exist. Nevertheless, I think it is possible to identify certain key elements in the narratives that go all the way back to the beginning. Despite the many differences between them, both the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and Daniel 4 have as their central focus the public proclamation by the king of his recognition of the power of the Most High God because of what God has done with respect to the king. And both narratives relate this experience to the king's absence from Babylon, behind which lies the historical memory of Nabonidus' sojourn in Teima. Both are in some way indebted to Nabonidus' own Harran inscription, as I discuss below. Similarly, in their present form, both Daniel 2 and 3 conclude with the king's recognition of the power of the god of the Jews (Dan 2:47; 2:28–29). Thus if anything seems to be at the core of the story tradition, it is the king's public recognition of the god of the Jews.

To understand more clearly why such narratives might have been composed, it is important to recall the controversies surrounding Nabonidus' kingship. He was a polarizing figure, not simply—or even primarily—because he was a usurper, though his own defensiveness about his legitimacy may point to some opposition on that score. Much more problematic was his advocacy of the supremacy of the moon god Sin and his championing of a theology that would equate Sin with Anu, Marduk, and Nabu.[19] The enmity of the priests of Marduk was recorded not only in the polemical "Verse Account of Nabo-

---

[18] Susan Ackerman, "The Prayer of Nabonidus, Elijah on Mount Carmel, and the Development of Monotheism in Israel," in *The Echoes of Many Texts* (ed. W. G. Dever and J. E. Wright; BJS 313; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 60.

[19] For a discussion of Nabonidus' theological programme, see most recently Beaulieu, "Nabonidus the Mad King," 137–66.

nidus," but also in their composition of the "Cyrus Cylinder," which provided theological legitimation for Cyrus as king of Babylon.[20] Both of these texts were composed after Cyrus' conquest, and Amelie Kuhrt has suggested that perhaps they do not so much indicate opposition to Nabonidus during his reign as an attempt to curry favor once the new Persian regime was a *fait accomplit*.[21] Those arguments, however, have been persuasively refuted by Peter Machinist and Hayim Tadmor.[22] Nabonidus was a divisive figure both during his reign and in the years following. These documents, plus the fact that Sippar and Babylon were taken by the Persians without a fight, have often been interpreted to mean that pro-Cyrus sentiment existed even before his entry into Babylon.

Nabonidus, of course, also had his supporters, not only during his reign but after it. The Dynastic Prophecy has confirmed a claim already known from Berossus that Nabonidus surrended to Cyrus, was spared and exiled to a remote place in the Persian empire, where he may even have been appointed as governor.[23] That he continued to be supported by a segment of the Babylonian population is indicated by the fact that two revolts against the Persian king Cambyses were led by individuals who claimed to be the sons of Nabonidus.[24]

Were the Jewish exiles similarly divided? If they were, of course, it would have been for different reasons than the Babylonians. But there is some indication that the same division of opinion between support for Nabonidus and Cyrus existed among the Jews as well. The prophet known as Second Isaiah explicitly championed Cyrus as Yahweh's anointed in an extended oracle in Isa 44:24–45:8. There, Cyrus is referred to not only as "anointed" but is also called "My shepherd," and he is given the responsibility of rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple (Isa 44:26–28). He is thus positioned in the role of successor to

---

[20] Schaudig, *Inschriften Nabonids*, is the most authoritative and recent edition of these texts.

[21] Amelie Kuhrt, "Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood," in *Pagan Priests* (ed. M. Beard and J. North; London: Duckworth, 1990), 119–55.

[22] Peter Machinist and Hayim Tadmor, "Heavenly Wisdom," in *The Tablet and the Scroll* (ed. M. E. Cohen et al.; Bethesda, Md.: CFL Press, 1993), 146–51. Piotr Michalowski ("The Doors of the Past," *Eretz Israel* 27 [1993]: 184), having analyzed Nabonidus' ability to interpret omens and read ancient texts for himself, observes that in addition to the priests of Marduk, "the king undoubtedly alienated much wider circles of priests, scribes and scholars."

[23] Beaulieu, *Reign of Nabonidus*, 231.

[24] Beaulieu, *Reign of Nabonidus*, 232; Briant, 120.

David and Solomon. This framing of Cyrus is often interpreted as a counter to the claims of the priests of Marduk that it was Marduk who had summoned Cyrus to kingship over Babylon.[25] This is likely one of the functions of the oracle, as it is introduced in Isa 44:24–26a by remarks denigrating Babylonian diviners. The harshest polemics, however, follow the Cyrus oracle in 45:9–13, where the prophet appears to confront Jewish opponents. "Does the clay say to the potter, 'What are you making?' Or 'Your work has no handles!'" (v. 9b). Possibly, the resistance of his audience was simple incredulity; but one ought also to consider the possibility that the Jewish exilic community was divided between those who remained loyal to Nabonidus and those who saw in Cyrus a liberator, and that this division might account for the sudden production of literature in which Nabonidus is represented as acknowledging the God of the Jews.

Rainer Albertz considers such a division of loyalty likely and locates continuing support of Nabonidus with "the narrow circle of exilic leaders at court, the descendants of David and Hilkiah,"[26] that is to say the aristocratic members of the royal and high priestly families who were particularly dependent on Nabonidus for their support and station. There may have been others, however. Although the evidence is indirect, the fact that most of the sites in northwest Arabia referred to in the Harran inscription were later important centers of Jewish settlement has suggested to some that Nabonidus may have settled Jewish soldiers and laborers in this region during his ten year sojourn there.[27] Thus a significant number of Jews may have had reason to favor Nabonidus against his enemies.

Whether or not Teima was a site of Jewish support for Nabonidus, the circles around Jehoiachin's sons would have had the motive to sponsor literature directed at the Jews in Babylon designed to secure a favorable opinion of Nabonidus by representing him as object of Yahweh's healing and care (the *Prayer of Nabonidus*), as one whom Yahweh had chosen to be king over the nations (Daniel 4), and as one who ultimately came to recognize in the Most High God the source

---

[25] *ANET*, 315–16.

[26] Rainer Albertz, *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* (Trans. D. Green; Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2003), 111.

[27] C. J. Gadd, "The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus," *Anatolian Studies* 8 (1958): 87; Rudolf W. Meyer, *Zur Geschichte und Theologie des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (ed. W. Bernhardt; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 99–101.

of his sovereignty and well-being (both Daniel 4 and the *Prayer of Nabonidus*). Moreover, the genre of court stories, which form the basis for Daniel 1–6, would have been quite at home among the scribes of the Judean royal family.

One might object that the king is represented in a quite negative light in Daniel 2–4. Even von Soden, who has argued for the origin of these narratives in traditions about Nabonidus, distinguishes between the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, which he describes as friendly toward the king, and the narratives in Daniel, which he sees as grounded in the anti-Nabonidus propaganda of the priests of Marduk.[28] I would agree that elements in Daniel 3 and 4 reflect and make parodic use of the negative characterizations of Nabonidus' actions by his opponents. In the plot line of these stories, however, in contrast to the propaganda directed against Nabonidus, the king is presented as one who comes to a proper recognition of the power of the Most High God, in this case the God of the Jews. Moreover, the genre of the stories has to be considered. It is characteristic of court stories to exploit the stereotypically dangerous and volatile power of the king for the sake of a dramatic plot line, even when the king is viewed favorably (as in Ahiqar, the Joseph story, and Esther). By focusing on the character of the king and his gradual redemption from misperceptions about the source of his sovereignty, Daniel 2–4 negotiate in an imaginative fashion the terms upon which Jews can support a gentile monarch.

If the early versions of these stories ended in a fashion similar to the ones now extant, with recognition of the power of the God of Daniel and his friends, then they cultivate an ultimately positive attitude to the king who is their subject. While the precise doxological formula in 3:31–33 may be a later redactional element, since it corresponds closely with the one in 6:27–28, the logic of the plot lines in the narratives suggests that the recognition of the god of the Jews by the king is indeed an old feature of the stories. A second objection might be raised as to the representation in Daniel 5 of Belshazzar, Nabonidus' son, as an arrogant and blasphemous idolater who is judged worthy of death. This, too, may actually fit the dynamics of the politics of the era. Significant conflict apparently existed between Nabonidus and his son,

[28] Wolfram von Soden, "Kyros und Nabonid: Propaganda und Gegenpropaganda," in *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihr Fortleben* (ed. H. Koch and D. N. Mackenzie; Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran 10; Berlin: Reimer, 1983), 61, 63.

conflict that became overt after Nabonidus returned from Teima and not only removed Belshazzar from his administrative responsibilities but also dismissed officials Belshazzar had appointed during his absence. Moreover, Belshazzar apparently did not share Nabonidus' advocacy of the moon god Sin. During Nabonidus' absence in Teima, the royal inscriptions in Babylon, supervised by Belshazzar, returned Marduk to full honor, a policy that was abruptly reversed when Nabonidus returned.[29] In two late inscriptions Nabonidus expresses this (apparently unfulfilled) wish to Sin: "And as for Belshazzar, my eldest son, my offspring, establish the fear of your great godhead in his heart. May he not commit any sin."[30] Although the book of Daniel records Belshazzar's death (5:30), there is no confirmation in cuneiform sources that he died during the transition to Persian rule. A negative portrayal of Belshazzar, however, is not inconsistent with attempts to cultivate a favorable disposition toward Nabonidus.

Thus far I have attempted to make a plausible, though necessarily speculative, case for the context that would explain the sudden appearance of numerous narratives about Nabonidus in which he variously receives healing from the God of the Jews and comes to acknowledge the sovereign power of this God. I have placed this context in the years just before and just after the Persian conquest, when the populace of Babylon, and, as I have argued, also the Jewish exiles, were divided in their support of Cyrus or Nabonidus. Thus the oracles of Second Isaiah and the narratives about Nabonidus would represent the competing propaganda for these kings by their Jewish supporters. Although court stories and prophetic poetry are very different genres, it is worth asking if there are any common themes in their representation of these two kings. Both literatures share an anti-idolatry rhetoric, though in Second Isaiah it is the prophet who critiques idols (41:6–7; 42:17; 44:9–20; 46:1–7), whereas in the *Prayer of Nabonidus* it is the king himself. More intriguing is the issue of whether or not the king in question knows or acknowledges the God of the Jews. This is a central feature of the Nabonidus stories. In Isa 41:25b, too, there is a brief reference to Cyrus as "one who calls upon my name." But the long Cyrus oracle in 45:1–8 says the opposite: "I call you by name . . . so that you may know that I am YHWH . . . though you do not acknowl-

[29] Beaulieu, *Reign of Nabonidus*, 63–65, 203–5.
[30] Ibid., 64.

edge me," 45:3b, 4b) and "I engird you, though you do not acknowledge me, so that they may know, from east to west, that there is none but me" (45:5b–6a). It is difficult to know quite what to make of these claims, except that the issue of whether or not a king can be said to acknowledge the God of the Jews appears to have been important in persuading the Jewish audience to support him—and that the rhetoric of Second Isaiah sounds a bit defensive on the question of Cyrus' acknowledgment.

The Relation of Jewish Nabonidus Literature to Neo-Babylonian Texts

The likelihood of a sixth century origin of the traditions behind the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and Daniel 4 received an important confirmation in 1956, when the two Harran Stelae of Nabonidus were discovered.[31] From the comparison of this inscription with the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and particularly with Daniel 4, it became evident that some of the distinctive features of these narratives clearly reflected acquaintance with Nabonidus' own self-presentation in this inscription.[32] Thus it is possible to examine the transmission of tradition across cultural and linguistic lines. But how could the contents of Nabonidus' stelae become known to Jews? And what about the genre of this inscription might have made it an appealing subject for appropriation and reuse by the Jews? There is much that is not known about the distribution of the text, i.e., whether copies were circulated in Babylon or in Teima, but as the editor of the Harran stelae notes, "the clear purpose of these inscriptions was publicity."[33] Although the largely illiterate population could not read the inscription itself, writings designed for the public were communicated by public reading.[34]

The genre of the inscription is also important. Nabonidus' inscription is written very much in the style of *narû* (i.e., stela) literature. These texts, many of which served as curriculum materials in the first

---

[31] Gadd, "Harran Inscriptions," 35–92.

[32] Meyer, *Zur Geschichte und Theologie*, 111. More recently, Klaus Koch, "Gottes Herrschaft über das Reich des Menschen: Daniel 4 im Licht neuer Funde," in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. Van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 77–119 (89–98).

[33] Gadd, "Harran Inscriptions," 90.

[34] Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), 11–14.

level of Babylonian education, were "fictional accounts of the deeds of famous kings allegedly inscribed on steles (*narûs*) to instruct present and future generations."[35] These *narû* compositions represent the king as addressing other kings, officials, or a broader audience of the king's subjects and giving advice. The king is depicted, not as a military leader, administrator, or even as a source of justice, but rather as a teacher of religious truth and of wisdom. As Beaulieu observes, "this, no doubt, corresponded to the ideal figure of the king promoted by official circles in the time of the Babylonian Empire."[36] He also notes that posing as a religious leader and teacher of wisdom was one of the things that the Verse Account mocks about Nabonidus, though it is grounded in his own self-presentation.

If the Jews wished to compose literature in which Nabonidus could be pictured as confessing the power of the Most High God, then the *narû* style of the Harran inscription, with its representation of the king as a religious teacher, provided a very congenial template for such a composition. Moreover, the audacity of Nabonidus' actual cultic reforms would have contributed to his suitability for this more radically imagined religious instruction. Beaulieu underscores the fact that Nabonidus' restoration of the Sin cult was not simply a restoration but a significant departure from tradition. "The deity about to take up residence in the restored Ehulhul is a deity with the same name as the old one but with a different theology and a different appearance. For the new deity to be accepted, Nabonidus must emphasize his role as religious leader, as teacher of rituals and cultic prescriptions."[37] How much the newness of Nabonidus' reforms was understood by the Jewish authors of Nabonidus literature cannot be known. But Beaulieu argues that the radical nature of Nabonidus' innovations is evident in the rhetoric of the Harran inscription.[38] These historical features make Nabonidus a particularly suitable Babylonian king to represent in a fictionalized role as a religious teacher who announces the supremacy of the Jewish god.

---

[35] Beaulieu, "Nabonidus the Mad King," 141.
[36] Ibid., 142.
[37] Ibid., 147.
[38] Ibid., 147.

The uses made of the Harran inscription by the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and by proto-Daniel 4 appear to be independent of each other.[39] All three compositions, however, share a cluster of distinctive elements: (1) the first-person style in which the king speaks; (2) the address to a public audience with the purpose of praising and giving honor to a deity, thus representing the king as a religious teacher; (3) a retrospective narrative having to do with the king's absence from Babylon; (4) the motif of a set time of years, after which the king returns to Babylon (though it is unclear whether the return itself was an element in the *Prayer of Nabonidus*). In the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, as in the Harran stele, the location of Teima is specifically mentioned as the location of his sojourn. These common elements are so distinctive that they do seem to indicate an awareness of the Harran stele by the authors of the Jewish texts.

The elements that I have detailed more or less exhaust the points of similarity between the Harran inscription and the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, insofar as it is preserved. The pattern of similarities with Daniel 4, however, is more sustained and more striking, as can be seen in the accompanying chart. Some of these similarities, of course, may be simply fortuitous, and despite the similarities, the author of Daniel 4 certainly takes the narrative in very different directions. To this complicated picture one would need to add the divergence of the Old Greek of Daniel 4 from the Masoretic Text. Though it is not possible to develop the specific arguments here, it appears that the MT (though itself containing some late and secondary literary features, such as the "court contest" framing in 4:3–4) probably preserves a version closer to the structure of the original narrative than does the Old Greek.[40] In any event, the author of proto-Daniel 4 used more of

[39] Although early reconstructions of 4QPrNab often enhanced its similarities to Daniel 4, Matthias Henze (*The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar* [JSJSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 1999]) persuasively concludes that "the discrepancies between the Prayer of Nabonidus and the tale of Nebuchadnezzar's madness are significant enough to exclude the possibility of a direct literary relationship" (68). Henze also rejects the notion of a linear traditio-historical development (68–69).

[40] The issues are extremely complex. Some have defended the priority of the MT. So David Satran, "Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation of the Fourth chapter of the Book of Daniel" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1985), 62–86; and Pierre Grelot, "La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique," *RB* 81 (1974): 22. Others have defended the priority of the OG. So Rainer Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches* (SBS 131; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk,

the structure of the Harran inscription as a framework for his narrative than did the author of the *Prayer of Nabonidus*. I have identified 9 points of formal and content similarity (see chart):

1. The summary of the text as a testimony to a "great work" or "signs and wonders" of the deity
2. The first person address to a public audience
3. The king's self-deprecating reference to himself
4. The central place of a revelatory dream
5. The absence from Babylon at the command of a deity
6. The set term for the absence
7. The hymnic praise of the deity
8. The return to Babylon, facilitated by a change in attitude of the king's subjects
9. Concluding praise of the deity.

Models for the Social Reception of Jewish Nabonidus Literature

That the Harran inscription served in lesser (*Prayer of Nabonidus*) or greater (Daniel 4) degree as a partial template for the construction of the Jewish narratives seems well established.

It remains to be considered, however, precisely how these narratives would have worked as social propaganda for the context in which I am suggesting they functioned originally, namely, as attempts to sway Jewish exilic opinion toward Nabonidus, when some in the community were championing Cyrus and the Persians as the instruments of Yahweh's will. One might object that these narratives were "just stories," court tales, entertainments. Although later generations, exemplified by Josephus (*A.J.* x.186–218), may have taken the Daniel narratives

---

1988); and Lawrence Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends* (HDR 26; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990). For my purposes, the major issue is the placement of the doxology that begins the account in the MT and that occurs at the end of the account in the OG. Collins (*Daniel*, 220–21) gives good reasons for assuming that the OG has assimilated to the pattern of the other narratives that place the doxologies at the end. But he also notes that the doxologies in the MT of chs. 4 and 6 may represent a redactional stage in which these chapters circulated separately. If the Harran inscription was a model for the composition of proto-Daniel 4, then its rhetorical structure may have prompted the composition of framing doxologies, but there is no way of knowing with certainty if this was the case.

as history, one might assume that the original audience would have known that the stories were not factual.

Two different but perhaps complementary responses may be made to this objection. First, it may not be necessary that one actually believe in the facticity of stories for them to have their effect. Fiction's access to truth is not dependent on its complete correspondence with facts. The main gist of the Nabonidus literature that underlies Daniel 2–5 and the *Prayer of Nabonidus* is that the Most High is sovereign—not the idols, not the gentile kings. That is the core belief of the audience to whom these narratives are addressed. And so to make Nabonidus the humiliated but ultimately redeemed king who recognizes this—even in a literary fiction—is to generate a sense of good will toward him. That is the modest case for the Nabonidus narratives as pro-Nabonidus propaganda.

A stronger case may also be made. Perhaps one should *not* be so sure that the original Jewish audience recognized the distance between the fictional Nabonidus of the narratives and the actual Nabonidus. The recent persistence by segments of the American population in believing things about President Barack Obama that are manifestly untrue (e.g., that he is a Muslim or that he was not born in the United States), even in the face of frequent proofs to the contrary, is simply the most recent instance of a common phenomenon. When important aspects of their worldview are at stake, subcultures can and will believe things that are manifestly not factual.[41] The worldview of the Judean exiles and their descendants in Babylonia was under significant stress after the destruction of the kingdom and the devastation of the temple of YHWH. Significant psychic motivation existed for at least some Jews of the Babylonian exile to take as fact what had perhaps been written in the circles around Jehoiachin's sons as fiction. In either case—the more modest or the stronger case—narratives about how Nabonidus came to recognize the power of the God of the Jews would have solicited positive feeling toward him.

It is also possible that Nabonidus' own rhetoric facilitated this Jewish re-interpretation of his religiously idiosyncratic behavior. In a

---

[41] Most of the research done on this phenomenon concerns conspiracy theories. For an entertaining recent survey see David Aaronovitch, *Voodoo Histories* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2009). But positive false rumors are also often believed with tenacity by populations whose sense of well-being is invested in them. (My thanks to Mladen Popović for alerting me to this work.)

recent article Beaulieu notes that as part of his attempt to identify Sin with other major Mesopotamian deities, including Marduk and Nabu, Nabonidus favored the common name *ilu* ("god") for Sin, especially in the logographic plural form DINGIR.MEŠ, and that this terminology was particularly in use in the Harran region. Indeed, Beaulieu observes, citing research by Drijvers, that "pagan Syrian inscriptions from this region dated to the first two centuries of our era still address the god of Harran as *ellaha*, echoing the theology favored during the late Assyrian and Babylonian empires."[42] Thus Nabonidus' veneration of the moon god, especially as it was conveyed in the Aramaic vernacular that was common in Mesopotamia, was expressed as his veneration of *ellaha*, the same term by which the Jews acknowledged their god, YHWH. In this fashion, the linguistic overlap may have facilitated the interpretation of Nabonidus' notorious religious differences with the priests of Marduk in terms that allowed Jews to entertain the notion that he actually venerated their own god. Although the court stories of the proto-Daniel narratives were most likely originally composed self-consciously as fictions, one should leave open the possibility that they may have functioned among the Jewish populace who heard and retold them as believable accounts of the last king of Babylon. Indeed, in light of his possibility, it is tempting to read Second Isaiah's references to Cyrus as one who was chosen by Yahweh "though you do not acknowledge me" as perhaps a defensive counterthrust to the claims being made for Nabonidus.

Methodological Issues

Rarely in biblical studies do scholars have access not only to variant literary traditions about the same figure and also to documentary sources that appear to have been used in the composition of the literary traditions. But in the instance of Nabonidus that is the case. Does this abundance of source material allow one to formulate insights into the process of the creation of the literary materials? Perhaps. Older attempts at understanding the development of narratives

[42] Beaulieu, "Nabonidus the Mad King," 152; H. J. W. Drijvers, "The Cult of Sin Lord of the Gods at Samatar Barabesi," in *Cults and Beliefs at Edessa* (Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain 82; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 123–24, 141–42.

like the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and Daniel 4 often relied on source and redaction critical methods.[43] Although such approaches often produce careful observations about differences among the literary sub-units of a composition, they often are too mechanical in their understanding of the nature of literary production, too much governed by a cut and paste model of composition. Much more promising are studies in oral composition and performance, especially as the focus on the role of type scenes and motifs has given way to a broader concern for orality and its relation to cultural memory.[44] But there is also some insight to be gained from recent work in cognitive literary theory, specifically, the notion of "conceptual integration" or "blending," which is described as "a basic cognitive operation for creating new meanings out of old."[45] As a fundamental mental process, blending is present in a wide variety of phenomena, from grammar, to semantics, to metaphor, to mathematics, to political cartoons, to narratives, and so forth. In the introduction to their article on blending, which they entitle simply "A Mechanism of Creativity," Mark Turner and Gilles Fauconnier cite a fake newspaper story that circulated after the Pathfinder space probe crash landed on Mars, bouncing on its inflatable balloons. This landing coincided with the fiftieth anniversary of "the Roswell incident," in which many people believed there had been a government cover-up of an alien spacecraft landing in New Mexico in the United States. The fake news story purported to be a Martian wire service report in which Martians claimed there had been a crash landing of an alien spacecraft, and the Martian government insisted it was just a high atmosphere balloon and swamp gas. The humor is created through the blending of the Pathfinder story and the Roswell story, a blending facilitated by the overlap of certain key elements that occur in both narratives: a spacecraft crash landing on another planet and a balloon. The process of composition is also facilitated by inputs from the repertoire of stereotypical space alien narratives as well as of newspaper reporting styles and genres. As Turner and Fauconnier stress, this process of conceptual blending is not simply a description

---

[43] Wills's analysis of the Old Greek of Daniel 4 in *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* is an excellent example.

[44] See, e.g., the essays in *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark* (ed. R. A. Horsley et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006).

[45] Mark Turner and Gilles Fauconnier, "A Mechanism of Creativity," *Poetics Today* 20 (1999): 397–418.

of a compositional technique. Rather, the blend that results has new meanings that were not present (indeed could not be present) in either of the input narratives. What they do not say explicitly, though I think they would agree, is that all creation is blending of some sort. There is nothing new under the sun—and yet, amazingly, there always is.

How might this model of creative blending illumine what occurs in the use of the Nabonidus Harran inscription in the creation of the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and proto-Daniel 4? Jews would probably have become acquainted with the inscription through public readings of it.[46] Such a long inscription would not be remembered verbatim. Instead, the memory of it would be stored as a template, an outline with key points of content. In this fashion it could be passed on orally to others. This schematic template serves as the input narrative from the Harran inscription. The author of the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, so far as we can tell, used only a few elements of this template, though they are distinctive: a first person public proclamation by Nabonidus, honoring a god for his miraculous works by recalling past events that the king himself has experienced, relating to the fixed period of time he spent at Teima.

The author of the *Prayer of Nabonidus* blended this template with another narrative template. In contrast to the example used by Turner and Fauconnier, one cannot be certain if another specific narrative was involved. But that is not a matter of great consequence. As Turner observes in *The Literary Mind*, "we do not recognize each story as wholly unique. Instead we know abstract stories that apply to ranges of specific situations." We know "conceptual categories of stories."[47] Thus one need not identify another specific source for the *Prayer of Nabonidus* but simply another story type. And that turns out to be quite simple. In the *Prayer of Nabonidus* the king is represented as someone who is (a) suffering from illness, (b) is healed, and who (c) writes a document containing a prayer that praises the god who has healed him. This is the story type represented by the account in Isaiah 38 of Hezekiah's illness, healing, and the thanksgiving psalm described as "a writing of King Hezekiah of Judah, after he had been sick and

[46] See n. 33.
[47] Mark Turner, *The Literary Mind* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 10.

had recovered from his sickness" (Isa 38:9).[48] The very genre of thanksgiving psalm involves a public performance, since such compositions were designed to glorify the deity to other worshipers. Moreover, the description of this thanksgiving in Isaiah 38 as something written brings the narrative details even closer to the motifs of the *Prayer of Nabonidus*. While it is possible that Isaiah 38 itself is in fact the other specific narrative template, such an assumption is not necessary.

More importantly, as Turner and Fauconnier argue, the effect of such a blend is new meaning, not simply a combination of old meanings. To graft a Yahwistic illness/healing/thanksgiving narrative onto Nabonidus' first person account of his experiences of the miraculous deeds of Sin is to create something highly novel—a narrative in which a Babylonian king acknowledges the saving power of the God of the Jews—and yet to do so in terms that echo the rhetoric of Nabonidus' own inscriptions. In Turner and Fauconnier's example of narrative blending, the seriousness of the narrative of the NASA mission and the silliness of the narrative of the Roswell conspiracy theorists simply results in a new parodic narrative. But the blending of two serious narratives—one concerning Nabonidus' strenuous attempts to foster the worship of the Moon God and the other concerning divine healing of a king in a Yahwistic context—combine to create a blended narrative that, whether or not recognized as fictional, takes its place within the repertoire of believable narratives about the relationships between gods and kings.

The relationship between proto-Daniel 4 and the Harran inscription is more complex. As indicated above, much more of the template of the Harran inscription is appropriated in Daniel 4. But Daniel 4, at least in its present form, shifts the focus of the story from one in which a dream is briefly summarized to one that is largely centered on a dream report and its interpretation. Moreover, it inverts the issue of fault. Nabonidus' stele inscription blames the sin of the populace of Babylon for the deity's decision to cause the king to leave Babylon. The Jewish story blames the king's own hubris. One can certainly find parallels for each of these narrative patterns in the Jewish repertoire (dream

[48] The *Prayer of Nabonidus* is often compared with the story of Manasseh, his repentance, and his prayer (2 Chr 33:12–13; Pr Man). See John Collins, "Prayer of Nabonidus," 87. The similarity to the account of Hezekiah in Isaiah 38 is, however, much greater.

interpretation: Genesis 41; Judges 7; royal disobedience, chastisement, and reform/repentance: 2 Samuel 12; 2 Chronicles 33), though it is not evident that all of these specific narratives existed before the composition of proto-Daniel 4. But the general insight of the cognitive theory of "blends" is persuasive. The Jewish narratives can be constructed through creative blending of a Babylonian inscription and stock elements from the repertoire of traditional Jewish narratives.

What I have attempted to suggest in this necessarily speculative study is that one can peer back to a certain extent through the transmission of traditions in the Danielic literature and identify some of the social dynamics that may have produced the literature originally, and also to see how it may have functioned in that context. The basic points are these: (1) Nabonidus was likely an object of interest to Jews only for a short time, during and just after his reign; (2) the Jewish literature composed about him focused on his recognition of the God of the Jews, a feature that would recommend him to a Jewish audience; (3) the contemporaneity of this Nabonidus literature with Second Isaiah, which features God's choice of Cyrus, suggests that these two bodies of literature represented a division within the Jewish exilic community of a theo-political nature, a division that was analogous to the split within Babylonian society more broadly. I have also attempted to show how the Jewish compositions were aware of and made use of Babylonian literature by and about Nabonidus, in particular, his Harran inscription. Finally, I have attempted to connect the data that we have from this ancient composition and its source material with modern cognitive theories about the processes of creativity, in the hope that it will assist our work in understanding the production of texts and the transmission of traditions. Although Nabonidus himself may have ceased to be a figure of continuing interest to Jews, the narratives originating about him in proto-Daniel continued to be creatively adapted for diaspora Jews, incorporating new traditions and blending new narrative elements over a period of several centuries.

Comparison of Harran Stela, *Prayer of Nabonidus*, Daniel 4

Harran Stela	*Prayer of Nabonidus*	Daniel 4
1. *Identification of the nature of the communication: announcement of the great work/miracle of the deity*		
(I.1) (This is) the great miracle of Sin…	(1) The words of thep[ra]yer which Nabonidus, King of [Baby]lon, [the great] king prayed…(5) Pro[cla]im and write to give honor and exal[tatio]n to the name of G[od Most High, and I wrote as follows….	(3:31–32) King Nebuchadnezzar to all people and nations…The signs and wonders that the Most High God has worked for me I am pleased to relate….
2. *First Person Style*		
(I.7) I (am) Nabonidus…	(2-3) [I, Nabonidus…] I was smitten	(4:1) I, Nebuchadnezzar
3. *Self-deprecating reference; chosen for kingship by deity*		
(I.7–11) I (am) Nabonidus, the only son, who has nobody, in whose heart was no thought of kingship…. Sin called me to kingship…	[no parallel preserved]	(4:14, 31, 33) The Most High…may set over it even the lowest of men…. I blessed the Most High, and praised and glorified the Ever-Living One…. Then and there my reason was restored to me…and I was reestablished over my kingdom.
4. *Revelatory Dream*		
(I.11) [Sin] Made me have a dream and said….	[no parallel preserved]	(4:15) I, King Nebuchadnezzar, had this dream….

Table (*cont.*)

Harran Stela	*Prayer of Nabonidus*	Daniel 4
5. *Absence from Babylon and/or punishment at command of deity*		
(I.23) [Sin] made me leave my city Babylon....	(1-2)... [smitten] with a bad disease by the decree of G[o]d in Teima	(4:21–22) It is the decree of the Most High....you will be driven away from men....
6. *Set term for the absence/punishment*		
(II.11–12) Then the (predicted) term of ten years arrived....	(2-3) [I...] was smitten for seven years....	(4:22, 31) You will be...drenched with the dew of heaven; seven seasons will pass over you.... When the time had passed....
7. *Hymnic praise of the deity's supremacy after the events recounted*		
(II.14–20) O Sin, lord of the gods... who is able to illuminate the heaven and to crush the netherworld...king of kings, lord of lords....	[conclusion not preserved, but presumably contained the promised praise]	(4:31) I blessed the Most High, and praised and glorified the Ever-Living One, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion....
8. *The return to Babylon, facilitated by the king's vassals or subjects*		
(III.4–9) [I dispatched a messenger] from Teima [and he went to] Babylon.... When they saw [him], the kings of the nearby regions came up to kiss my feet....	[no parallel preserved]	(4:33) My companions and nobles sought me out, and I was reestablished over my kingdom....

Table (*cont.*)

Harran Stela	*Prayer of Nabonidus*	Daniel 4
9. *Concluding praise of the deity*		
(III.28–29) I fulfilled the command of Sin, the king of the gods, the lord of lords who dwells in heaven, whose name surpasses that of (all) the (other) gods in heaven.…	[conclusion not preserved, but presumably contained the promised praise]	(4:34) So, now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise, exalt, and glorify the King of Heaven, all of whose works are just and whose ways are right.…

[Translation of Harran stele follows Oppenheim, *ANET* 562–63, with minor changes; translation of *Prayer of Nabonidus* follows Collins, "Prayer of Nabonidus"; translation of Daniel 4 follows the NJPS]

THE EMERGENCE OF ARAMAIC AND HEBREW SCHOLARLY TEXTS: TRANSMISSION AND TRANSLATION OF ALIEN WISDOM

Mladen Popović
Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

1. *Introduction*

In his 2002 article on the beginnings of Jewish interest in natural science, Philip Alexander refers to David Ruderman's monograph *Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe* that addresses the matter of Jewish attitudes towards and involvement in science.[1] Before discussing the modern period, Ruderman briefly surveys the Middle Ages, but he leaves antiquity untouched. In his article, Alexander therefore extends the scope of the survey by looking further back in time. He covers late antiquity and the rabbinic sources, and Hellenistic and early Roman Judaism, and argues that sometime in the late Persian period "Jews for the first time became interested in producing scientific models of the workings of the natural world," with the Enochic *Astronomical Book* especially marking "a turning-point in Jewish intellectual history—the emergence…of what might properly be called a scientific attitude."[2]

The Enochic *Astronomical Book* harkens back to Mesopotamian precursors from the late second and first half of the first millennium B.C.E., adapting these to its own needs.[3] The early Enochic corpus is an important source of evidence for our knowledge of the nature and

[1] David B. Ruderman, *Jewish Thought and Scientific Discovery in Early Modern Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 1.

[2] Philip S. Alexander, "Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 223–43 (240).

[3] See most recently Henryk Drawnel, "Moon Computation in the *Aramaic Astronomical Book*," *RevQ* 23/89 (2007): 3–41; Jonathan Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in their Ancient Context* (STDJ 78; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

context of early Jewish scientific interests. A little later, in the early second century B.C.E., Ben Sira represents another, albeit negative, source, as he apparently wished to defend traditional Hebrew wisdom against, on the one hand, Jewish apocalyptic interests in the mysteries of heaven and earth, exemplified by the early Enochic texts in particular but also by other texts, and, on the other hand, Greek science.[4] The Dead Sea Scrolls are a third important source, as they provide not only original Aramaic versions of the early Enochic writings in manuscripts that range in date from the middle of the third century B.C.E. until the early first century C.E. but also other Jewish texts that continued a form of calendar science in that tradition during the same period, in addition to concrete astronomical, astrological and physiognomic lists. Due to the date and nature of our sources, our approach to early Jewish scientific interests must be diachronic. In my contribution, I wish to extend Alexander's discussion of ancient Jewish science by taking into account some of the texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus along with the Enochic material.[5]

A fascinating feature of the manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls is that the oldest examples of Jewish scientific writings were discovered among them. In light of the overwhelming religious character of the texts from Qumran, it appears all the more remarkable to find compositions there that were not framed by a religious interest in divine, eschatological judgement, as is the case with the Enochic and apocalyptic material.[6] Furthermore, we are dealing with texts that, as far as we can tell, were not inspired or influenced by so-called scriptural examples, as is the case for almost all other texts from Qumran.

In this paper, I will address two main questions. First, what was the context of the transmission of scholarly knowledge in Second Temple

---

[4] See, e.g., Jeremy Corley, "Wisdom versus Apocalyptic and Science in Sirach 1,1–10," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 269–85.

[5] Upon finishing my paper, Jonathan Ben-Dov kindly sent me his article "Scientific Writings in Aramaic and Hebrew at Qumran: Translation and Concealment," in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran at Aix en Provence 30 June–2 July 2008* (ed. K. Berthelot and D. Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming). We deal with similar issues but maintain different points of view.

[6] The distinction between the religious and the scientific is perhaps anachronistic but nevertheless important to make from an etic perspective; see further below.

Judaism? Second, what evidence is there that the Qumran texts are translations of Babylonian or Hellenistic precursors?

Regarding the context of transmission, I will focus first and foremost on the literary context: what textual formats or genres of scientific writings are attested? And what sort of authorial strategies did ancient Jewish scholars pursue? In my contribution, I will divide the Jewish texts from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods that show a scientific interest into two categories: on the one hand, scientific material that has been framed or reworked into other writings such as apocalyptic texts and, on the other hand, those Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran that provide manuscript evidence for "actual" scholarly/scientific texts. If we take into account the scientists or scholars behind these texts we must also deal with two categories of authorial strategies. First, ancient Jewish scholars who presented themselves in the authorial and authoritative guise of important figures from the distant past to whom divine revelations concerning scientific knowledge were made. Second, Jewish scholars who remained completely anonymous and also invisible, as some texts seem to lack an authorial voice.

With regard to what evidence there is that the Qumran texts are translations of Babylonian or Hellenistic precursors, I will focus on a specific case study of the Aramaic manuscript 4Q561 and the Hebrew manuscript 4Q186 and address the relationship between these two manuscripts, paying particular attention to the issue of Aramaic as a medium of transmission of Babylonian scientific learning to the West.

A third issue needs to be raised at the end of my article that relates to this second issue of Aramaic as a medium of Babylonian scientific learning, namely, that of the cultural locus of scientific interests in ancient Judaism. In which context was scientific learning transmitted? Moreover, if Babylonian precursors of specific types of learning can be assumed, is it also possible to determine more specifically how Jews could have become acquainted with these? In short, how did Babylonian science become known to Jews in the Second Temple period?

Before I turn to discuss the transmission of scientific knowledge, both in the Enochic writings and in the scholarly lists from the Dead Sea Scrolls, I will first address the character of ancient Jewish science, as it is known from the Enochic corpus.

2. *The Origin and Character of Enochic Science: Alien Wisdom and Religious Ethics*

As regards Enochic astronomical science and for that matter the calendrical, astrological and physiognomic texts from Qumran, we are dealing with the appropriation of "alien wisdom," to borrow a phrase from Arnaldo Momigliano.[7]

Scholars have rightly pointed to a Mesopotamian background for the astronomical aspects of the Enochic *Astronomical Book* (*1 En.* 72–82).[8] Qumran calendar texts that use elements of a Babylonian lunar system further strengthen the supposition that the transmission of scientific ideas into Second Temple period Judaism had a Babylonian origin.[9] For certain elements of cosmography and geography in the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 En.* 1–36), however, a Greek background in addition to a Mesopotamian one is also possible.[10] The astrological and physiognomic texts from Qumran may also have a Hellenistic background in addition to a Babylonian one.[11]

I will not go into detail now regarding the nature and level of astronomical learning behind the Enochic *Astronomical Book* and the calendrical texts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls that derive from the Enochic tradition. From the perspective of the history of science, these ancient Jewish texts have frequently been dismissed as primitive

---

[7] Cf. Arnaldo Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975). See also Alexander, "Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," 232.

[8] See, e.g., Otto Neugebauer, "The 'Astronomical' Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72 to 82)," in *The Book of Enoch* or *1 Enoch: A New English Edition* (ed. M. Black; SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 386–414 (387, 394–95); Matthias Albani, *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube: Untersuchungen zum astronomischen Henochbuch* (WMANT 68; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1994), 155–72; Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*. For the Mesopotamian background of other features see James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988).

[9] Cf. Jonathan Ben-Dov and Wayne Horowitz, "The Babylonian Lunar Three in Calendrical Scrolls from Qumran," *ZA* 95 (2005): 104–20.

[10] Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 61–62, 279–89; Kelley Coblentz Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen"* (JSJSup 81; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 231–57.

[11] Mladen Popović, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (STDJ 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

or irrelevant. Although, for example, the authors of the calendrical texts were interested in the harmony created by the conduct of the heavenly luminaries, and tracing and appreciating this harmony did require a certain measure of astronomical and arithmetic capability, they were not committed to the standards of observation and prediction that were prevalent in contemporary Babylonian and Graeco-Roman societies.[12]

On the contrary, the Jewish scholars behind Enochic astronomy continued to use a Babylonian astronomical model from the end of the second millennium and the first half of the first millennium B.C.E., the so-called Enūma Anu Enlil and MUL.APIN-type astronomy that was long outdated in terms of astronomical and mathematical sophistication in Babylonia itself in the latter half of the first millennium. As Jonathan Ben-Dov has recently emphasized in his excellent treatment of astronomical and calendrical science in *1 Enoch* and the Dead Sea Scrolls: "The Jewish 'astronomers' emulated Mul.Apin's teaching as part of their religious worldview, adapting it to fit their unique needs by fashioning a more schematically-oriented discipline characterized by a specific emphasis on heptadic-based numbers"; and the Jewish astronomical and calendrical texts "gradually became detached from observation and inclined towards over-schematization."[13] Jewish scholars in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods do not seem to have significantly updated this astronomical learning to reflect advances in contemporary Babylonian and Hellenistic astronomy, although knowledge of late Babylonian moon computations, the so-called Lunar Three, seems to be presupposed in some calendrical texts from Qumran. However, it still represents the nonmathematical astronomy as opposed to the sophisticated late Babylonian mathematical astronomy.

The origin of scientific learning may thus have come from outside Jewish Palestine but, as Ben-Dov has argued, "the emulation of this knowledge in Jewish circles led to a new synthesis, perceptibly different from the main streams of astronomical teaching existent in Babylonia, Greece, Egypt, and India."[14] The result was a new synthesis not

---

[12] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 3, 181–82.

[13] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 3, 196. Cf. also Michael O. Wise, "Observations on New Calendrical Texts from Qumran," in *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine* (JSPSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 222–39 (229).

[14] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 1.

just in terms of astronomical and calendrical science but also in terms of a new worldview where human understanding and divine judgement came together in a manner that had not been seen before in Jewish tradition.

3. *The Transmission of Scientific Knowledge*

Scholars have regarded Jewish interests in natural science and the cosmos and its workings as an integral part of Enochic literature and other apocalyptic texts in which lists of revealed things play a central role. That literature would evince the belief that esoteric knowledge concerning man, nature and the cosmos did not remain hidden for all of humankind but was revealed to some special individuals through heavenly mediation. The scientific interest, however, did not stand alone but went hand in hand with a cosmological understanding that saw the laws of nature and the law of God as different sides of the same coin. An incorrect understanding of the workings of the cosmos implied a transgression of the rules laid down by God and led to judgement at an eschatological moment in time. Thus, scientific and religious interests were combined in these apocalyptic texts.

However, the textual format of scientific texts from Qumran differs strikingly from the apocalyptic framework of Enochic science. The Enochic interest in divine, eschatological judgement is an aspect that is conspicuously lacking in scientific texts from Qumran, such as 4Q186, 4Q317, 4Q318 and 4Q561.

May we then conclude that these texts from Qumran provide us with a glimpse of a scientific interest that did stand alone? Probably not. It cannot be assumed that there was a notion in antiquity that natural science was a separate domain of intellectual inquiry, as there is in the modern period.[15] It is therefore an anachronism to argue for a separate domain of scientific inquiry in Second Temple period Judaism.[16] Although an evident apocalyptic framework is lacking in 4Q186, 4Q317, 4Q318 and 4Q561, the interest in the knowledge contained in these texts may very well have been rooted in a cosmological under-

[15] However, it is possible that in Babylonia a mathematical astronomical interest may have existed purely for its own sake. Cf. Noel M. Swerdlow, *The Babylonian Theory of the Planets* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 174.

[16] On a division between the "scientific" and "religious" aspects in Enochic and Babylonian sources that is too strict and too simplistic, see also the discussion in Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 276–78.

standing that saw laws of nature and the law of God as different sides of the same coin.

However, it is often stated that all texts from Qumran should be characterized as "religious" in nature,[17] yet I believe that we should not simply use that label in an unqualified sense for 4Q186, 4Q317, 4Q318 and 4Q561. The understanding that the Qumran collection is a religious library and that most of the texts are of a religious nature goes hand in hand with the conclusion that these texts were inspired or influenced by other religious texts, namely the Scriptures. However, I would argue that this is not the case with the scientific texts from Qumran. We cannot discern any scriptural exemplar for these texts and the specific form in which they were transmitted. These texts stand, therefore, somewhat apart from the other compositions from Qumran—but not completely of course, given the Enochic astronomical and calendrical texts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

3.1. *Cosmology and Ethics: The Authoritative Figure of Enoch as Authorial Guise*

The antediluvian figure of Enoch was a crucial authorial guise adopted in certain Jewish circles to allow people to express and justify their scientific interests in the workings of the cosmos. It seems that others regarded cosmological speculations at best indifferently and ignored them altogether, or they opposed them, as did Ben Sira and others. At around the turn of the second century B.C.E., people transmitting texts such as the Enochic *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of the Watchers* may have been opposed to someone like Ben Sira who was critical of investigations into realms of knowledge that had not been revealed for all to see, as opposed to the revealed exoteric wisdom transmitted by himself.

The stance of Job is exemplary in this regard. The divine speeches at the end of the book (38–41) emphasize the incapacity of humans to fathom the intricate workings of nature:

> Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth? Tell me, if you have understanding. Who determined its measurements—surely you know! Or who stretched the line upon it? On what were its bases sunk,

[17] See, e.g., in this volume, Florentino García Martínez, "Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The "Voice of the Teacher" as an Authority-Conferring Strategy in Some Qumran Texts," 228.

> or who laid its cornerstone when the morning stars sang together and all the heavenly beings shouted for joy? (Job 38:4–7, NRSV)

Early in the second century B.C.E., Ben Sira follows the position taken in the book of Job, admonishing his audience to keep away from cosmological speculation:

> Things too difficult for you do not seek, and things too strong for you do not scrutinize. The things that have been prescribed to you, think about these, for you have no need of hidden matters. (Sir. 3:21–22)[18]

However, the type of questions God asks Job resurface in the *Epistle of Enoch*, and there the answer is not negative.[19] The *Epistle* rhetorically asks:

> For who is there of all the sons of men who is able to hear the words of the Holy One and not be terrified; and who is able to think his thoughts? And who is there of all men who is able to look at all the works of heaven?…Or to ascend and see all their ends, and to consider them or make (something) like them? Or who is there of all men who is able to know what is the width and the length of the earth; and to whom has the size of all them been shown? And who is there of all men who is able to know the length of the heavens, and what is their height and upon what they are founded? And what is the number of stars, and where all the luminaries rest? (*1 En.* 93:11–14)[20]

The answer to this question is, of course: Enoch. The authors of the early Enochic texts took their cue from Gen 5:21–24 by "exploiting a narrative lacuna," Alexander says, "as a way of legitimating new teaching."[21] In Gen 5:24 we read: "Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him." Unlike the other antediluvian figures, Enoch is not said to have died. According to the Enochic writers, Enoch was taken on a cosmic tour, guided by the angel Uriel,

---

[18] Translation from Benjamin G. Wright, "Sirach," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 722.

[19] See already Michael E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (ed. F. M. Cross, Jr., W. E. Lemke and P. D. Miller; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), 414–52; Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 6.

[20] Translation from George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 143.

[21] Alexander, "Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," 233. Alexander also points to the biblical wisdom tradition contained in Proverbs 8 that may have provided justification for the Enochic circles in their scientific endeavours (237–38).

leader of the luminaries, who revealed to him all the workings of the universe. Towards the end of the journey, Uriel says to Enoch:

> Enoch, I have now shown you everything, and I have revealed everything to you so that you may see this sun and this moon and those who lead the stars of the sky and all those who turn them—their work, their times, and their emergences. (*1 En.* 80:1)[22]

The angelic revelation regarding the mysteries of heaven and earth is passed on not only to Enoch but to others as well. Enoch instructs his son Methuselah, whom he then orders to preserve and transmit this knowledge further:

> And now, my son Methuselah, all these things I am recounting to you and writing down for you! And I have revealed to you everything, and given you books concerning all these: so preserve, my son Methuselah, the books from your father's hand, and (see) that you deliver them to the generations of the world. (*1 En.* 82:1)[23]

Thus, the authors of the Enochic writings presented themselves as part of an antediluvian and authoritative tradition. In other texts, Enoch was regarded as the inventor of astronomy. For example, Pseudo-Eupolemus (dated prior to the first century B.C.E.) tells how Abraham taught astronomy and other sciences to the Egyptians when he dwelt with the Egyptian priests in Heliopolis, but that he credited Enoch as being the inventor of astrology:

> Abraham lived in Heliopolis with the Egyptian priests and taught them much: He explained astrology and the other sciences to them, saying that the Babylonians and he himself had obtained this knowledge. However, he attributed the discovery of them to Enoch. Enoch first discovered astrology, not the Egyptians.… The Greeks say that Atlas discovered astrology. However, Atlas is the same as Enoch. The son of Enoch was Methuselah. He learned everything through the angels of God, and so knowledge came to us. (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.17.2–9)[24]

Here too astrological knowledge is ascribed a divine and antediluvian origin. In this respect, and there are other overlaps, the Jewish figure of Enoch resembles the figure of Enmeduranki from the Mesopotamian tradition. In the Mesopotamian tradition, the sciences are primordial antediluvian knowledge. The Neo-Assyrian *Enmeduranki-text*

---

[22] Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 110.
[23] Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 113.
[24] Translation from Robert Doran, *OTP* 2:881.

tells that the gods Šamaš and Adad taught Enmeduranki, the antediluvian king of Sippar, the practice of oil and liver divination, astrology and related mathematics. Enmeduranki transmitted the secrets that Šamaš and Adad taught him to the men of Nippur, Sippar and Babylon, presumably the few learned ones.[25] The text presents knowledge of divination practices as originating with the gods and being transmitted to the scholars through the king. However, beyond the narrative setting of the king and his learned entourage for the transmission of this learned and divine knowledge, the *Enmeduranki-text*, like *1 Enoch*, also envisages a family setting for the teaching of and instruction in the sciences. The *Enmeduranki-text* gives instructions to the master-initiate for educating his son in the knowledge and rites of the diviner. It says:

> …the learned savant, who guards the secret of the great gods, will bind by oath before Šamaš and Adad by tablet and stylus the son whom he loves and will teach him.[26]

In Mesopotamia, the scribal craft was an occupation passed down from father to son, especially when it came to the sophisticated level of Babylonian divination and sciences. The family here, however, need not necessarily be understood in a strict biological sense but rather as an expression of the relationship between teacher and pupil.

In Hellenistic and early Roman Judaism the authoritative figure of Enoch[27] was crucial for justifying an interest in cosmological matters. This may have to do with the fact that the nature of that knowledge was new to Jewish tradition, and that a venerable figure from the past would ease any suspicion there may have been about the import of alien wisdom.[28] The figure of Enoch was thus used as an authorial and authoritative guise for the transmission of new cosmological lore.

---

[25] After this point the text is somewhat confused. It repeats the things Enmeduranki taught the learned men of the three cities, adding, however, astrology and related mathematics. See W. G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," *JCS* 21 (1967): 126–38; Wilfred G. Lambert, "The Qualifications of Babylonian Diviners," in *Festschrift für Rykle Borger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Mai 1994: tikip santakki mala bašmu…* (ed. S. M. Maul; CM 10; Groningen: Styx, 1998), 141–58.

[26] Lambert, "Qualifications of Babylonian Diviners," 152. See also Herman L. J. Vanstiphout and Niek Veldhuis, "Ṭuppi ilāni takāltu pirišti šamê u erṣetim," *AIUON* 55 (1995): 30–32.

[27] On which Ben Sira also agreed, see Sir 44:16.

[28] Cf. also Alexander, "Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," 232.

In contrast to the Mesopotamian and Graeco-Roman traditions, where we know of individual scholars, no Jewish scientist from the Second Temple period is known by name, with perhaps one exception from Babylonia, which I will come back to in the final part of my article. Thus, the authors of the Enochic literature remained anonymous; they attributed their knowledge pseudepigraphically to distant figures of the past such as Enoch. However, this does not mean that the "I" of the author is the same as the "I" in the text. The introduction to the *Book of the Watchers*, one of the early Enochic writings and the opening to *1 Enoch* in its final form, makes this clear when it says that he, Enoch, took up his parable, after which the text changes into the first person singular, reproducing Enoch's words (*1 En.* 1:2). In addition, in a section concerning sacred geography in the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 En.* 17–19) the speculative nature of the knowledge makes it clear that the authorial guise of Enoch the traveller can not be related to a real traveller:

> And they took me (and) led (me) away to a certain place in which those who were there were like a flaming fire; and whenever they wished they appeared as human beings. And they led me away to a dark place and to a mountain whose summit reached to heaven.… And they led me away to the living waters and to the fire of the west, which provides all the sunsets.… And I departed (for) where no human walks.… I saw the foundation of the earth and the cornerstone of the earth: I saw the four winds bearing the earth and the firmament of heaven. And I saw how the winds stretch out the height of heaven. They stand between heaven and earth; they are the pillars of heaven.… I saw at the ends of the earth the firmament of heaven above.… And beyond these mountains is a place, the edge of the great earth; there the heavens come to an end.… And Uriel said to me, 'There stand the angels who mingled with the women. And their spirits—having assumed many forms—bring destruction on man and lead them astray to sacrifice to demons as to gods until the day of the great judgment, in which they will be judged with finality. And the wives of the transgressing angels will become sirens.' Beyond this chasm I saw a place where there was neither firmament of heaven above, nor firmly founded earth beneath it. Neither was there water on it, nor bird; but the place was desolate and fearful. There I saw seven stars like great burning mountains. To me, when I inquired about them, the angel said, 'This place is the end of heaven and earth; this has become a prison for the stars and the hosts of heaven. The stars that are rolling over in the fire, these are they that transgressed the command of the Lord in the beginning of their rising, for they did not come out in their appointed times. And he was angry with them and bound them until the time of the consummation of their sins—ten thousand years.' I, Enoch,

> alone saw the visions, the extremities of all things. And no one among humans has seen as I saw. (*1 En.* 17–19)[29]

The "I" in the text is Enoch, who has seen what no one has ever seen (*1 En.* 19:3), and the tour involves places to which no man can travel (*1 En.* 17:5). Thus, contrary to, for example, Graeco-Roman geographical treatises such as those by Pausanias or Mela, the writers of the Enochic geography do not appear to be travellers themselves. This is impossible as we are dealing with a mythical geography, comparable to a certain extent to the part in the epic of Gilgameš where, lamenting the death of his friend Enkidu, Gilgameš travels to the end of the world and beyond to pass where no mortal creature can pass.

However, as the passage quoted above shows, the figure of Enoch is not only a transmitter of revealed knowledge about cosmic geography and astronomy, but he is also interested in the divine judgement over the seven planets that erred. Alexander has rightly emphasized that Enochic "science" is mirrored by Enochic "ethics"; cosmology went together with knowledge of divine judgement. Knowledge of the mysteries of heaven and earth had an eschatological side to it. Thus, in Enochic tradition, scientific knowledge was not passed on to future generations for the progress of science. Far from it. Enochic astronomy emulated older forms of Babylonian astronomy but did not advance astronomy in a scientific manner. Scientific knowledge was passed on not for sake of science itself but for religious reasons related to Enochic ethics and the anticipation of divine judgement.[30]

Therefore, what we have in the Enochic writings is the framing and reworking of scientific material, adapted from older and outdated Babylonian precursors, into a Jewish apocalyptic context. Ancient Jewish scientists thus presented themselves in the authorial guise of an important figure from the distant past to whom divine revelations concerning scientific knowledge were made.

---

[29] Translation from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 38–40.

[30] However, it is possible that the scientific tradition represents an earlier literary development which was later put into the context of a message of impending judgement. It is very likely, for example, that the *Astronomical Book* functioned as a separate composition, in various forms, before it was incorporated into the Enochic writings. See, e.g., Alexander, "Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," 235–36; Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 69–118.

Another important pseudepigraphic figure to whom astrological knowledge was ascribed, although not framed in an apocalyptic context, is Abraham. This is clear from the reference by Pseudo-Eupolemus and others quoted above (Artapanus in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.18.1; Pseudo-Eupolemus in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.18.2; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.167–168). However, more important are the references by non-Jewish authors to astrological books attributed to Abraham. Scholars have tended to overlook these, but Reimund Leicht has drawn attention to them and argued that astrological literature in Abraham's name, originating from Alexandrian Judaism, circulated in antiquity.[31] There are two interesting points to take note of from Leicht's discussion. First, Leicht argues that the fact that non-Jewish astrological scholars quoted this Abrahamic astrological literature shows scholarly acceptance of these Jewish astrological traditions amongst non-Jews, and this scholarly acceptance continued for quite some time: Vettius Valens (second century C.E.)/Firmicus Maternus (fourth century C.E.). Second, there are no traceable direct influences of this astrological Abraham literature in Judaism. Apart from the references in Jewish sources to Abraham as an astrological teacher, we cannot find a trace of his actual teaching in Jewish texts. A question that Leicht does not address is whether there was anything particularly Jewish about the astrological teachings ascribed to Abraham. As far as we can tell from the quotations from Vettius Valens and Firmicus Maternus, there was not. Nonetheless, ascribing the teachings to Abraham could have made Jewish astrology, or what was perceived as such, respectable in the eyes of non-Jews.

3.2. *Non-Enochic Aramaic and Hebrew Scientific Writings from Qumran: 4Q186, 4Q317, 4Q318 and 4Q561*

The Dead Sea Scrolls have provided us with the original Aramaic versions of the early Enochic writings and other Jewish texts that continued a form of calendar science in the same tradition. However, the Dead Sea Scrolls have also brought to light unique manuscript evidence for astronomical, astrological and physiognomic lists that do not belong to the Enochic tradition in a strict sense, although perhaps the same circle of scribes and scholars may have been responsible for

[31] Reimund Leicht, *Astrologumena Judaica: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der astrologischen Literatur der Juden* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 11–17.

their transmission. In terms of authorial strategies, these manuscripts add important evidence that modifies some of what has been said thus far concerning the transmission of scientific learning in Second Temple Judaism. However, let us first turn to the texts themselves, without going into the details of their content. The focus is on the textual format of these compositions.

The Hebrew manuscript of 4Q186 dates paleographically to the turn of our era (30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.). In its original state, this scroll would have been an impressive physiognomic-astrological catalogue combining different forms of learning (physiognomics, astrology and possibly medicine and magic) and drawing connections between different elements of the cosmos with the aims of ordering and understanding these relationships and discovering the means to influence them. The textual format is clearly that of a list.

The second column of the first fragment is an example of this:
4Q186 1 ii:

1. [ ]…unclean
2. [ ] a granite stone
3. [ ] a bli[nd (?)] man
4. (and) lo]ng, …[…]…sec[re]t parts (?)
5. and his thighs are long and slender, and his toes are
6. slender and long. And he is from the second column.
7. There is a spirit for him in the house of light (of) six (parts), and three (parts) in the house of
8. darkness. And this is the horoscope under which he was born:
9. in the foot of *Taurus*. He will be humble, and this is his animal: *Taurus*.

The Hebrew manuscript of 4Q317, written in the so-called Cryptic A script, has not yet been formally published—only a photograph was published in DJD 28—but Carbon-14 dating has determined that the date of the manuscript lies sometime in the second half of the second century B.C.E.[32]

4Q317 deals with the phases of the moon but shows no sign of aligning these with the signs of the zodiac, as is the case in 4Q318. A

[32] A. J. Timothy Jull et al., "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995): 11–19 (14); Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 523.

practical, observational background for the computations in 4Q317 is debatable. According to Ben-Dov, 4Q317 is "a purely schematic treatise which possesses no bearing on empirical observations of the moon," whereas Jean-Claude Dubs argues that the text's lunar model was used in a practical way to determine lunar phases.[33] Nevertheless, the text's format is evidently that of a list, which the many scribal interventions further support. Unlike other calendrical texts from Qumran, a religious orientation is not readily apparent; for example, no priestly rosters are attested to in this text and festival days or Sabbaths are not mentioned.[34] We will look at 4Q317 1 + 1a ii as an example of this:

1. [On the fourth of the month, eleve]n parts [are obscured. And thus the moon enters the day.]
2. [On the f]ifth of the month, [tw]elve [parts are obscured.]
3. And thus [the moon enters the day. On the sixth of the month,]
4. thir[teen] parts are obscured. [And thus the moon enters the day.]
5. On the seventh of the month, [fourteen parts] are obscur[ed. And thus
6. the moon enters the day. *vacat*
7. On the eighth of the month, the moon [rules all the day in the midst]
8. of the sky [fourteen-and-one-half (?) being obscured. And when the sun sets,] all its light [ceases]
9. to be obscured, [and thus the moon begins to be revealed]
10. on the first day of the week. *vacat* [On the ninth of the month,]
11. on[e] part [is revealed. And thus the moon enters the night.]
12. On the tenth of the month, [two parts are revealed. And thus the moon enters]
13. the night. *vacat* On the ele[venth of the month three parts are revealed]
14. And thus the moon enters the night. *vacat*[35]

The Aramaic text 4Q318 was copied at around the turn of the era. The text consists of two parts: a *selenodromion* and a *brontologion*. The *selenodromion* describes the synodic movement of the moon through

[33] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 144; Jean-Claude Dubs, "4Q317 et le rôle de l'observation de la Pleine Lune pour la détermination du temps à Qoumrân," in *Le Temps et les Temps dans les littératures juives et chrétiennes au tournant de notre ère* (ed. C. Grappe and J.-C. Ingelaere; JSJSup 112; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 37–54.

[34] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 144–46, takes it as the first text in which the triennial cycle is adopted, predating and having influenced other calendrical texts from Qumran. He also understands 4Q317 to be a sectarian manuscript (145–46).

[35] Translation from Martin Abegg, *DSSR* 4:59.

the zodiac during twelve months of thirty days each, counting a 360-day year, as in Mesopotamian tradition.[36] The *brontologion* has predictions for when it thunders, presumably at the moment when the moon is in one of the signs:

> (Month of) Shevat (January–February). On (day) 1 and 2 Pisces; on 3 and 4 Aries; on 5, 6 and 7 Taurus; on 8 and 9 Gemini; on 10 and 11 Cancer; on 12, 13 and 14 Leo; on 15 and 16 Virgo; on 17 and 18 Libra; on 19, 20 and 21 Scorpio; on 22 and 23 Sagittarius; on 24 and 25 Capricorn; on 26, 27 and 28 Aquarius; on 29 and 30 Pisces.
> (Month of) Adar (February–March). On 1 and on 2 Aries. On 3 and on 4 Taurus. On 5, on 6 and on 7 Gemini. On 8 and on 9 Cancer. On 10 and on 11 Leo. On 12, on 13 and on 14 Virgo. On 15 and on 16 Libra. On 17 {and} on 18 Scorpio. On 19, on 20 and {on 21} Sagittarius. On 22 and on 23 Capricorn. On 24 and on 25 Aquarius. On 26, on 27 and on 28 Pisces. On 29 and on 30 Aries. (4Q318, fragment 2, column I, lines 4–9 and column II, lines 1–6)
> [When it thunders in Taurus] there shall be a siege against […] labour for the province and a sword at the court of the king, and in the province of […] shall be. For the Arabs […] famine. They shall plunder from one another.
> When it thunders in Gemini there shall be fear and sickness, because of strangers and […] (4Q318 fragment 2, column II, lines 6–9)

This sort of text appears both in the Babylonian and Graeco-Roman astrological traditions. It is readily apparent that the text is in the form of a list and completely lacking any authorial voice.

Our final evidence of a "purely scientific" text from Qumran is the Aramaic manuscript 4Q561, which I have dated according to the Cross dating to about 50 and 25 B.C.E., although in the recent DJD publication Émile Puech prefers a slightly earlier date of the first half of the first century B.C.E.[37] 4Q561 was a physiognomic catalogue that listed the physical descriptions of different types of people.[38]

---

[36] The lunar course, assuming a daily lunar velocity of 13;35,10°, has a schematic pattern: 2–2–3; 2–2–3; 2–2–3; 2–2–3; 2. After twenty-eight days the moon has traversed all twelve zodiacal signs and returns on the last two days to the sign in which it began. Thus, the moon begins each new month in another sign. Curiously, the cycle begins with the sign of *Taurus* and not with *Aries*. This has not yet been satisfactorily explained.

[37] Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 58–59; É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie (4Q550–4Q575a, 4Q580–4Q587)* (DJD 37; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 306–7.

[38] Unfortunately, Puech has retained the misnomer 4QHoroscope ar in DJD 37 due to his misunderstanding of the text's genre. He states that 4Q186 has the charac-

From the few remaining fragments of 4Q561, it is again evident that we are dealing with a list, its style terse and succinct. This is clear from the following example (4Q561 1 i):

1. his [hairlo]cks will be mingled and not very abundant, hi[s] eyes
2. between light and dark-coloured. His nose will be long
3. [and] beautiful, and his teeth even. And his beard
4. will be thin [but] not too much so. His limbs
5. [will be s]mooth[and]be[tween t]hin and thic[k][39]

Having briefly reviewed these four texts from Qumran, I have a simple and obvious point to make, which is that there is a clear lack of an authorial "I." This is perhaps not so strange because these texts are in the form of a list. They are similar in this respect to the numerous lists of Babylonian omen literature as well as to the astrological lists collected in the *Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum*.

From the perspective of authorial strategy, however, it is important to stress the lack of an authorial and authoritative voice in these texts. Scholars have deduced from the Enochic texts the lists of revealed things in apocalyptic literature and, from opponents to cosmological speculations such as those of Ben Sira, that in certain Jewish circles the figure of Enoch was used as an authorial and authoritative guise, framing the transmission of new cosmological lore and justifying interest in such cosmological matters. The "purely scientific" manuscripts from Qumran add a new perspective and compel us to qualify this reconstruction of the context of ancient Jewish scientific interests. The apparent lack of an attribution to a pseudepigraphic figure as an authorial and authoritative voice in 4Q186, 4Q317, 4Q318 and 4Q561

---

teristics of a horoscope and that 4Q561 is closely related to 4Q186 but more difficult to classify as a horoscope. Nevertheless, the designation of "horoscope" can be used because the physiognomic descriptions of the body are the basis for predictions and Puech refers to *Jub.* 11:8, but that hardly makes his reasoning any more intelligible; see DJD 37:304. There are no clear and indisputable references to zodiacal signs or other astrological notions. 4Q561 lacks important elements, even more than 4Q186, a text also wrongly referred to as a horoscope, which would qualify it as belonging to the genre of horoscopes as known from antiquity. Perhaps it is better to say it has no such elements whatsoever. The misnomer 4QHoroscope ar can therefore not be understood by scholars outside the field of Scrolls studies.

[39] Cf. *Reading the Human Body*, 61 and Puech, DJD 37:308.

indicates that scientific interests did not need such justification. They could very well do without it.[40]

However, compared to the authorial strategy discussed earlier, which was used in the Enochic texts, two more striking features should be noted. First, the "purely scientific" manuscripts from Qumran were not framed by a religious interest in divine, eschatological judgement, as is the case with the Enochic and apocalyptic material.[41] The Qumran lists are more elaborate and explicit than the apocalyptic lists of revealed things and more complex than the simple arithmetical scheme in the *Astronomical Book* of *1 Enoch*. If, from a comparative perspective, we take into account the Babylonian omen lists, which were one of the means for recording scientific discourse in Mesopotamia, the occurrence of a similar genre of so-called *Listenwissenschaft*[42] puts the Jewish scientific interests in a different, perhaps more scholarly context than if the Enochic and apocalyptic material is alone taken into account. It is unnecessary to conclude that the subject matter was religious, in the sense of an "interest in divine, eschatological judgement," to understand fully what is going on in these scholarly lists from Qumran. These Qumran texts do not presuppose a concomitant ethical and eschatological aspect as is found in the Enochic writings.

Second, the astrological texts 4Q186 and 4Q318 demonstrate that during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, Jews in Palestine were

---

[40] In addition to the astrological books attributed to Abraham (see n. 31 above), the *Treatise of Shem* is an interesting example of a text with a pseudepigraphic framework for astrological lore. However, it seems unlikely that this composition dates to the late Second Temple period. See James H. Charlesworth, "Treatise of Shem," *OTP* 1:473–86; Alessandro Mengozzi, *Trattato di Sem e altri testi astrologici* (TVOa 7, LSc 1; Brescia: Paideia, 1997); James H. Charlesworth, *Die Schrift des Sem* (JSHRZ-NF 2.9; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 2005); and especially Leicht, *Astrologumena Judaica*, 36, 45–55, who offers important new manuscript evidence from the Cairo Genizah, and argues for a seventh-century C.E. dating for the redaction of these Palestinian Aramaic texts. In addition, like the Mandaic *Book of the Zodiac* (cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 111), the *Treatise of Shem* stands much closer to Greek astrological traditions, probably even going back to a Greek original, than can be ascertained for the Qumran astrological texts. Together with the weak arguments for a first-century B.C.E. dating, this points to a late antique or early medieval origin for the *Treatise of Shem* (sixth–seventh century).

[41] Of course, due to the fragmentary nature of our evidence one cannot rule out that in the original manuscripts this technical material in the form of lists was incorporated in a similar framework as in *1 Enoch*, but this cannot be proven and is also not a necessary condition for making sense of these texts.

[42] See most recently Markus Hilgert, "Von ‚Listenwissenschaft' und ‚epistemischen Dingen': Konzeptuelle Annäherungen an altorientalische Wissenspraktiken," *J. Gen. Philos. Sci.* 40/2 (2009): 277–309.

interested in contemporary scientific knowledge and not just in "outdated" forms of Mesopotamian astronomy as found in the *Astronomical Book*. These texts demonstrate that contemporary scientific notions, such as that of the zodiac, which was developed sometime in the fifth century, and the combination of physiognomics and astrology, which we possibly already find in the Persian period and certainly from the Hellenistic period onwards, found their way into Jewish society during that period. These two elements represent developments that post-date the older astronomical science in MUL.APIN that was emulated in the Enochic *Astronomical Book* and the calendrical texts from Qumran in that tradition.[43]

Although the authors remain anonymous and even without authorial voice, and are therefore invisible in the scholarly lists from Qumran, there is an intriguing possibility that the author, or rather the scribe, shows himself to us. For this, we need to look at the actual manuscripts, in this case 4Q186 and 4Q317. The manuscripts of 4Q186 and 4Q317 immediately catch the reader's attention due to the way they are written. Contrary to the regular direction of writing in Hebrew, 4Q186 is written from left to right. Characters from different scripts have also been used. In addition to the regular, so-called square script, the writer or copyist used ancient Hebrew, Greek and cryptic letters. These two features—inverted and mixed writing—make this text exceptional. There are no other known examples of Jewish texts written *entirely* in reversed order as well as in mixed scripts. The complete text of 4Q317 is written in the so-called Cryptic A script. Ben-Dov discusses this feature and concludes that it "appears that the achievements of the Jewish calendrical-astronomical discipline were so highly appreciated that they were restricted to the perusal of the properly-initiated scholars."[44] It is possible that the scribe used inverted and mixed writing in 4Q186 and the cryptic writing in 4Q317 simply to show off, to convey scribal pride, to guard the knowledge contained in the text, or perhaps to signal its special value. In other words, the scribal treatment may signal the cultural capital ascribed to these texts.[45] Nevertheless, that more or

[43] The zodiac was not developed before the fifth century B.C.E. It does not figure in the earlier Mesopotamian text MUL.APIN, which was the source for the *Astronomical Book*. The connection between astrology and physiognomics occurs first in Late Babylonian sources (*Esoteric Babylonian Commentary* and *LBAT* 1593) and Hellenistic astrology.

[44] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 146.

[45] Cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 227–31.

less similar scientific texts, such as the Aramaic astrological text 4Q318 and the Aramaic physiognomic text 4Q561, were not written in any "coded" manner should caution us to be too firm in our conclusions (see further below).

Concerning the transmission of scientific learning in Second Temple Judaism, the "purely scientific" texts from Qumran modify in an important way some of the things that have been said on the basis of the Enochic corpus and lists of revealed things in apocalyptic literature. Some of these texts incorporate newer, more contemporary forms of learning than the older MUL.APIN-type of astronomy seen in the Enochic *Astronomical Book*. Furthermore, the Qumran texts lack an apocalyptic framework as well as a pseudepigraphic figure that functions as an authoritative voice for the author, justifying the scholarly learning in these texts.

The context of the transmission of Aramaic and Hebrew scholarly traditions was not only determined by the textual formats and authorial strategies that were adopted, but was also, as I have said earlier, influenced by its alien origin, so to speak. Therefore, I turn now in more detail to the background of some of the learning encountered in the Qumran scientific texts and ask whether they represent translations of foreign scholarship. I will focus on the Aramaic text 4Q561 and the Hebrew text 4Q186.

4. *Translations of Foreign Wisdom: 4Q561, 4Q186 and Aramaic as a Medium of Transmission*

As all scholarly texts from Qumran date from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, a Hellenistic cultural background seems to suggest itself naturally. However, Babylonian influences on the Enochic forms of astronomy and its offshoots in the Qumran texts have rightly been emphasized. Moreover, it has been suggested that the westward transmission of scientific ideas from Babylonia occurred through Aramaic sources.[46]

---

[46] Cf. Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael Sokoloff, "Astrological and Related Omen Texts in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic," *JNES* 48 (1989): 201–14 (202); Alexander, "Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," 238–39. Ben-Dov ("Babylonian Science in West-Semitic Sources: The Case of Qumran," in *The Interactions of Ancient Astral Sciences* [ed. D. Brown; Bremen: Hempen, forthcoming]) has recently argued that concrete evidence for an Aramaic medium is lacking for the spread of scientific astronomy from Babylonia to Greece and Egypt, which seems to have been rendered

If I limit myself to the Aramaic text 4Q561 and the issue of cultural provenance, I must note that the matter cannot be resolved in this case. Generally speaking, the physiognomic traditions of Babylonia and Greece are different, but the remaining fragments of 4Q561 are too fragmentary and too general to argue for them exclusively originating from either tradition. As an Aramaic text, 4Q561 may very well have a Babylonian origin, but this cannot be proven. Like other Aramaic texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls[47] and the *Astronomical Book* of *1 Enoch*, which all have a Babylonian background, it is possible to conceive of a process of transmission of physiognomic lore from Mesopotamia against such a background. However, this does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that there was a Babylonian influence on 4Q561 and that physiognomic learning came to Palestine from Mesopotamia. Jewish culture in Palestine during the Hellenistic-Early Roman period was not influenced either by the East or by the West. It was not a matter of either/or, but rather, at times, of both.[48]

In the case of the Hebrew text 4Q186, however, its astrological framework points decisively to a Hellenistic background, as the horoscope (*molad*), meaning the ascendant (the point of the zodiac rising above the eastern horizon at the moment of birth), is of no importance at all in Babylonian horoscopy but is in the Greek.[49]

In addition to Ben-Dov, Leicht has also argued for the importance of Aramaic as a possible means of transmission of scholarly knowledge westwards.[50] As astrological texts from Qumran show affinities with both Babylonian (4Q318) and Hellenistic traditions (4Q186 and 4Q318, the latter because of the zodiacal names), one could perhaps suggest an Aramaic astrological tradition as a body of learning midway between Mesopotamia and Greece. As 4Q186 is a Hebrew text, it has been suggested that it may be a Hebrew translation of the Aramaic physiognomic text 4Q561.[51]

While Leicht does not reflect on the arguments for 4Q186 being a translation of 4Q561, Puech does so in his recent DJD edition of

---

immediately into Greek. In the case of celestial divination, however, Aramaic sources may have transmitted Babylonian lore.

[47] I also refer to the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242) in *Reading the Human Body*, 112. On the *Prayer of Nabonidus* see the contribution by Carol Newsom in this volume, and further below.

[48] Cf. also Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 258.

[49] Cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 123–25.

[50] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 259–66; Leicht, *Astrologumena Judaica*, 37–38.

[51] Cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 66; Leicht, *Astrologumena Judaica*, 27.

4Q561.[52] On the one hand, Puech acknowledges that astrological elements do not appear in the extant text and that 4Q561 is perhaps just a physiognomic composition. On the other hand, he surmises (1) that the lack of astrological elements may be the result of chance preservation, (2) that it is not impossible that 4Q561 2 6–7 is an astrological section ("and th]ree [toes] will go ou[t from…] to finish/finishing [his] y[ears…"), although the reading is not certain, as Puech admits, and it remains completely unclear what kind of astrological feature he is thinking of, and (3) that references to "spirit" (*ruaḥ*) and "house" (*bayit*) in 4Q561 3 9 and 6 2–4 may also suggest the possibility of an astrological context, although neither the reading "spirit"[53] nor the reading "house"[54] are certain, and the sense of Puech's reconstruction for 4Q561 6 4 ("a] hairy [man] from the house of") is unclear.

Referring to *Jub.* 11:8 ("And he [Nahor] grew up and dwelt in Ur among the Chaldeans, and his father taught him the researches of the Chaldeans in order to practice divination and astrology according to the signs of heaven"), Puech suggests that 4Q561 represents an Aramaic witness of the genre of Chaldean horoscopy, without being a pure and simple translation: Babylonian and Greek sources would have been used as prototypes. Never mind that the passage from *Jubilees* does not give any technical details about the nature of the divination and astrology that Nahor learned, 4Q561 does not look at all like the Babylonian horoscopes we have from antiquity, even if it were not a pure and simple translation. The textual form that Puech adduces, namely that of protases and apodoses, is not the textual format of the horoscopic genre but is typical of Babylonian omen literature in general. Add to that the complete lack of elements that normally appear in ancient horoscopes and there is no basis for interpreting 4Q561 as a horoscope. A further problem with Puech's interpretation of 4Q561 in his DJD edition is that he seems to impose elements we know from 4Q186[55] onto the Aramaic text and then concludes that the Hebrew text, which is younger in date, adapted in its own way the older Ara-

---

[52] Puech, DJD 37:303–5.

[53] 4Q561 3 9: בבית]לה[; ורוח 6 2:]ר.וח לה

[54] 4Q561 6 4:]שׁערן מן בית[. Cf. Starcky's reading:]שׁערן עבות[. See Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 272.

[55] Cf. Puech, DJD 37:304 n. 9: "4Q561 a conservé des mentions de 'l'esprit dans la maison de…'"; DJD 37:305: "sa place dans 'la colonne' et 'les maisons de lumière ou de ténèbres.'" But these phrases do not appear at all in this form in 4Q561. Cf. also DJD 37:318 for the translation of 4Q561 6 3.

maic text of 4Q561. The latter may very well be the case, but Puech's reasoning seems circular or not entirely clear, at least to me.

So how do the two texts of 4Q561 and 4Q186 relate to each other? Is the Hebrew text 4Q186 a translation of the Aramaic text 4Q561, as has often been stated? In my book *Reading the Human Body* I argued that there were no grounds for assuming that 4Q561 and 4Q186 represent the same literary composition.[56] The common background of the texts in physiognomic tradition, be that Babylonian or Hellenistic, could satisfactorily explain the similarities between both texts. Of course, it is possible that the original manuscript of 4Q561 had astrological elements, as Puech suggests, but to argue that 4Q561 is not just a physiognomic composition but also an astrological one is simply not borne out by the textual evidence at hand. With regard to the possible reading of "his spirit" or "he has a spirit" in 4Q561 6 2 (ר]וח לה), I cautioned that what is said about it cannot be surmised from the fragmentary text or from the phrase's presumed identity with 4Q186, where it occurs in combination with the phrases "house of light" and "house of darkness." In 4Q561, the column width means there is not enough space to reconstruct references to certain numbers in the "house of light" and the "house of darkness," as in 4Q186; it is materially impossible.[57] There is no evidence to suggest that 4Q561 originally contained references to light and darkness. Therefore, apart from the physiognomic descriptions, it seemed to me far from clear that 4Q561 is the same text as 4Q186, containing the same elements but in Aramaic.

I still agree with what I wrote about the relationship between the Aramaic text 4Q561 and the Hebrew text 4Q186, but perhaps Puech is right in suggesting that 4Q186 is a Hebrew adaptation of the Aramaic text 4Q561. There is no evidence for an exact, one-to-one translation, but if we understand translation in a broader sense, then the slightly older Aramaic text could perhaps have been a source of the Hebrew text. Although this assumption cannot be proven in detail either, there may be some circumstantial evidence that I overlooked in my book, and that is the occurrence of one word. The word *tēragēl* (?) (תרגל), "curly, wavy" (?), appears in both texts (4Q186 2 i 2 and 4Q561 4 2),

[56] Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 66–67.

[57] One should perhaps allow for the possibility that the formula from 4Q186 occurred in abbreviated form in 4Q561. It is, however, difficult to imagine how this was done because the formula in 4Q186 is itself already elliptical.

a *hapax legomenon* both in Hebrew and in Aramaic.[58] While I realized this, it did not make me think about the relationship between the two texts. Perhaps the occurrence of this *hapax* in both texts is evidence of a more direct relationship between the two texts rather than them just sharing a tradition. It could be that the Jewish Aramaic physiognomic tradition we encounter in 4Q561 was a source for the physiognomic element in the physiognomic-astrological list in the Hebrew text of 4Q186. In that broader sense, 4Q186 can be seen to adapt the Aramaic text of 4Q561, not as an exact translation but as a transmission and adaptation of its physiognomic tradition.

The text of 4Q186 contains many enigmatic phrases that are unfamiliar to us in Hebrew or Aramaic texts from the Second Temple period. These possibly represent an effort on the part of an ancient Jewish author to translate and appropriate foreign learning and unfamiliar words and concepts. Astrology was not a fixed and unified system of concepts and terminology during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. There was much terminological inconsistency and conceptual confusion, reflecting the still unsettled state of astrology. One has to bear in mind the possibility of multiple developments and trajectories, not all of which are still recognizable. Against this background, and taking into account the late first-century B.C.E. date of the manuscript, 4Q186 can perhaps be seen as a text representative of the incipient stages of horoscopic astrology in ancient Judaism, attempting to render concepts foreign to Jewish culture into Hebrew.[59]

In this process, Aramaic may have been a medium for the transmission of Babylonian scientific learning to the West. Apart from the issue of whether Aramaic was a medium, which has scholars focusing on the Aramaic texts at hand, it is also important to take note of the efforts that were apparently made to render scholarly texts into the Hebrew language. These may have been translations of Aramaic compositions or may have been influenced by Aramaic scholarly texts, as the example of 4Q561 and 4Q186 may demonstrate.

---

[58] Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 256.

[59] The calendrical texts from Qumran also render the Babylonian numerical material in cumbersome prose showing the lack of Hebrew equivalents for the Babylonian logograms and perhaps also their difficulty in rendering the Babylonian expressions. Cf. Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 264, 276, on Babylonian astronomy rendered in prose in the Enochic corpus.

Why were Aramaic scholarly texts translated or adapted into Hebrew? Ben-Dov suggests an interesting explanation for the translation of Aramaic texts into Hebrew on the basis of (1) the Enochic *Astronomical Book* and 4Q317 and (2) 4Q561 and 4Q186.[60] His explanation hinges on the coded writing used in both Hebrew manuscripts. In the case of 4Q317, Ben-Dov suggests that translation and encryption are interconnected because the writing of calendar science in Hebrew had ritual significance and therefore its perusal was restricted by the use of a cryptic script. However, after an adapted version in Hebrew in an encrypted script there followed a later stage of a "'softer' Hebrew adaptation, merged into sectarian discourse and not encrypted."[61] 4Q186 then belongs to the stage of an encrypted, adapted version in Hebrew. With respect to the guarding of learning, to which I have already referred, Ben-Dov distinguishes—in relation to Qumran—between two different approaches which he connects with two different kinds of scribes. Aramaic-writing scribes, on the one hand, warned against the dissemination of their writings to unauthorized persons without taking any practical measures to prevent this from happening, while Hebrew-writing scribes belonging to the *yaḥad* took practical measures in the form of coded writing to keep uninitiated individuals at bay from the scholarly content of such texts.

This matter needs further reflection, but some points should be raised here. First, Ben-Dov's hypothesis does not really explain why Aramaic texts were translated into Hebrew, especially since the Aramaic texts were not coded and could therefore be read more easily. What is the difference between Aramaic and Hebrew scholarly texts, as Aramaic was commonly spoken and read by everyone as the standard popular language, as Ben-Dov himself acknowledges? Second, the translation into Hebrew may relate to the special value that some at the time ascribed to Hebrew as the holy tongue, but this does not

[60] Ben-Dov, "Scientific Writings in Aramaic and Hebrew." On the importance of scholarly texts in Hebrew in the late Second Temple period, cf. also Ben-Dov, "Hebrew and Aramaic Writing in the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran Scrolls: The Ancient Near Eastern Background and the Quest for a Written Authority," *Tarbiz* 78 (2009): 27–60 (in Hebrew).

[61] Ben-Dov, "Scientific Writings in Aramaic and Hebrew." Ben-Dov's view, however, of the relationship between earlier material such as the *Astronomical Book* and 4Q317, on the one hand, and the *mišmarot* texts, on the other hand, as one of successive stages from strictly scientific texts to texts mixed with religious elements need not be understood as a linear development.

explain the manuscript evidence, which shows Aramaic and Hebrew scholarly manuscripts existing side by side at Qumran from as early as the late third century B.C.E. until around the turn of the era. Third, if translation and encryption were interconnected, how does the translation of a non-scholarly text such as Tobit fit in, a text of which both Aramaic and Hebrew manuscripts have been found at Qumran? Fourth, it is not clear whether one can and must distinguish between different sorts of scribes for Aramaic and Hebrew. Was that indeed the case, and how can we know? Ben-Dov's explanation of the Hebrew translation or adaptation of Aramaic scholarly texts at Qumran presents us with a good start for further reflection on these issues. However, I doubt that the reason for the translation of Aramaic texts into Hebrew, whether scholarly or non-scholarly, is intrinsically connected with cryptic writing.[62]

5. *The Sociocultural Locus of Scientific Interests in Ancient Judaism*

If we can assume there were Babylonian precursors of specific types of learning in Second Temple Jewish texts we must ask: how did Jews become familiar with Babylonian sciences? However, we must first address a more general issue; the context in which scientific learning was transmitted in ancient Judaism.

5.1. *A Priestly Context?*

Pseudo-Eupolemus places Abraham among the Egyptian priests of Heliopolis when transmitting his learning. Scholars have likewise suggested a priestly setting for the transmission of learned knowledge in Second Temple Judaism. However, what does a priestly context mean?

In the *Aramaic Levi Document*, a priestly setting for the transmission of certain forms of scholarly learning is envisaged. The *Aramaic Levi Document* contains a section (31–47) in which Isaac gives specific

[62] Cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 10 n. 30, where I also note that as soon as the Cryptic A script turns up outside Qumran it will be difficult to argue that it was a sectarian writing system. Apparently, some of the characters on the inscribed stone cup found during the Zion Gate excavations at Jerusalem in June 2009 resemble this script, but Stephen Pfann is researching this at the moment. In any case, it may demonstrate that translation and encryption are not related.

instructions to his son Levi concerning the exact weights of the wood required for sacrifice and the amount of sacrificial material needed for the meal offering. The numbers and fractions used reflect a Babylonian-type sexagesimal numeral system. It has been argued that the metrological number and measure notations have a pedagogical function as part of the Jewish priestly education.[63]

A priestly locus is not made explicit by the Enochic corpus, but scholars have suggested that the people transmitting knowledge belonged to a well-educated body of people from Jewish society that was possibly active in or around the Jerusalem temple.[64] It seems, however, reasonable not to limit the sociocultural locus of ancient Jewish scholars to such a learned elite in Jerusalem and the temple. This is already evident by the location of the Qumran corpus, but the locus may also have extended to other localities in Palestine—there is no *a priori* reason why not.

We have no ancient sources that give any hint that scientific knowledge was imparted at the Jerusalem temple. The question is whether scientific learning was limited to a priestly setting. The difficulty is one of differentiation. Many, if not most of the Jewish sources from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods are ascribed to priestly circles.[65] Therefore, we assume that learned writings must somehow also have been the domain of such priestly circles. However, there are few references in ancient Jewish literature at our disposal that reveal in what setting, by whom and how scientific texts and the learning contained in them were used. Any extrapolation from these texts to social functions and contexts must remain tentative.

The locus of learning in the Ancient Near East was undoubtedly the temple.[66] However, priestly affiliation need not necessarily be

---

[63] See Henryk Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (JSJSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 280–93; Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 254. Henryk Drawnel suggests that the content matter of the Enochic *Astronomical Book* also belonged to the priestly lore of school literature, see Drawnel, "Priestly Education in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (*Visions of Levi*) and *Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208–211)*," *RevQ* 22/88 (2006): 547–74.

[64] Cf. Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 266.

[65] See, e.g., the ascription of scripturally inspired compositions from Qumran to a priestly levitical exegetical tradition in Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

[66] Cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 77–78. See also Lorenzo Verderame, "La formazione dell'esperto (*ummânu*) nel periodo neo-assiro," *Historiae* 5 (2008): 51–67. For a good overview of present scholarship on the issue of scribal training see Karel

understood in the limited sense of someone who was a cultic functionary at the temple. For example, the title of "priest" that Berossos held does not imply that he held a cultic or religious function but that he was connected to the Esagila, the main temple of Babylon. Josephus calls himself a priest, but there is no explicit reference in his writings to him participating in the cultic activities of the temple. Nevertheless, his vivid descriptions of what went on in the temple and his pride at being a member of the priesthood have caused scholars to assume that Josephus was actively involved in cultic activities for a time.[67]

Many texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls clearly have a priestly orientation, but if the people behind these texts were indeed somehow connected with the settlement at Qumran their presumable priestly affiliation suggests a differentiation in the priestly circle in that it was not limited to Jerusalem, the temple and its direct environment. If, therefore, sciences such as astronomy, astrology, arithmetics and physiognomics were the domain of priestly intellectuals this should perhaps be understood, anachronistically put, in a secular sense. Ancient Jewish scribes could perform different functions in different contexts, which would entail different levels of writing and scribal training. Sometimes scribes would have been no more than copyists, while in other cases scholarly and scribal activity may have overlapped, as was the case in Babylonian culture. We do not know whether sciences such as astronomy, astrology or physiognomics were on a Jewish educational or scribal curriculum, but it is very doubtful. Scientific learning would have been circulated by individual, scholarly scribes or teachers, who presumably attracted some students.[68] In this respect "priests," comparable with Berossos in Babylon, who were not directly involved in the cultic activities of the Jerusalem temple may have represented the intellectual elite that was involved with scientific learning. Our present sources make it difficult to be more concrete or precise about the sort of people who were involved in the transmission of learned knowledge in Hellenistic-Roman Palestine.

---

van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007).

[67] See most recently Oliver Gussmann, *Das Priesterverständnis des Flavius Josephus* (TSAJ 124; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

[68] Cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 215–19.

5.2. *Obtaining Knowledge of Babylonian Higher Education through Cognitive Blending?*

If we return to the issue of the transmission of Babylonian sciences to Jewish Palestine, we must ask ourselves how Jews came into contact with such learning. This may have been through intermediary Aramaic texts. Another possibility is a more direct acquaintance with Babylonian learning. How could this have come about?

In her contribution to this volume Carol Newsom reflects on the issue of how Jews may have become acquainted with Babylonian Nabonidus traditions and how such familiarity found expression in new Jewish compositions such as the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242) or Daniel 4. She suggests that the cognitive theory of conceptual integration or blending could account for the creation of these Jewish narratives in which Nabonidus' Harran B inscription served as a template that was blended with stock elements from traditional Jewish stories. Knowledge of Nabonidus' inscription, Newsom argues, came from the public reading of it. It would not have been remembered verbatim, but the memory of it would have been stored as a template, an outline with key points of content. In time, the original inscription would become schematized in memory and oral communication.

Newsom's hypothesis of conceptual blending to help understand the production of texts and the transmission of traditions is useful to consider when researching how Jews became acquainted with Babylonian higher learning, if only because it helps one realize the important difference between various sorts of texts and the effect that may have on the means of their transmission. What we tend to think about the transmission of traditions and the production of texts is very much determined by the sort of texts that we, as scholars, work with. In the case of scientific writings, cognitive blending seems unlikely as a means of transmission of such traditions, as does public proclamation. We are not dealing with templates of stock narrative elements. The genre of scholarly writings is different from narrative or, dare I say, more "religious" texts. The scholarly lists from Qumran are a different sort of text from the *Prayer of Nabonidus* or Daniel 4.[69] Cognitive

[69] As argued above, 4Q186, 4Q317, 4Q318 and 4Q561 stand, as scholarly lists, somewhat apart from the other compositions from Qumran, lacking as they do an apocalyptic and eschatological framework and not being inspired by scriptural exemplars.

blending or public proclamations may help explain narrative texts but it does not seem to fit in with the production and transmission of the terse and succinct scholarly lists we know from Babylonia and Qumran. These are not the sort of texts that one schematizes in memory or through oral communication. In Babylonia only those scribes who were deemed expert enough to pursue their studies of the scribal curriculum learnt these.[70]

5.3. *Jewish Scribes at Babylonian Academies? The Case of Šema'a, Son of Adirum*

Thus, if not by means of cognitive blending or public proclamation, how did Jews become familiar with Babylonian science in a more direct manner? Perhaps this was through access to Babylonian academies? It has been suggested that Jews may have been present at Babylonian temples in their function as scholarly institutions or academies.[71]

As I noted earlier, we do not know of any Jewish scholars from the Second Temple period by name except perhaps one.[72] Ben-Dov points to a certain scribe called Šema'a, son of Adirum, *še-ma-'-iá* A ^{m}*a-di-ru*, who appears in the colophon of a Babylonian scholastic text (BM 47463) and whose name, it has been suggested, was Jewish.[73] Ben-Dov also refers to the narrative concerning the Babylonian education of three exiled youths, Hanania, Miša'el and Azariah, in the book

---

[70] Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 76–78, 215–16. Whether such omen lists also had a more practical function outside the curriculum is debatable, cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 84.

[71] Cf. Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 266, 273.

[72] See, however, Reviel Netz, "The First Jewish Scientist?" *SCI* 17 (1998): 27–33. Netz argues for the possible identity of Dositheus, with whom Archimedes corresponded, as a Hellenistic Jewish astronomer from Egypt in the second half of the third century B.C.E., but admits that the evidence remains inconclusive.

[73] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 273; idem, "Scientific Writings in Aramaic and Hebrew." Alasdair Livingstone (*Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1986], 260) draws attention to the "Hebrew scribe." Cf. also the reference to an earlier astronomer with the Aramaic, or perhaps Hebrew, name Ṭabiya, who sent an astronomical report in cuneiform from Babylon to Nineveh, cf. Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 261 n. 41. In Neo-Assyrian times we know of scholars from Egypt, Syria and Anatolia who were present at the royal court of Nineveh, cf. recently Karen Radner, "The Assyrian King and his Scholars: The Syro-Anatolian and the Egyptian Schools," in *Of God(s), Trees, Kings, and Scholars: Neo-Assyrian and Related Studies in Honour of Simo Parpola* (ed. M. Luukko, S. Svärd and R. Mattila; StudOr 106; Finnish Oriental Society: Helsinki, 2009), 221–38.

of Daniel to suggest that some of the Jews in Babylon had direct access to Babylonian scribal and scholarly circles.[74]

The exact date of the Babylonian scholastic text BM 47463 is not immediately clear. Alasdair Livingstone has published it but does not give any specific information regarding the tablet's date, except to say that the work is Babylonian in origin.[75] The tablet was part of a collection of tablets (acquisition number 1881–11–03, 168) that were sent to the British Museum from Baghdad on August 19, 1881. While they were labelled as coming from the Rassam excavations, this does not imply that all of the tablets from this batch indeed came from the Sippar excavations that Hormuzd Rassam conducted on behalf of the British Museum between 1879 and 1882. The so-called "Sippar collection" of the British Museum contains much intrusive material from other sites.[76] At least part of the 81–11–3 collection may be Late Babylonian.[77] It has not yet been published in the *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum* series, but Christopher Walker of the British Museum has kindly provided me with a file of the 81–11–3 collection.[78] This list confirms that the 81–11–3 section includes tablets from the Neo-Babylonian, Persian and indeed Seleucid periods. In the case of BM 47463 we are dealing with a tablet from the Persian period from Babylon, as indicated by Irving Finkel (see below).

One should therefore allow for the possibility that a Second Temple period scribe appears in BM 47463. However, is he also a Jewish scribe, as has been suggested? Unfortunately, this cannot be confirmed. The Neo-Babylonian or Late-Babylonian name Šema'a (*še-ma-'-iá*) cannot

---

[74] Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*, 273.

[75] Livingstone, *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, 6, 58, 259–60; see Plate V for the colophon on the reverse of the tablet.

[76] Cf. Julian E. Reade, "Introduction: Rassam's Babylonian Collection: The Excavations and the Archives," in *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum, Volume VI: Tablets from Sippar 1* (ed. E. Leichty; London: British Museum Publications, 1986), xiii–xxxvi, and especially xxxii for 81–11–3; G. van Driel, "The British Museum 'Sippar' Collection: Babylonia 1882–1893," *ZA* 79 (1989): 102–17.

[77] Cf. Joachim Oelsner, "Review: D. A. Kennedy, *Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum, Part XLIX: Late-Babylonian Economic Texts* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1968)," *ZA* 61 (1971): 159–70 (161–63, 167); Van Driel, "The British Museum 'Sippar' Collection," 107 n. 5.

[78] Christopher Walker informs me (e-mail, January 12, 2010) that this will be published in volumes 4–5 of the *Catalogue of Babylonian Tablets* series, hopefully in 2010.

render the Hebrew *šmʿyh(w)*.[79] The latter name is rendered as *šá-ma-ah-ia/iá-a-ma* in Neo and Late Babylonian.[80] To be sure, *še-ma-'-iá* is a West-Semitic name, based on Š-M-ʿ ("to hear").[81] It ends in the hypocoristic suffix *-î* (< *-iy*), like Old Testament *šmʿy* (LXX σεμεει), and is explicable both in Hebrew and in Aramaic terms.[82] However, as Ran Zadok points out, the paternal name *a-di-ru* probably derives from the Aramaic ʿ-D-R ("to help," which in Hebrew would be from ʿ-Z-R).[83] The name of Šema'a, son of Adirum, is therefore more likely to be Aramaic than Hebrew. Whether it is the name of a Jewish person cannot be determined, but it seems unlikely. Finkel has listed more tablets copied by Šema'a as well as some of his relatives. On the basis of the colophons of these tablets he suggests a branch of a scholarly family tree for Babylon in the Persian period.[84] I therefore do not think there is enough evidence to argue that Šema'a was a Jewish name, but it could perhaps have been the name of a Jewish person.[85] This,

---

[79] The following explanation of the name of Šema'a is based on a personal communication by Ran Zadok (e-mail, January 8, 2010), who deserves full credit.

[80] See Ran Zadok, *The Earliest Diaspora: Israelites and Judeans in Pre-Hellenistic Mesopotamia* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2002), 34:51, 40:96.

[81] Cf. Michael D. Coogan, *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murašû Documents* (HSM 7; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 85; Ran Zadok, *On West Semites in Babylonia During the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: An Onomastic Study* (Jerusalem: Wanaarta, 1977), 81, 119; Heather D. Baker, ed., *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, Volume 3, Part I: P-Ṣ* (Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2002), 1081a.

[82] For it to represent the theophoric Yahwistic element *-yh(w)* one would expect the *-ma* spelling at the end. See the references in n. 85 below.

[83] Cf. Coogan, *West Semitic Personal Names*, 79–80, for names with this Aramaic root. See also Karen Radner, *Die neuassyrischen Texte aus Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad* (Berichte der Ausgrabung Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad, Dūr-Katlimmu 6; Berlin: Reimer, 2002), 152, 4, for the Neo-Assyrian *a-di-ri* from Dūr-Katlimmu on the lower Habur, an Aramaic-speaking region; undated, but datable to the Sargonid period. I was unable to consult this volume.

[84] Irving L. Finkel, "Adad-apla-iddina, Esagil-kīn-apli, and the Series SA.GIG," in *A Scientific Humanist: Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs* (ed. E. Leichty, M. deJong Ellis and P. Gerardi; OPSNKF 9; Philadelphia: The University Museum, 1988), 143–59 (153–55). See now also Daniel Schwemer, "Washing, Defiling, and Burning: Two Bilingual Anti-witchcraft Incantations," *Or* 78 (2009): 44–68, especially 53, 57–58 for another reading of the name.

[85] Jews took on Babylonian names, as did other foreigners; this is known from the Murašu documents (cf., e.g., Zadok, *The Earliest Diaspora*, 29:20–22) and Daniel 3. Jewish scribes, therefore, may possibly have been among those scholars with full Akkadian names, and parents with Akkadian names could give their children West-Semitic names. However, the issue here does not concern the possibility of there being Jewish scholars-scribes in Babylonia but rather concerns what positive evidence or proof there is for Jewish scholars-scribes in Babylonia. On non-Babylonian names of

however, we also cannot determine from the material at our disposal. It therefore remains in the realm of the possible. More research on this material is needed than can be done here, but there is thus far no reason to assume that Šema'a was a Jewish scribe.

Nevertheless, the name seems to present us with an interesting case. Scholars know of a few Babylonian scribes who have non-Akkadian names, but these are just a handful compared with the thousands of Babylonian scribes bearing Akkadian given, paternal and clan names. All of the Babylonian scribes with non-Akkadian names wrote legal documents.[86] Šema'a has no surname, indicating that he did not belong to the Babylonian urban elite, which seems to have had stricter limitations for entry to the scribal elite than the Assyrians.[87] However, at the same time, Šema'a seems to be the only known example to date of a scribe bearing a non-Akkadian name who copied literary, scholarly texts.[88] This suggests that there may have been others like him, however small their number, among the group of Babylonian scribes bearing full Akkadian names—although within this pool of scribes Šema'a is the only one known to have worked on literary texts. Perhaps some Jews may also have had scribal responsibility for copying literary texts, but this remains speculative in light of the evidence.[89] Again, more research is needed on the social make-up of the Babylonian priesthood

---

West-Semitic origin, see, e.g., Kathleen Abraham, "West Semitic and Judean Brides in Cuneiform Sources from the Sixth Century BCE: New Evidence from a Marriage Contract from Āl-Yahudu," *AfO* 51 (2005/2006): 198–219. Interestingly, all the Judean names that are Yahwistic are written with *-ma* at the end. Cf. also Finkel, "Adad-apla-iddina," 154 n. 83.

[86] See Ran Zadok, "The Representation of Foreigners in Neo- and Late-Babylonian Legal Documents (Eighth through Second Centuries B.C.E.)," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (ed. O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 471–589.

[87] Cf. Zadok, "The Representation of Foreigners," 483–84.

[88] The other tablets that Finkel attributes to Šema'a are: BM 47451 (a bilingual incantation, ušburruda), BM 47491 (a medical text dealing with women's illnesses), BM 47687 (a highly condensed form of the medical omen series SA.GIG). To these should perhaps be added BM 47459 (a ritual text) and BM 47447 (an astrological text, possibly a commentary on Enūma Anu Enlil 16–20).

[89] Ben-Dov (*Head of All Years*, 272) also refers to the possibility that Ezekiel was exposed to Neo-Babylonian scholarship (see the bibliographic references there). I do not dispute such possibilities. It is evident that there were influences from Babylonian literature and learning on Jewish thinking. The question is how this occurred. One can perhaps imagine Babylonian and Jewish scholars talking to each other and thus learning about each other's thinking. However, in this latter part of my paper I have dealt with whether we can be more concrete and specific with regard to the production and transmission of scholarly texts. In addition, as I have argued, the form of scholarly

and scholars, on their relationships with the so-called lower scribes and clerks such as the *sepīru* who wrote on scrolls in Aramaic,[90] and on the issue of non-Babylonians and their access to Babylonian higher learning.

Although we have a fair amount of evidence for Babylonian Jews being villagers or merchants in Neo and Late-Babylonian documents, we do not as yet have positive documentary evidence for Jewish-Babylonian scholarly scribes that suggests that Jewish individuals were present at Babylonian academies or had access to the Babylonian higher scribal curriculum during the Second Temple period. This may have been the case, but hard evidence for it is lacking at the moment. The setting of the Daniel narratives may be suggestive but is inconclusive in this respect.[91]

We cannot be any more specific about the concrete ways in which Jews became acquainted with Babylonian scholarship. There were certainly Babylonian precursors to the specific types of learning we encounter in Second Temple Jewish texts, but apart from the Aramaic language as a possible medium for the transmission of Babylonian learning to Jewish Palestine it is not possible to determine further how Jews learned about Babylonian scholarship. Nonetheless, the references discussed in the final part of this paper may add to our ongoing reconstruction of the context of the transmission of Aramaic and Hebrew scholarly traditions in the Second Temple period as adaptations and emulations of alien wisdom.[92]

---

lists does not readily lend itself to oral transmission and perhaps does not even make for pleasant conversation.

[90] See, e.g., Philippe Clancier, "Les scribes sur parchemin du temple d'Anu," *RA* 99 (2005): 85–104 (93–98), for Hellenistic Uruk.

[91] The question is first to what extent Daniel's narrative setting represents historical reality in this respect and second whether there is other evidence corroborating it—which there is not at present, as far as I am aware.

[92] For their information and comments, I am most grateful to Jonathan Ben-Dov, John Collins, Yoram Cohen, Geert De Breucker, Charlotte Hempel, Steve Mason, Carol Newsom, Laurie Pearce, Eibert Tigchelaar, Niek Veldhuis, Caroline Waerzeggers, Christopher Walker, and Ran Zadok.

SHARED TRADITIONS: POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN S AND D*

Charlotte Hempel
University of Birmingham

Introduction

The theme of this conference (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*) is well chosen inasmuch as these ancient manuscripts provide us with firm ancient, and one would like to say first-hand, evidence of such processes. One of the texts that has received a great deal of attention in terms of its textual history is the *Community Rule* as attested particularly in the well preserved copy from Cave 1 and the more recently published ten Cave 4 manuscripts of the text.[1] There are good reasons why the Rule texts are a particularly fruitful field to harvest in the quest laid out by the organizers of this conference. Whereas scholars are frequently at pains to draw attention to small but significant differences between different copies of the same work attested at Qumran such as the *War Scroll* from Caves 1 and 4[2] and most recently also the manuscripts of MMT,[3] the evidence of the Rule manuscripts has been available since the early 1990s. In the particular case of the *Community Rule*, the differences between 1QS and the various 4QS manuscripts are substantial and varied and

* A version of this paper was presented at a workshop hosted by Prof. Reinhard Kratz and Dr. Annette Steudel of the University of Göttingen in February 2009. I am grateful to them and to the organizers of the Toronto Conference for the opportunity to explore these issues in a congenial and stimulating environment.

[1] For recent treatments see, e.g., Charlotte Hempel, "The Literary Development of the S Tradition—A New Paradigm," *RevQ* 22 (2006): 389–401; Sarianna Metso, *The Serekh Texts* (London: T & T Clark, 2007); and Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad: *A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

[2] For recent studies of the War texts see Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts* (CQS 6; London: T & T Clark, 2004) and Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* (STDJ 76; Leiden: Brill, 2009) and earlier literature cited there.

[3] See now Hanne von Weissenberg, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (STDJ 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

allow us, therefore, to try and glimpse first-hand the transmission and production of a complex web of ancient traditions and texts. Though it is impossible to deny that the S tradition evolved and did so in complex ways, scholars are still debating the direction of the developments which we witness: from earlier manuscripts to later ones (the position of Alexander followed by Tov and Dimant who stress paleography as a key criterion);[4] from short to long (Vermes, Metso, and others);[5] from "the many" to "the sons of Zadok" in 1QS 5 or *vice versa*. A great deal of the initial discussion of the intriguing relationship between 1QS and 4QS focused on differences and on exploring how to account for these differences in as cogent an argument as possible. In my own most recent contribution to this discussion I emphasized the fruitfulness of noting those places where we can observe equally remarkable similarities and overlaps between S manuscripts that diverge radically in other places. In an article that appeared in *Revue de Qumran* in 2006 I suggested that our initial excitement about finally having access to significant new variants in 4QS partially blinded us for a time from noting the importance of overlapping material in other places. Whereas much of the early scholarly debate about the literary growth of S was chiefly concerned with determining which manuscripts or family of manuscripts represents the earlier text,[6] I proposed that the quest for the beginning of the growth of this textual tradition is to be found in the shared material found across the manuscript spectrum.[7] Such a more balanced approach is now also advocated by Schofield.[8]

In particular, I identified important common ground between different S manuscripts in the material mandating a careful separation from the people of injustice (אנשי העול) shared by 1QS 5 and 4QS$^{d/b}$

[4] Cf. Philip S. Alexander, "The Redaction-History of Serekh ha-Yaḥad: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–453; Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 27; and Devorah Dimant, "The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance," *RevQ* 22 (2006): 615–630 (619).

[5] See Geza Vermes, "Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4," *JJS* 42 (1991): 250–255; and Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

[6] Note, for instance, Metso's now famous and helpful stemma where the guiding criteria at the time were differences between manuscripts, see Metso, *Textual Development*, 147.

[7] Hempel, "Literary Development."

[8] See her *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 137.

in spite of major differences in the surrounding material.[9] Another example is the shared reference to the sons of Aaron and the multitude of Israel in 1QS 5:20–22 and 4QS^{d} 2:1–2. Both manuscripts allot a key role to the sons of Aaron here in remarkable contrast to the language they employ elsewhere, especially in 1QS 5:2–3 (the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and the multitude of the men of the community) and 4QS^{d} 1:2 (the many).[10]

Points of Contact Between S and D

I would like to develop this approach further beyond the data presented by individual S manuscripts and include the evidence of the *Damascus Document* inasmuch as it relates directly to the literary development of the *Community Rule*. Here again, a similar scholarly trajectory can be traced. Prior to the publication of the Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Damascus Document* by Joseph Baumgarten,[11] scholars were occupied by and large with accounting for the differences between the community attested in the Laws of the *Damascus Document* (the organization of families in camps presided over by a *mebaqqer* in particular) and the *Community Rule*, which never refers to families (explicitly) or to camps, but was for a long time associated with a celibate community. The overwhelming impression of differences between organizational matters dealt with in the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document* was often accounted for on the basis of the evidence of Josephus who speaks of two types of Essenes, one married and one celibate (cf. *J. W.* 2.120–121, 160; the latter passage introduces "another class of Essenes," ἕτερον Ἐσσηνῶν τάγμα.[12]

---

[9] On this material see Charlotte Hempel, "The Community and Its Rivals According to the Community Rule from Qumran Caves 1 and 4," *RevQ* 21 (2003): 47–81.

[10] See Heinz-Josef Fabry, "Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran," in *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments* (FS E. Zenger; ed. F. L. Hossfeld and L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger; Freiburg: Herder, 2004), 201–217; Charlotte Hempel, "The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 207–224; and eadem, "Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If So Was It Mutual?" *RevQ* 24 (2009): 135–153.

[11] Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

[12] Cf. Eileen Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: What Have We Learned 50 Years On* (London: SCM, 2006), 80–81. For a recent discussion of the classical evidence on the

The overwhelming impression of distinctiveness between what is laid down in the *Damascus Document* and what we find in the *Community Rule* was then employed to create two mental boxes for these texts: a married branch and a somewhat superior celibate group of people, the former living spread out in camps whereas the latter resided at Qumran.

Most recently this rather comfortable picture the texts seemed to present to us has suffered disruption from a variety of fronts. Firstly, scholars are today much more wary in their interpretation of the texts and the other archaeological remains as reflecting a celibate community.[13] Secondly, the umbilical cord between the site of Qumran and the emergence of the *yaḥad* has been severely damaged by a redating of the incipient phase of the communal occupation of the site to the early decades of the first century B.C.E.[14] In short, both the neat geographical divide (Qumran versus *Hinterland*) and the neat divide of social habits (married versus celibate) have both been challenged considerably by recent scholarly developments. To this we may add the gradual demolition of the uniqueness of a number of crucial archaeological features attested by the Qumran site. I am thinking here particularly of the mushrooming of Qumran type burials in a number of other places (such as Khirbet Qazone, Ein Ghuweir, Beit Zafafa) to an extent that makes it problematic to speak of the burial practice attested at Qumran as a distinctive Qumran type.[15] Equally intrigu-

---

celibacy question see Joan E. Taylor, "Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes: A Case Study on the Use of Classical Sources in Discussions of the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis," in *SPhilo* (2007): 1–28 (20–26) and further literature referred to there. See also Sidnie White Crawford, "Not According to Rule: Women, the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran," in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S. M. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 127–150.

[13] See the seminal work by Eileen Schuller, "Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:117–144, and White Crawford, "Not According to Rule."

[14] See Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 47–72; John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 166–208; Torleif Elgvin, "The Yaḥad is More than Qumran," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 273–279.

[15] See, e.g., Pesah Bar-Adon, "Another Settlement of the Judean Desert Sect at 'Ain el-Guweir on the Dead Sea," *BASOR* 225 (1977): 2–25; Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 210–225; Rachel Hachlili, "The Qumran Cemetery: A Reconsideration," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery 1947–1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman et al.;

ing is the discovery of large numbers of individual dining dishes in Hasmonean Jericho.[16] In light of these developments, Alison Schofield quite properly devoted a chapter to the significance of the broader archaeological picture for our understanding of what was going on at Qumran in her recent monograph on the *Community Rule* and the *yaḥad*.[17] Thirdly, a number of scholars have recently challenged the exclusive association of the *yaḥad*, as it emerges from the *Community Rule*, with Qumran on the basis of their reading of S. Thus, John Collins now speaks of the *yaḥad* as an umbrella organization,[18] and Alison Schofield conceives of a Jerusalemite provenance for the earliest stages of the *Community Rule*, a text that was eventually revised at Qumran and in outlying related communities.[19] In short, we witness a broadening of the borders and horizons from a number of fronts.

Finally, most recent scholarship on the question of how to identify and distinguish between sectarian and non-sectarian texts is moving in a direction of increased complexity. Whereas it was taken for granted in the first decades of Qumran studies that we should endeavour to identify a core group of sectarian texts to be associated with a single sectarian community who resided at Qumran, things are no longer quite that straightforward. Today many scholars shy away from speaking of a neat divide between sectarian and non-sectarian material and acknowledge instead a more gradual scenario (cf. concepts such as 'pre-sectarian,' 'proto-sectarian,' 'parent-movement,' and the Groningen Hypothesis's[20] 'formative period'). Inaugurating the latest phase in these scholarly developments Brooke now advocates

---

Jerusalem: IES, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 661–672; Konstantinos D. Politis, "The Discovery and Excavation of the Khirbet Qazone Cemetery and Its Significance Relative to Qumran," in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (ed. K. Galor et al.; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 213–219; Boas Zissu, "Odd Tomb Out: Has Jerusalem's Essene Cemetery Been Found?" *BAR* 25 (1999): 50–55, 62.

[16] See Rachel Bar-Nathan, "Qumran and the Hasmonaean and Herodian Winter Palaces of Jericho: The Implication of the Pottery Finds for the Interpretation of the Settlement at Qumran," in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 263–277.

[17] Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 220–271.

[18] See now Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, and earlier literature referred to there.

[19] Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad. See also Charlotte Hempel, "1QS 6: 2c–4a—Satellites or Precursors of the Yaḥad?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture* (ed. A. Roitman et al.; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

[20] Florentino García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *FO* 25 (1988): 113–136.

distinguishing between 'incipient' sectarianism and 'nascent,' 'full-blown,' and 'rejuvenated' sectarianism;[21] and Florentino García Martínez has proposed abandoning the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts altogether and speaks instead of 'clusters' of texts that share particular characteristics.[22] In sum, I perceive an intellectual climate in our approach to the texts, the social trajectories that produced them and a number of archaeological features that is moving towards producing a much more challenging and complex picture of the Qumran finds. We note again and again that emerging *similarities* continue to gnaw away at the distinctiveness of what was once confidently called "the Qumran Community." Increasing numbers of pieces of evidence are nibbling away at the pedestal of uniqueness that the Qumran community once occupied with considerable pride. Should this worry us? Does it make our corner of antiquity and our scholarly niche any less important? I think not. By contrast, the broadening of the horizons we witness enhances the wider relevance of the texts and the people we are studying.

Another invasion of data that has been biting large chunks out of the particularity of the *Community Rule* is the penal code material. This legislation was formerly closely associated with the S community but is now attested much more fully also in the Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*, 4QMiscellaneous Rules and 11QFragment Related to Serekh ha-Yaḥad.[23] There is no doubt in my mind that the points of contact between S and D are crucial pieces of evidence in

---

[21] George J. Brooke, "From Jesus to the Early Christian Communities: Trajectories Towards Sectarianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture*, forthcoming.

[22] Cf. Florentino García Martínez, "¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos," *RevQ* 23 (2008): 383–394.

[23] Cf. 1QS 6:24–7:25 // 4QS^{d} 5:1 // 4QS^{e} 1:4–15, 2:3–8 // 4QS^{g} 3 2–4; 4a–b 1–7; 5a–c 1–9; 6a–e 1–5 in the *Community Rule* and CD 14:18b–22 // 4QD^{a} 10 I–II // 4QD^{b} 9 VI // 4QD^{d} 11 I–II; 4QD^{e} 7 I in the *Damascus Document*. See also in 4QMiscellaneous Rules (*olim* Serekh Damascus) 4Q265 4 I:2–II:2, and 11Q29 (Fragment Related to Serekh ha-Yaḥad). For scholarly discussions see, inter alia, Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code," *JJS* 43 (1992): 268–276; Charlotte Hempel, "The Penal Code Reconsidered," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein et al.; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 337–48; Jutta Jokiranta, "Social Identity in the Qumran Movement: The Case of the Penal Code," in *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (ed. P. Luomanen et al.; BibInt 89; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 277–98; Sarianna Metso, "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*.

our search for the production of these particular texts. Moreover, the insights gained from the full evidence available for D and S are likely to testify to ways in which ancient Jewish texts grew, developed and related in other cases too.[24] I noted already in the opening paragraphs of this paper that I have been stimulated by the discovery of overlap and common ground between otherwise heavily diverging manuscripts of the *Community Rule*. A related area of investigation that scholars have explored over recent years is the significance of shared traditions and points of contact between the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*.

The relationship between the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule* has always been a topic of great interest to scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls ever since the Qumran discoveries provided an ancient home for the mediaeval manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*—a text that was something of a cuckoo in its mediaeval nest. Thus, most recently Schofield has rightly noted that "the D material illuminates the transmission history of S."[25] However, I think she goes somewhat too far when she identifies "our categories of 'S' and 'D'" as "themselves scholarly constructs."[26] Whereas some have argued for a development from S to D (so, e.g., Kruse[27] and Regev[28]) most scholars are in favour of a model that presumes that the community structures developed in S are a further development of the camp structure of D (e.g., recently Kapfer[29] and Schofield[30]). The full publication of the manuscripts has provided a wealth of new data and stimuli to this

---

Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center, 4–8 February 1998 (ed. J. M. Baumgarten et al.; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 85–93.

[24] See Charlotte Hempel, "The Growth of Ancient Texts—An Example from Qumran," in *How to Read the Dead Sea Scrolls: Methods and Theories in Scrolls Research* (ed. M. Grossman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, forthcoming).

[25] *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 171.

[26] *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 189.

[27] Colin G. Kruse, "Community Functionaries in the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document (A Test of Chronological Relationships)," *RevQ* 40 (1981): 543–551.

[28] Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007) and idem, "Between Two Sects: Differentiating the Yaḥad and the Damascus Covenant," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. C. Hempel; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

[29] Hilary Evans Kapfer, "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes Toward the Temple as a Test Case," *DSD* 14 (2007): 152–177.

[30] Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 163–173.

long-standing debate. I have already mentioned the most extensive point of contact between both texts, i.e., the penal code. In what follows I would like to stand back from particular areas of textual intimacy between S and D and from particular texts in favour of trying to draw up a preliminary list of points of contact. In this endeavour I am able to draw initially on Eibert Tigchelaar's "Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran and Masada" in the final volume of the DJD series. The data collected by Tigchelaar are drawn from indications of textual overlap provided by various editors in the DJD series though he added some of his own examples.[31] I recently stressed elsewhere the way in which the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document* clearly emerge as the frontrunners as far as Tigchelaar's entries on parallels in different nonbiblical compositions are concerned.[32] Thus, despite huge and well known differences between D and S these two textual traditions overlap and interlink more often than other nonbiblical Scrolls.

There are, however, a number of further instances of textual intimacy or inter-textual contact between the S and D traditions that are not accounted for in tables of this nature or the comparable tables offered by Alexander and Vermes drawn on by Tigchelaar as well as Schofield.[33] In the course of my work on both texts I have written on several inter-textual meeting points between S and D, and I would like to draw a selection of these together for the purposes of this paper. I have no doubt other items can be added to my list. I am also fully aware that other texts should be included in the web of shared traditions or features that emerges from D and S, such as 4QMiscellaneous Rules and 1QSa.

A further complication ought perhaps to be at least mentioned. Although we might be quick to speak of the relationship of different manuscripts of S to one another and to other compositions, there are frequently some important variables that we need to take into

---

[31] Cf. Eibert Tigchelaar, "Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran and Masada," in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 285–322 (287).

[32] Cf. Tigchelaar, "Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels," 319 and Charlotte Hempel, "CD Manuscript B and the *Rule of the Community*—Reflections on a Literary Relationship," *DSD* 16 (2009): 370–387 (372–376).

[33] Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: Serekh Ha-Yaḥad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 3 and Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 179.

account. Thus, Alexander and Vermes noted the possibility that two of the Cave 4 manuscripts (4QS^{h} and 4QS^{j}) are not complete copies of the *Community Rule* but may constitute the remains of collections that also include excerpts from S.[34] In a similar vein Metso has asked whether there may be a closer connection between 4QS^{h} and 5Q13, a text citing parts of the *Community Rule* but clearly not a copy of S.[35] Finally, the suspected possible copy of S from Cave 11 published by García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude may just as likely be a Penal Code text rather than anything resembling a more comprehensive manuscript of S.[36] Similar caution has been advocated by George Brooke with reference to the identification of Psalms scrolls from Qumran.[37] A particularly interesting specific example is the long-noted close relationship to the *Community Rule* of 4Q502 (papRitMar) 16 1–4 which Eibert Tigchelaar has recently identified as a possible fragment belonging to 4QpapS^{c}.[38]

The following areas of close contact between D and S are particularly noteworthy.

The Penal Code[39]

It is again fascinating to observe that initial explorations of the relationship between this code in D and S focused on differences. Thus, two of the first studies by Joseph Baumgarten and myself immediately turned to differences of various kinds to try and trace a development. Baumgarten focused particularly on the nature of the punishments stipulated to ask whether a development could be traced towards more leniency or stringency.[40] I attempted to make a case for a development

---

[34] Alexander und Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, 11–12, 190, 201.

[35] Metso (*Serekh Texts*, 62) observes, "One has even to reckon with the possibility that the scant remains of 4QS^{h} would represent a copy of 5Q13 with which it bears uncanny resemblance."

[36] See Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11. II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–30* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 433–434.

[37] Cf. George Brooke, "The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Psalms in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 5–24.

[38] Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "'These are the names of the spirits of…': A Preliminary Edition of *4QCatalogue of Spirits (4Q230)* and New Manuscript Evidence for the *Two Spirits Treatise (4Q257* and *1Q29a)*," *RevQ* 84 (2004): 529–47, here 538.

[39] For references and selective bibliography see note 23 above.

[40] Baumgarten, "The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code."

between the S penal code and the D penal code on the basis of differences in the list of infringements.[41] In this context I paid particular attention to the four infringements present in D but lacking in S:

- Despising the judgement of the many
- Taking someone's food against the law
- Fornication with one's wife
- Murmuring against the fathers, murmuring against the mothers

The key point to make in the present context is the remarkable degree of *similarity* and close inter-textual relationship between the penal codes now preserved in D and S. This closeness extends from matters of genre and form, to content, sequence, and terminology.

Gatherings of Ten[42]

Alongside the dominant paradigm of camps led by a series of overseers in the *Damascus Document* and the well known *yaḥad/rabbim* organization described in S both traditions contain a reference to gatherings of ten individuals to be led by a priest (Cf. 1QS 6:2c–4a // 4QS^{d} // 4QS^{i}; CD 13:2b–3a). Whether one is inclined to suggest that these gatherings are remnants of an embryonic stage of social interaction (Hempel) or rather reflect a broader *yaḥad* organization with outlying communities (Collins and Schofield) or legislate for travelling members of the *yaḥad* meeting on a journey (Metso)—the important emphasis to note for our present purposes is the close point of contact between otherwise rather different organizations in this case. Whichever interpretation

[41] Hempel, "Penal Code Reconsidered."

[42] See 1QS 6:6b–8a (cf. 4QS^{d} [4Q258] II: 10b) and 1QSa 2:21–22; further *m. Sanh* 1.6. For some recent discussions see John. J. Collins, "The Yaḥad and 'The Qumran Community'," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. C. Hempel and J. Lieu; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81–96; idem, *Beyond the Qumran Community*; Charlotte Hempel, "1QS 6:2c–4a—Satellites or Precursors of the Yaḥad?"; eadem, "Interpretative Authority in the Community Rule Tradition," *DSD* 10 (2003): 59–80; eadem, "Emerging Communal Life and Ideology in the S Tradition," in *Defining Identities: 'We', 'You' and 'the Others' in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 43–61; Sarianna Metso, "Whom Does the Term Yaḥad Identify?" in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, 213–235; and Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad.

one favours it is curious to find this correspondence between D and S both in terms of content and terminology.

Admission Into the Community by Swearing an Oath

In a previous study I was keen to stress the close similarity between the requirement to swear an oath to return to the law of Moses with all one's heart and all one's soul found both in D and S (cf. CD 15:5b–10a // 4QD^{a} 8 i // 4QD^{e} 6 ii and 1QS 5:7c–9a // 4QS^{b} // 4QS^{d}).[43] This simple procedure contrasts sharply with a much more complex admission process laid down in 1QS 6:13b-23. What does this point of contact between S and D indicate? In my view it is most likely an early, embryonic way of expressing a common purpose practiced by Second Temple period Jews. Metso rightly notes the close relationship of the oath attested in S and D to Neh 10:28f. It appears there is broader evidence for such an oath in the late Second Temple period. She takes the lack of explicit reference in S and D to the covenant of Nehemiah 10 as a further indication that Nehemiah may not have been transmitted as scriptural at Qumran.[44] A different way of looking at this triangle—S, D, and Nehemiah—is to suggest a comparable social development that is attested in Nehemiah and our texts.[45] The central point to be made here again is the close contact between D and S on this matter. Most recently James VanderKam has addressed this issue at some length in favour of the alternative view which considers various statements on admission into the community (attested in D, S, and Josephus) to relate to a single procedure.[46] Moreover, in his estimation the entrance vow took place in the course of the annual covenant ceremony. While

---

[43] Charlotte Hempel, "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, and Disciplinary Procedures," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 2:67–92 (70–73).

[44] Sarianna Metso, "Creating Communal Halakhah," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. P. W. Flint et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 279–301 (297).

[45] See already Morton Smith, "The Dead Sea Scrolls in Relation to Ancient Judaism," *NTS* 7 (1960): 347–360 (355–357) and, more recently, Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007) and Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Judaism the First Phase: The Place of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Origins of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 189–227.

[46] James C. VanderKam, "The Oath and the Community," *DSD* 16 (2009): 416–432.

VanderKam arrives at a different conclusion from my own, I welcome the debate of this question which seems to me not to have been given the attention it deserves.

Maskil Heading[47]

Whereas brief Maskil headings occur in a large number of texts from the corpus of the Scrolls and in the Psalms, both D and S share a more elaborate heading announcing the statutes for the Maskil to walk in them with all the living according to the rule for each time (D: למשפט עת ועת // S: לתכון עת ועת). A series of rules addressing the dealings of the Maskil with others follow this heading in S, and I have elsewhere identified the scant remains of Maskil traditions in D.[48] The almost *verbatim* correspondence between D and S as far as the Maskil headings are concerned presents further striking and crucial evidence in our quest to trace the transmission of traditions in S and D.

The Self Designation 'The People of Perfect Holiness'

CD 20:1b–8a deals with the temporary expulsion of disobedient members, and its close relationship to 1QS 8–9 attests a distinctive use of the self-designation 'the people of perfect holiness' (אנשי תמים הקדש) frequently in CD 20 and also in 1QS 8:20. A powerful account of the close relationship between this part of CD and S was given by Murphy-O'Connor already in 1972: "Had CD XX, 1c–8a been found as an isolated fragment it would have been presumed that it belonged to the *Rule*…."[49] In addition to the close resemblance between CD 20:1–8 and S, we also note that the self-designation 'people of perfect holiness' is not found anywhere else in the Scrolls even if the ambition to attain

[47] Cf. CD 12:20b–22a // 4QD[a] 9 II:7–8 and 1QS 9:12 // 4QS[e].

[48] See Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 105–106, 114–121, 189; and eadem, "*Maskil(im)* and *Rabbim*: From Daniel to Qumran," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, 133–156 and further literature referred to there.

[49] Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33–XX,34," *RB* 79 (1972): 544–64 (554–555).

perfection and holiness is expressed more frequently in our texts.[50] I have dealt with this material in a recently published article.[51]

It is curious that 4QS^{e} lacks most of the material found in 1QS 8–9 that lies at the heart of the literary contact between CD 20 and 1QS. If Metso is correct, and the shorter version attested by 4QS^{e} is more original, the close relationship between 1QS 8–9 and CD 20 noted by scholars is particularly prominent in a section of 1QS that may be secondary.

Liturgical Framework

A number of scholars have noted the shared liturgical framework present in the *Damascus Document* and some of the *Community Rule* manuscripts. Thus, the *Damascus Document* as now attested more fully by the Cave 4 manuscripts (see esp. 4QD^{a} 11 and 4QD^{e} 7) ends with the description of a covenant renewal event at an annual ceremony. Similarly 1QS and some 4QS copies preserve a substantial account of a covenant ceremony in their opening columns. Vermes suggests both events are identical.[52] More recently Ben Zion Wacholder and Alison

---

[50] On this terminology see Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, 107f. See also Cecilia Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 122–128 where she shows clearly that the contrast drawn in CD 7:4–6 is between those who walk in perfect holiness (obeying the rules of the small law code just preceding this reference) and those who despise. See also A. M. Denis, *Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1967), 135–138. Wassen's interpretation has recently been endorsed by Eyal Regev, "Cherchez les femmes: Were the *yaḥad* Celibates?," *DSD* 15 (2008): 253–284 (255–259). Much has been made by previous scholars of a supposed dichotomy between those (implied: celibate individuals) who walk in perfect holiness and those who live in camps and marry and have children, see, e.g., Elisha Qimron, "Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectarians," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:286–294 and most recently Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 165, see also 171. If Wassen is right, and I think her case is persuasive, then CD 7:4–6 could well speak of a similar conflict or crisis situation that also left its mark on CD 20:1b–8a. Wassen herself suggests that "the writer of XX 1b–8a may have used the language of CD VII 4–5 to highlight the desirable qualities of all the members," *Women in the Damascus Document*, 124–125 n. 51.

[51] Hempel, "CD Manuscript B and the Rule of the Community."

[52] Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. 3d ed.; London: SCM, 1994), 94.

Schofield have also commented on the literary connection.[53] We have again cause to note further complexity in parts of the S tradition since manuscripts such as 4QS^{d} lack the liturgical material found in 1QS 1–4. In other words, we come across a further point of contact between S and D that is more prominent in the fuller form of the S tradition as represented by 1QS/4QS$^{a–c}$ and 4QS^{h}.

In this connection, Steven Fraade has recently addressed the intriguing relationship of the narrative and legal elements in the *Damascus Document* and proposed considering the document as a whole as "an anthology that was drawn upon so as to provide performative 'scripts' […] for the annual covenant renewal ceremony…."[54] Several, though not all, manuscripts of the *Community Rule* (cf. 1QS, 4QpapS^{a}, 4QS^{b}, 4QpapS^{c} and 4QS^{h}) also include a covenant ceremony and may have functioned in a similar 'performative' manner.[55]

Analysis and Conclusions

In the remainder of this chapter I would like to offer an attempt at sketching the larger picture painted by these various pieces of inter-textual contact between S and D. First of all, it seems noteworthy to me that we have come across inter-textual data in a variety of shapes and sizes. It seems very likely that some of the connections are based on the fact that the authors/compilers of both complex corpora drew on similar source material, as is likely the case with the legislation on a quorum of ten and some of the penal code traditions. On the other end of the spectrum, we note some close points of contact that must go back to a later stage in the shaping of the traditions. We may argue about whether this general distinction holds water and where to locate a particular instance of literary contact. The strongest candidates of literary contact that goes back to a late stage in the growth of the

---

[53] Cf. Ben Zion Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (STDJ 56; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 367 and Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 165.

[54] Steven Fraade, "Ancient Jewish Law and Narrative in Comparative Perspective: The Damascus Document and the Mishnah," *Diné Israel: An Annual of Jewish Law* 24 (2007): 65–99 (87).

[55] For an overview of what is preserved in the different manuscripts of the *Community Rule* see Table 1 in Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, 1–2 and Metso, *Serekh Texts*.

traditions we discussed are the section on the people of perfect holiness in CD 20 and 1QS 8–9 as well as the liturgical bridge between S and D. In each case the evidence of the Cave 4 manuscripts of S can be interpreted to attest a situation before this particular connection was established. Thus, we have a covenant ceremony in some S manuscripts and 4QD but not in all of the S manuscripts. Similarly we have identified the close relationship to CD 20:1–8 in a part of 1QS that is lacking from 4QS^{e}. In this respect Alison Schofield's recent observations that the inter-textual points of contact between S and D appear to be located near or at the point of the *Damascus Document's* final redaction are convincing.[56] At other times she is not quite as nuanced in her comments, however. Thus, in offering some reflections on the relationship of S to non-S texts she rightly notes, "in addition to utilizing similar theology and terminology, D and S shared similar literary sources and, by extension, a close relationship between their authoring communities."[57] She also maintains in commenting on the table of eighteen 'parallels' between S and other texts that "S was widely known and influential."[58] Given that out of the eighteen 'parallels' she lists ten are from D and two from 4Q265, by and large made up of penal code material, it is dubious to take it for granted that the overarching influence of S is the best way to account for the points of contact. Two further 'parallels' occur in 5Q11 which may constitute a further copy of the Rule from Cave 5.[59] We already noted the identification of 4Q502 16 as part of 4QS^{c}.[60] In short, it seems just as likely—if not more so—that the reason we witness so-called parallels between S and other compositions, chiefly D and 4Q265, is because they are based on some of the same source material. Alongside such developmental connections we also found some evidence for links at the seams that gave the material its final form. In this connection Karel van der Toorn speaks of evolving ancient texts in terms of pearls on a string.[61] Our overview over a number of prominent points of contact between S and D have uncovered shared pearls as well as shared types of string between both corpora.

---

[56] Cf. Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 165, see also 167–168.
[57] Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 179.
[58] Idem.
[59] Cf. Metso, *Serekh Texts*, 6.
[60] See n. 38 above.
[61] Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

Having reflected on the points of contact between S and D on the level of the texts, we may want to ask whether it is possible to make the leap from textual contact to people or social contact. Two options present themselves here.

Firstly, it is conceivable that most of the complex literary creations are products of scribal activity, and it is quite likely that the scribes responsible for the complex texts we are working with took an active part in shaping the traditions at their disposal, often influenced by the work of their colleagues.

Secondly, this is not to say that we do not have representations of something resembling real events on the level of sources or building blocks that entered the final literary structures. It may be possible, for instance, to connect García Martínez's recent suggestion of looking for clusters of texts that reflect similar provenance[62] with clusters of groupings that would have given rise to the textual clusters. One example mentioned above that I find conceivable as such a cluster of people would be the small gatherings of ten led by a priest in authority.

Finally, if a great deal of the material that eventually comprised S originated outside of Qumran (given the date of a complex work like 1QS [100–75 B.C.E.] and the date of the communal occupation of the site [early first century B.C.E.]), then we may want to ask how much of the traditions contained within it corresponds to similar data elsewhere.

Most recently, Alison Schofield has proposed that the different manuscripts of S ultimately originated in Jerusalem where a core of the S tradition emerged. A master copy in the shape of 1QS was further promulgated first in Jerusalem and then at Qumran. Thus, she notes, "It may be that 1QS was the authoritative text of Qumran, the product of the activity of the hierarchical and exegetical center of the movement."[63] This particular part of her theory results in a neat divide between the Qumran centre (almost a *politburo*) and outlying communities. This reconstruction seems to me to imply a level of control not supported by the large number of different manuscripts of S attested at Qumran. Schofield further proposes that the Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Community Rule* are depositories of blocks of the S traditions that

[62] García Martínez, "¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué?"
[63] *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 279.

were transmitted and evolved in a number of communities outside of Qumran.

I see no need to assign only 1QS to an educated elite, an ancient Jewish equivalent of Oxbridge if you like.[64] Rather, anyone involved in the active scribal transmission of any S manuscript, be it 1QS or 4QS, would by definition have belonged to the educated elite. Someone from outside the confines of the educated elite would not have been able to read, let alone compile and shape, this kind of material. It may be preferable, therefore, to think of an Ivy League of communities if we wanted to go along this route—which I am not sure I do.

There is no need in my view to place 1QS on a pedestal and allot to it a priority as far as the *yaḥad* is concerned that is reminiscent of the now waning star of the Masoretic text in text-critical research. Instead, the texts seem to paint a rather fluid picture of literary activity with influences and material shared in some remarkable ways between D and S as well as other compositions. These amply attested literary relationships illuminate our understanding of how texts grew, emerged, developed, used older sources, and cross-fertilized more broadly. In light of the evident literary creativity witnessed by the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*, it would be worthwhile to encourage more dialogue with the current debates on how to understand the phenomena often referred to with the term 'rewritten scripture.'[65] Different ancient Jewish texts are fluid and influencing each other, and as scholars we are caught in the difficult position of trying to trace how the influence operated. It seems certain that comparable processes and activities can be witnessed in the realm of D, S and 4Q265 and the literature dubbed 'rewritten scripture.' This should not be unexpected since the constituency of people performing such complex learned processes are almost certainly genetically related to one another. If we think of the community or at least its scribal component as learned and engaged in sophisticated dealings with texts and traditions, it is unlikely that they would have made a conscious distinction in their approach to rewriting scripture and rewriting Serekh/D-type-traditions.

---

[64] See also *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad, 190, for the notion of "the movement's hierarchical center," further 275.

[65] For a valuable recent overview see Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

ASPECTS OF THE PHYSICAL AND SCRIBAL FEATURES OF SOME CAVE 4 "CONTINUOUS" PESHARIM

George J. Brooke
University of Manchester

Introduction

This short essay is written to complement two other studies that I have undertaken recently that have enquired respectively into some aspects of the scribal character of *Pesher Habakkuk* and of some of the Cave 4 thematic commentaries.[1] The purpose of this study is to put together several features that have been observed in particular about the Cave 4 *Isaiah Pesharim, Pesher Nahum* and *Pesher Psalms* to see where the discussion has reached concerning how the choice of manuscript and the scribal presentation of the texts indicate how the compositions in these manuscripts might have been conceptualised by those responsible for producing or reproducing them and, in some small way, how they might have been used and received. Some reference will also be made to *Pesher Habakkuk* from Cave 1, since it is the most complete of all the so-called continuous pesharim[2] and can act in some ways as a control over observations made about the more fragmentary Cave 4 examples.

---

[1] George J. Brooke, "Physicality, Paratextuality and Pesher Habakkuk," in *Palimpsestes II: An International Symposium on Commentary Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures* (ed. S. Aufrère; OLA; Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming); idem, "Scribal Issues in Some Thematic Commentaries from Qumran," in *Scribes and Scribalism* (ed. P. R. Davies and T. Römer; London: Equinox Publishing, forthcoming).

[2] The classic distinction between "continuous" and "thematic" pesher was made by Jean Carmignac, "Le document de Qumrân sur Melkisédeq," *RevQ* 7 (1969–1971): 343–78 (360–61); a third category of "isolated pesharim" was added by Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Psuedepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M. E. Stone; CRINT 2/II; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 504. Dimant also pointed out what has become well known, that not all of the continuous pesharim have the same structure or indeed comment on continuous scriptural base texts; see further, e.g., Moshe J. Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Recitation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Pesher Technique," *DSD* 1 (1994): 30–70 (67–70).

The Manuscripts and their Preparation

Most of the manuscripts of the so-called continuous pesharim from Cave 4 are sufficiently fragmentary that it is difficult to gauge their original sizes, in particular their lengths. It is thus very difficult to ascertain whether there was ever a preferred or optimal size for a continuous pesher.[3]

Pesher Nahum stands out as a possible exception. Not only is its height known, but also some suggestions have been made concerning its overall length. These proposals fall into two camps. On the one hand is the detailed calculation by Dirk Stoll.[4] He supposes that the damage patterns, with an implied decreasing turn towards the beginning of the extant fragments, could suggest that the scroll was rolled up with the end of the text on the outside turn when it was put back in the cave. If that was indeed the case, on Stoll's calculations it is not possible that there was more than one further column of writing preceding the first of the most substantial fragments 3–4.[5] As a result he has argued that the scroll would never have contained any commentary on Nah 1:7–2:11. This is indeed a possibility, but a number of factors make an alternative understanding of the damage patterns in the fragments seem preferable. So, on the other hand, on the basis of the not unjustifiable supposition that identifying damage patterns in *Pesher Nahum* is inconclusive and with the not unlikely assumption that the start of the scroll was on the outside when it was replaced in the cave, Gregory Doudna has calculated that the *Pesher Nahum* scroll was likely to have

---

[3] Perhaps because of their fragmentary nature, most discussions of the so-called continuous pesharim make no mention of the physical features of the manuscripts on which they are written: e.g., Bilhah Nitzan, "The *Pesharim* Scrolls from Qumran," in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World, Vol. 1* (ed. M. Kister; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2009), 169–90 [Heb.], has not made any detailed comments on the physical aspects of the manuscripts containing the texts that she discusses.

[4] Dirk Stoll, "Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer–mathematisch oder Wie kann man einer Rekonstruktion Gestalt verleihen?" in *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.–26. Juli 1993* (ed. H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger; Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 205–18 (212–17).

[5] All the fragment, column and line reference numbers follow those used by Maurya P. Horgan, "Pesharim" in *Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translation. Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; PTSDSSP; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 1–193.

had 13 written columns of between 11.5 and 15.2[6] cm in width.[7] Doudna does not take his calculations to their logical conclusion and suggest an overall length for the scroll. If the average width of columns is gauged at 14.0 cm and the spacing between columns at 2.0 cm, then the overall length of the scroll would have been 2.06 m; and with some larger margins at the start and finish, slightly longer than that. Doudna observes that his reconstruction produces a scroll with a twelve and a quarter column layout not unlike that of *Pesher Habakkuk*, though it must be noted that in *Pesher Habakkuk* the column widths are narrower, causing William Brownlee to remark that "if the first two columns were of average width, the entire scroll must have been something over 160 centimeters long."[8] In addition *Pesher Habakkuk* is strikingly and distinctively written on just two pieces of leather with seven columns of writing on the first and the possibility of seven on the second; *Pesher Nahum*, on the other hand, was made up of at least three and possibly four pieces of leather.[9]

A reconstructed *Pesher Nahum* scroll of somewhat more than 2.06 m results in both *Pesher Habakkuk* and *Pesher Nahum* having a happy correspondence with a general observation made by the master of manuscript reconstruction, Hartmut Stegemann. In an essay published in 1990 he presented the key items of his methodology and its implications for both major scrolls and others. He described the features of a group of shorter scrolls as follows: "There are shorter scrolls which had a length of only about 1.5 or 2 m divided into, for example, 12 or 13 broader columns or about 20 smaller columns. If they were rolled with the beginning of their text in the outer layer

---

[6] This is almost certainly an incorrect measurement. 4QpNah 3–4 ii has shrunk near the top where Doudna seems to have taken his measurements. A more precise measurement might suggest that the column was originally nearly 16.5 cm wide.

[7] Gregory L. Doudna, *4QPesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; Copenhagen International Series 8; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 37–38. Doudna's proposals for the likely length and contents of the scroll have been endorsed and followed by Shani Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 6 n. 16.

[8] William H. Brownlee, "The Habakkuk Commentary," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Volume I: The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (ed. M. Burrows et al.; New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950), xxi.

[9] There is evidence of stitching (together with a double margin) between *Pesher Nahum* 3–4 iii and iv. If those columns were x and xi of the original manuscript as Doudna has proposed, then the first ten columns would have been presented on two or three pieces of leather.

of the scroll, they were not as tightly wrapped as the larger scrolls."[10] While the *Pesher Habakkuk* scroll seems to be at the lower limits of such a group, the *Pesher Nahum* scroll, at just over 2.0 m is at the upper limits for a short scroll, but nevertheless seems to merit the description of being "normal" or "standard."[11] Furthermore, as such, it is also likely that on the basis of the general character of other scrolls, there was probably nothing preceding the commentary on Nahum in the scroll.[12] That conclusion would make the manuscript correspond with Emanuel Tov's important overall observation that the vast majority of scrolls from the Qumran caves seem to have contained but a single composition.[13]

In addition to the possible lengths of the scrolls containing the continuous pesharim, before scribes begin to write, the size of the writing blocks on each sheet of leather were ruled out.[14] As with the likely lengths of the scrolls that contain these commentaries, so the sizes of the writing blocks vary, but within a particular range. None has writing blocks so short, of so few lines, that there might be some technical explanation for it, as with some of the calendar texts, the festival scrolls, and some incantation texts. None is so large that it could be assigned some very special status or authority as with several of the manuscripts containing scriptural compositions, a point which I will return to below.

As for the size of the writing block, it is interesting to note that amongst the continuous pesharim from Cave 4 for which measure-

---

[10] Stegemann, "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 189–220 (196).

[11] One wonders whether the standard sizes of scrolls was a limiting factor on the amount of commentary that might or could be included on a scroll, or whether scribes had ready access to facilities for adding a further sheet of leather if it was needed. The size of "standard" scrolls might have had a role in limiting both how much scriptural text was selected for commentary and how extensive any comments could be.

[12] Stoll ("Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer," 217) concludes the same, but on the basis that there was no room for any other composition at the start of the scroll, given that (for him) it was rolled with the beginning as the innermost turn.

[13] Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 39. This makes it highly unlikely that *Pesher Hosea A*, *Pesher Hosea B* (different hand) and *Pesher Micah* were all part of the same scroll as proposed by John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean desert of Jordan»," *RevQ* 7/2 (1970): 199.

[14] *Pesher Habakkuk* is an intriguing exception in this regard, since its second sheet was cut to size from a larger piece of leather that had already been ruled.

ments are more or less certain *Pesher Nahum* has the smallest writing block by height, with twelve lines, putting it in Tov's category of leather scrolls with a small writing block (4–14 lines).[15] The continuous pesher that is next in column size is *Pesher Habakkuk* (1QpHab) with seventeen lines per column, falling in Tov's medium-sized category (15–24 lines).[16] *Pesher Hosea A* has nineteen lines per column. The only pesharim for which there is enough evidence that they can be classified has having a large writing block (25–34 lines) are *Pesher Psalms A* with twenty-seven lines, close to the minimum measure that Tov uses for that category, and *Pesher Isaiah A* with twenty-nine lines;[17] since the determination of the classes of writing blocks is arbitrary, it is not necessary to make *Pesher Psalms A* or *Pesher Isaiah A* the exceptions, but they can be considered as marking the upper limit of column height for such a composition. Tov has bravely asserted that "the average number of lines per column in Qumran scrolls is probably twenty,"[18] and the continuous pesharim attest to that precisely with a range of twelve to twenty-nine lines. Although to some extent the size of pieces of leather from which manuscripts could be made was determined by the size of the relevant parts of the animals from which the leather was taken, nevertheless in general it seems that the so-called continuous pesharim from Cave 4 fall within a standard range.

Alongside indications of height, it is necessary to put some indication of column width. In the scrolls found in the Qumran caves margins are most commonly provided by vertical rulings for both the right and left side of the column. In *Pesher Isaiah B*, *Pesher Hosea A* and *Pesher Nahum* (and also *Pesher Habakkuk*) this most common system of vertical ruling for both the right and left side of the writing block

[15] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 85. Tov lists *Pesher Isaiah B* as having the shortest columns, of ten lines, but this is incorrect. Not only are there some ink remains of an eleventh line, but also the surface of the leather has broken away at the bottom, so that what Tov seems to have taken as a bottom margin is in fact not so. The overall number of lines in *Pesher Isaiah B* cannot be determined.

[16] *Pesher Habakkuk* only covers Habakkuk 1–2; for a variety of reasons it is most likely that the Qumran interpreter knew of Habakkuk 3 but chose not to comment upon it.

[17] According to John Strugnell ("Notes en marge du volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean desert of Jordan»," 183) the columns had 25 lines; Maurya P. Horgan has used Strugnell's suggestion for reconstruction to suggest a column of 29 lines: Horgan, "Pesharim," 86–97.

[18] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 84.

is used.[19] In *Pesher Hosea A*, somewhat distinctively, the guide dots commonly used when dry lines are ruled appear in the inter-columnar margin in the middle of a sheet.[20] As to the dimensions of the widths of columns in the continuous pesharim from Cave 4, little can be said. In the manuscripts found in the Qumran caves widths often vary in size, even on a single sheet of leather. For the Cave 4 continuous pesharim definite width sizes are only available for one column of *Pesher Isaiah B* (12.1 cm), for two columns of *Pesher Nahum* (3–4 ii: 15.3–16.3 cm [because of uneven shrinkage in the column]; 3–4 iii: 13.6 cm), and for two columns of *Pesher Psalms A* (1–10 ii: c. 11.8 cm; 1–10 iii: c. 10.3 cm). Even these few dimensions show that variations in width can occur in adjacent columns. Perhaps of note is that *Pesher Nahum* iii is the last column on the sheet of leather and so its width may have been determined simply by the amount of leather on the sheet that was remaining to be filled; in the case of the two columns of *Pesher Psalms A* whose width is extant neither are at the start or the end of a sheet of leather and yet there is variation in the column width. By way of comparison some figures can be cited from Tov's overall analysis: "The average column-width in 1QM is 15.0 cm, 13.0 cm in 1QH^{a}, and 9.5–15.5 cm in 1QS. An example of a scroll with very wide columns measuring 21–24 cm is 4QJer^{b} (115–130 letter-spaces; reconstructed)."[21] There seems to be nothing extraordinary in the dimensions of the columns in the Cave 4 continuous pesharim, though equally it can be concluded that there is no pre-determined standard dimension, either in proportion to a column's height or otherwise.

The sizes of top and bottom margins also need to be considered briefly. "In the Qumran leather and papyrus texts, the bottom margins are usually larger than the top margin."[22] *Pesher Nahum* and *Pesher Isaiah E* fall directly in this category with top margins of 1.5 and 1.8 cm and bottom margins of 2.3 and 2.5 cm respectively, putting them amongst a group of manuscripts from the Dead Sea region with

---

[19] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 59; Tov cites two dozen examples of this common practice from both biblical and nonbiblical manuscripts, from both sectarian and non-sectarian manuscripts, and from manuscripts both from Qumran and Masada.

[20] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 61; Tov also cites *RP*^{c} (4Q365), *ShirShabb*^{f} (4Q405), *Narrative A* (4Q458), *Visions of Amram*^{e} *ar* (4Q547) and *Dan*^{d} (4Q115). A summary of observations about guide dots in the manuscripts from Qumran, including the irregularity of *Pesher Hosea A*, can be found in Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 67.

[21] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 83.

[22] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 99.

margins on the large side.[23] *Pesher Hosea A* has top and bottom margins of equal size (2.0 cm each), as does *Pesher Psalms A* (1.7 cm each). These are all smaller than rabbinic sources later were to prescribe for scriptural manuscripts.[24] Since it is generally the case that the scriptural manuscripts from the Qumran caves and elsewhere have larger margins than their non-scriptural counterparts one may suppose that there is a trajectory of scribal practices that is moving towards what later rabbinic authorities would confirm as normative. So, perhaps as with the size of the writing block, so also the size of the margin suggests that there is nothing extraordinarily special about the pesher literature.

Is there any significance in the observation that continuous pesharim, along with some other kinds of excerpted compositions and thematic commentaries are generally in standard small and medium-sized scrolls? The sectarian commentary literature does not seem to have been reproduced with ideas of its distinctive status and authority in mind, as was the case with many of the scriptural books and even the *Hodayot* which are extant in "de luxe" copies. This might possibly indicate that these commentaries were deemed of less status than the scriptural texts upon which they commented. Thus, although it is certainly possible to argue that in some ways the commentaries proper are prophetically continuous with the prophetic texts on which they comment, even revealing "mysteries" that were unknown to the original prophets, it is also important to keep in mind that the manuscripts chosen for copying out these commentaries, their sizes and preparation, do not seem to signal any particular authority for these compositions. Thus although the conclusion of Alex Jassen with regard to the pesharim is attractive, "Prophecy continues in the Qumran community through the inspired interpretation of Scripture,"[25] it is to be remembered that inasmuch as such a claim asserts the equal authority of scriptural prophecy and its interpretation, the physical evidence for such a claim is largely lacking or at best could be interpreted either way.[26] There does not seem to be anything out of the ordinary in the

[23] See the list of manuscripts with large margins (at least one above 2.0 cm) in Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 102–103.

[24] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 99.

[25] Alex Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 353.

[26] It could possibly be argued that although size might indicate something about function, it says little about authoritative status, since some scriptural texts and

physical size and preparation of the manuscripts of the continuous pesharim.

One last feature of the physical remains of the Cave 4 continuous pesharim needs brief mention. It has sometimes been argued that the pesharim are autographs,[27] extant in only single copies. This is unlikely. Not only is it most probable that *Pesher Habakkuk* is a copy that incorporates subsequent comments,[28] but also the existence of commentaries on Isaiah on different materials (papyrus and leather) and with some overlap in texts (*Pesher Isaiah A* and *Pesher Isaiah C* both comment independently on Isaiah 10–11) suggests that modern scholarly discussion of the continuous pesharim as autographs is inappropriate. Most of the Cave 4 continuous pesharim are indeed manuscripts from the late first century B.C.E. or first half of the first century C.E.[29] and so indicate that this kind of exegesis was "put into writing only towards the end of the sect's life,"[30] but that says little about the date of composition and the processes of transmission of such exegetical works. Nevertheless, the fact that most of the continuous pesharim are indeed extant in only one relatively late copy might indicate that they survive as such not just by accident but rather because of their function, not being authoritative reference works for the community (as the multiple variant copies of the *Hodayot*, the *Rule of the Community*, and the *Damascus Document* might indicate for those compositions), but serving more as informal community study aids.[31]

---

sectarian rule books are also presented on manuscripts the same standard size as these continuous pesharim.

[27] Most authoritatively suggested by Frank M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; The Biblical Seminar 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 92.

[28] See the comments by Eugene Ulrich in this volume on the "process of developmental composition" for scriptural books; much of what he describes applies to non-scriptural compositions as well. Some manuscript copies of works found in the Qumran caves, such as the *Hodayot* scrolls, or the copies of the *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document*, seem to attest to various stages in the composition of a work.

[29] On how this may indicate nothing unusual for Cave 4 see Stephen J. Pfann, "Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves: Libraries, Archives, Genizas and Hiding Places," *BAIAS* 25 (2007): 147–70 (157).

[30] Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 92.

[31] Mark Geller, "The Hermeneutics of Babylonian Medical Commentaries," in *Hermeneutics in the Ancient World* (ed. A. Lange and G. Selz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming) has observed that there are no duplicate copies of the Babylonian medical commentaries, a fact he understands to be indicative of their function as individual exercise notes.

The Scribes and their Texts[32]

In a short study of this kind it is not possible to consider every aspect of the scribal character of the so-called continuous pesharim from Cave 4. Just as in the previous section of this paper I have not been exhaustive in considering some of the significant physical features and preparation of the manuscripts that contain these pesharim, so in this section I will mention only briefly several aspects of the scribalism of these continuous pesharim, aspects which have come into focus all the more readily since the synthetic analytical work of Emanuel Tov on scribal practices.[33]

As for the scribes of the manuscripts themselves, Strugnell proposed forty years ago that the same scribe wrote *Pesher Isaiah A* and *Pesher Hosea A*, possibly also *Pesher Micah* (4Q168).[34] However, although the scribes of *Pesher Isaiah A* and *Pesher Hosea A* share several features, not least in the orthography of the *šin*, they also display differences, such as in the shape of the *lamed*. Against Strugnell, Emanuel Tov has declared, however, that "the Qumran pesharim were authored by different individuals and were probably copied by yet other scribes, some of whom could have been the authors themselves." He has also added that "interestingly enough, none of the scribal hands visible in the pesharim appears in a second pesher."[35] I am inclined to agree with Tov and suppose that the so-called continuous pesharim from Cave 4 were each penned by different scribes, though I would be very cautious before concluding that any of the scribal copyists were also the authors of the compositions they were writing down.[36] Cave 1's *Pesher*

---

[32] On the problems of the label "scribal exegesis" see Jonathan Norton, "The Question of Scribal Exegesis at Qumran," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006* (ed. A. Klostergaard Petersen et al.; STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 135–54; he argues that scribal realia, the subject of this section of the essay, should be kept largely distinct from social historical issues surrounding the identification of the sectarian exegetes.

[33] In general on the character and plausibility of Tov's synthesis, especially with regard to Qumran scribal practice see the contribution by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar in this volume.

[34] John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'," 199, 201, 204. For the list of suggestions for scribes who have written more than one manuscript see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 23.

[35] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 258.

[36] Tov's comment for the pesharim, that authors might possibly be responsible for copying their own compositions, seems to echo Cross's persistent view on the pesharim as autographs.

Habakkuk is well known as having been penned by two scribes. What might be the significance in this observation? Does the occurrence of several scribes indicate that the copying of a continuous pesher was not a particularly specialist or esoteric task? Does the likelihood of there being at least as many scribes as manuscripts indicate that the manuscripts served for personal use?

Whatever the case might be, I have already noted the way that the writing of this kind of exegetical literature seems to belong late in the life of the sectarian movement, part of which probably lived at Qumran. Apart from the details of the content of this literature, are there aspects of its scribal presentation that might improve the modern appreciation of it? The continuous pesharim are constructed from the controlling citation of scriptural lemmata, arranged in the sequence of scripture itself, each lemma being followed by commentary that is formulaically introduced.[37] In general it seems that the length of the scriptural lemmata that are cited in the continuous pesharim are determined largely according to the sense unit that is required by the commentator.

The various practices of citation can be broadly categorized under three headings. To begin with, there are those continuous pesharim, amongst which *Pesher Habakkuk* is a key example, in which sometimes the citations are less than those divisions of text that the Massorah has determined to form verse units, sometimes they overlap with those divisions and sometimes they include two, three or more verses.[38] Similar diversity of citing the text is apparent in most of the other so-called continuous pesharim: *Pesher Isaiah C, Pesher Isaiah D*, and *Pesher Nahum*. Second, there are those continuous pesharim, all on the book of Isaiah, in which the lemmata consistently are constructed of larger portions of scriptural text, consisting of two or more scriptural verses as later defined: *Pesher Isaiah A, Pesher Isaiah B* and *Pesher Isaiah E* are in this category. One wonders whether the association of this practice with the book of Isaiah has something to do with the length of the book or indeed of the parts of Isaiah selected for

[37] I described several aspects of the controlling characteristics of the scriptural citation in the continuous pesharim in George J. Brooke, "The Pesharim and the Origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. O. Wise et al.; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 339–54.

[38] Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 140) has provided the details for *Pesher Habakkuk*.

interpretation. Third, it seems as if *Pesher Hosea A* and *Pesher Psalms A* anticipate somewhat more closely what was later declared in rabbinic usage and cite more or less precisely the verse divisions as are apparent in the MT. To my mind this third category is almost certainly the result of the particular poetic character of the scriptural text that is being commented upon in those works. It is not difficult to imagine how an interpretative reader of the Psalms was to some extent controlled by the structure of the psalm and its systems of parallelism, whereby small sense-units were created.

It is clear that after the choice of the scriptural book or substantial section of it, the division of the scriptural text into units for comment is a first step in the interpretative process.[39] As with the variation in the sizes of the writing block in each continuous pesher, so for the lemmatisation of the scriptural text there is variation, but within discernible parameters. It might well be that this variety should be understood as reflecting a two-pronged approach in the hermeneutics of pesher: on the one hand in many instances short phrases or individual words are identified, often through the use of pronouns, with particular features of the interpreter's contemporary world, but on the other hand, often the interpretation is more general and presupposes the overall original structure and purpose of the passage cited. Intriguingly, there is no direct correlation between the length of the scriptural citation and the form of the comment; sometimes lengthy lemmata are followed by brief atomistic identifications, and sometimes brief citations are followed by more general comments. In addition, the formulaically introduced commentary may contain a mixture of such interpretations.

As to the issue of spacing between units in more detail, it seems as if several different scribal conventions are used in the Cave 4 continuous pesharim; there is no one scribal practice. The largest space division is a line that is left partially empty after a pesher comment ends, followed by another line also left completely empty before the next scriptural lemma is started at the right hand margin in the next line. This kind of spacing occurs in *Pesher Psalms A* 1–10 ii 5–6, at ii 20–21, at iv 5–6 and at 21–22, all between the pesher proper and the lemma. It is also present in *Pesher Isaiah A* 2–6 ii 19–20 and in *Pesher*

[39] Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 140) concludes that the units of text in the pesharim are created because of the nature of the subject matter requiring comment, rather than that they reflect a tradition of verse division different from that of the MT.

Isaiah C 6–7 ii 9–10 and 20–21, the last of which seems to represent a major break within a quotation (between Isa 10:23 and 10:24), though only the start of the empty line is extant.[40] More commonly, the units of scriptural lemma and formulaically introduced commentary follow on from one another with an open space at the end of the comment so that the scriptural citation can begin at the right-hand margin of the next line; also common is a separation of text and interpretation from the next set of text and interpretation by a space. Cave 1's *Pesher Habakkuk* is distinctive amongst the continuous pesharim in not using spaces to separate complete units of scriptural lemma and interpretation; although *Pesher Habakkuk* uses paleo-Hebrew for the tetragrammaton in scriptural citations,[41] its lack of spacing between interpretative comment and the next scriptural citation might imply that the reader of the text was expected to know the scriptural text by heart, but not the accompanying comment.[42]

As for the presentation within individual units of scriptural citation and commentary, the scribes of the various Cave 4 manuscripts of continuous pesharim seem to have used differing systems.[43] *Pesher Psalms A* "is the only surviving *pesher* which did not indicate the *incipit* of the *pesher* with any spacing system, while it often indicated its end with a closed section (usually in the first half of the line) or an open section (usually in the second half of the line)."[44] Most often spacing occurs between the lemma and the pesher, as in *Pesher Habakkuk*, either as a space at the end of a line or as a space in the middle of the line. In the papyrus[45] *Pesher Isaiah C* there are marginal marks that indi-

---

[40] The same may also be the case in *Pesher Hosea A* i, 5–6, 13–14; ii, 6–7, but the extant text is too fragmentary to be certain what was at the start of those lines which appear to be empty.

[41] The use of paleo-Hebrew for the tetragrammaton will be discussed further below. Several reasons have been proposed for its use in some manuscripts. If its use in some continuous pesharim was to prevent accidental pronunciation of the divine name, then perhaps the scriptural text being used was not known by heart, at least not by all possible readers of the text.

[42] Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 330) has suggested that the system of *Pesher Habakkuk* supposes that "the biblical text was considered to be one continuous text together with its *pesher*, which was preceded by a space." But the use of a space between scriptural lemma and pesher seems to me to indicate just the opposite of this conclusion.

[43] The evidence has been assembled by Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 326–30.

[44] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 330.

[45] On how parchment may have replaced papyrus as the regular writing material in early Second Temple period see Menahem Haran, "Book-Scrolls in Israel in Pre-Exilic Times," *JJS* 33 (1982): 161–73.

cate the beginning and continuation of the pesher, with other kinds of sign indicating the beginning of the continuation of the scriptural citation, which does not always take place at the margin.[46] Overall, if the absence of a space between whole units of lemma and comment in *Pesher Habakkuk* might suggest that the scribe expected the reader to know the scriptural text by heart, the same can certainly be said for *Pesher Psalms A* in which the absence of a space after the scriptural citation seems to suppose that the use of a technical formula to introduce the comment is more than enough to indicate a differentiation between scriptural text and its interpretation. Once again, as with one aspect of the physical size and layout of the writing blocks of the Cave 4 continuous pesharim, the indications in the layout of the text in these continuous pesharim seem to point to a clear differentiation between scripture and comment in the mind of the scribe, even if only in repeating the data from the manuscript from which he was copying. But in all this there is considerable variety of scribal practice.[47]

Indeed, it does seem to be the case that the Cave 4 continuous pesharim are quite likely to be copies. In common with other manuscripts penned by more than one hand, Cave 1's *Pesher Habakkuk* would seem to be a copy. The same seems to apply to *Pesher Psalms A*. There is a scribal mistake in *Pesher Psalms A* 1–10 iii 5 which is corrected by a supralinear addition in the same hand. Although the mistake could have come about through a visual error as the eye of the person dictating jumped from one phrase to another, an error that was then transferred orally, for Tov the process of correction clearly indicates that there must have been a written *Vorlage*,[48] not least because the tetragrammaton in the correction is written in square script rather than the paleo-Hebrew characteristic of the rest of the manuscript. On this basis, although for several prophetic texts there exists only one copy, it seems likely that the assumption should be that the Cave 4 continuous pesharim should be considered to be copies, until proven otherwise.

---

[46] Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 330) refers to several commentary texts amongst the Oxyrhynchus papyri, indicating that scribal devices to differentiate lemma from comment were widespread in antiquity, as they are also today.

[47] Again, Eibert Tigchelaar in this volume points out how the *variety* of scribal practices for any single phenomenon, whether orthographical, morphological or something else altogether, can be seen as a significant challenge to the idea of there having been a single scribal school evident in some manuscripts.

[48] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 29.

Qumran scholarship is indebted to Tov for attempting to demarcate a Qumran scribal practice. All the continuous pesharim from Cave 4, apart from *Pesher Isaiah B*, display features of such scribal practice, some in several ways that lead to a clear identification with such a scribal school (*Pesher Isaiah A, C, E; Pesher Hosea A; Pesher Psalms A, B*), others less clearly so (*Pesher Isaiah B, Pesher Isaiah D; Pesher Hosea B; Pesher Micah; Pesher Nahum*), sometimes because too little relevant text survives.[49] This is probably nothing more than would be expected, since the vast majority of clearly sectarian compositions are penned in such practice, but with many variations in its application.[50] Even in the case of *Pesher Isaiah B*, alone of the continuous pesharim, there are cancellation dots above and below a dittograph (i 4; *w'šr*).[51] Such cancellation dots occur in several manuscripts, both those containing biblical compositions and also those with sectarian compositions, but they are most frequent in texts that are written according to the so-called Qumran scribal practice; *Pesher Isaiah B* is one of only eight manuscripts not written according to that system in which cancellation dots are used.[52] It is not possible or necessary to rehearse all the features of this scribal practice in each case. In addition *Pesher Psalms A* and *Pesher Hosea A* (like *Pesher Habakkuk*) contain non-final forms in final position and final forms in non-final position.[53]

However, one feature of the continuous pesharim deserves more particular comment. As has been observed and as Tov highlights,[54] two different systems are used in the pesharim for the representation of the tetragrammaton in scriptural citations—the tetragrammaton is never used in the sections of interpretation. In *Pesher Isaiah B, Pesher Isaiah C, Pesher Micah, Pesher Nahum, Pesher Zephaniah,*

---

[49] See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 281, 285, for the principal data in a tabulated form.

[50] A few sectarian compositions do not follow Qumran scribal practice: Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 262: *Pesher Isaiah*^{b} (4Q162), *Commentary on Genesis A* (4Q252), *S*^{d} (4Q258), *S*^{j} (4Q264), *Calendrical Document A* (4Q320), *MMT*^{b} (4Q395), *Barkhi Nafshi*^{a} (4Q434); mostly these were penned in the second half of the first century B.C.E. While acknowledging the way many of the key sectarian compositions share various scribal features, Tigchelaar (in this volume) pays particular attention to these exceptions in his review of Tov's overall synthetic proposals for Qumran scribal practice.

[51] In *Pesher Habakkuk* vii 2 cancellation strokes are used above the two-letter word that has to be deleted. As this indicates, cancellation dots are not the only scribal means for deleting a dittograph; for other means, such as crossing out, erasures and parentheses, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 226.

[52] See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 197–98.

[53] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 231.

[54] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 240.

and *Pesher Psalms B* square characters are used for the divine name, while in other Cave 4 continuous pesharim it was written in paleo-Hebrew. *Pesher Hosea B*, for which no tetragrammata in scriptural citations have survived, uses *'l* for "God" in square characters in its sections of interpretation.[55] There is no exclusive correlation between the manuscripts that use paleo-Hebrew and those that certainly reflect the Qumran scribal practice.[56] In addition, in *Pesher Psalms A* (1–10 iii 14) the prefix to a paleo-Hebrew tetragrammaton is written in a square character, whereas in *Pesher Psalms C* (4Q173 frag. 5) the prefix to *'l*[57] is written in cryptic script as is the divine designation.[58]

It is difficult to understand why this variation might have occurred. Any attempt at differentiating between these two groups of manuscripts according to date is likely to fail in the end, simply because the paleographical dates given to each manuscript have to be sufficiently broad.[59] Nevertheless, though precision on the matter is impossible, there is a possibility that a trend can be observed: most of the earlier pesharim tend to use square Hebrew, whereas most of the later ones tend to use paleo-Hebrew. Annette Steudel has attempted to set out some of the other possible developments in the sectarian commentary

---

[55] Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 244) suggests that *Pesher Isaiah B* also has *'el*, but this seems to be an error.

[56] See especially Tigchelaar's comments in this volume on *Pesher Isaiah B* and *Pesher Nahum*.

[57] In the MT for Ps 118:20, which seems to be quoted here, the Hebrew reads the tetragrammaton, so it looks as if there is a double substitution here: *'l* for *yhwh* and cryptic script for square characters. If this fragment does indeed belong to a pesher, this is the only example of such a double substitution in the corpus of pesharim.

[58] Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 241) suggests that it is *Pesher Psalms A* that concurs with later recommended practice as expressed in Sof. 4.3: "All the letter which are written before or after divine names may be erased." He describes *l'l* of *Pesher Psalms C* (4Q173a) as written in paleo-Hebrew (241), whereas it is actually in some kind of cryptic script as he rightly comments (205), based on his "Scribal Markings in the Texts from the Judean Desert," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (ed. D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill 1996), 61: "Greek and Latin letters in mirror writing with Hebrew values."

[59] Tov (*Scribal Practices*, 240 n. 296) provides the date evidence: "The following dates have been assigned to pesharim using the square character: 4QpIsa^{b} (4Q162; 50–25 B.C.E.), 4Qpap pIsa^{c} (4Q163; 85 B.C.E.), 4QpMic? (4Q168; 30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.), 4QpNah (4Q169; 50–25 B.C.E.). The following dates have been assigned to pesharim using the tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters: 1QpHab (1–50 CE), 4QpIsa^{a} (4Q161; 50–25 B.C.E.), 4QpPs^{a} (4Q171; 50–25 B.C.E.), 4QpPs^{b} (4Q173; 30–1 B.C.E.), 4QpIsa^{e} (4Q165; 30–1 B.C.E.)."

literature on a similarly tentative basis.[60] As to whether there was a different provenance for the different practices, any comment has to remain similarly cautious. Whatever the case with the provenance of those manuscripts with square Hebrew throughout, it is striking that with the exception of S^{d} (4Q258) all the manuscripts that use paleo-Hebrew for the tetragrammaton also follow the Qumran scribal practice.[61] One minor aberration needs noting: in *Pesher Psalms A*, as mentioned, there is a supralinear addition at 1–10 iii 5 in which the tetragrammaton is written in square characters, but in the citations from the Psalms in the surrounding text it is always written in paleo-Hebrew.[62]

The writing of the tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew script was probably done by a different scribe with specialist training; this seems to be likely on the basis of noting that the scribe of *Pesher Isaiah E* has left a space (6 4) for the tetragrammaton to be added later but it never was.[63] Perhaps such specialists were even of a higher social grade because of their competence in handling the divine name.[64] There are two suggestions as to the purpose of writing the tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew which are not mutually exclusive.[65] On the one hand

---

[60] Annette Steudel, "Dating Exegetical Texts from Qumran," in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (ed. D. Dimant and R. G. Kratz; FAT II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 39–53; see especially her chart on p. 47.

[61] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 243, has indeed suggested that "a special link between the writing of the divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters and the Qumran community is therefore highly conceivable." Perhaps the practice of the use of paleo-Hebrew for the divine name simply reflects a sectarian attitude of respect.

[62] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 29 and 223. On p. 29 Tov proposes that the supralinear correction was done by the same hand as that of the text of the scroll itself; but on p. 223 he implies that the addition is in a second hand because of this variation in scribal habit.

[63] Al Wolters, "The Tetragrammaton in the Psalms Scroll," *Textus* 18 (1995): 87–99, has noted how the subsequent filling-in procedure gave rise to a number of scribal errors in 11Q5, the Psalms Scroll; in particular, at 11Q5 iii 4 the tetragrammaton was not inserted where it should have been.

[64] Al Wolters, "The Tetragrammaton in the Psalms Scroll," 98; cited as a possibility also by Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 245. For the view that some scribes, even possibly at Qumran, were trained for specialist tasks see George J. Brooke, "4Q341: An Exercise for Spelling and for Spells?" in *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard* (ed. P. Bienowski, C. B. Mee and E. A. Slater; LHBOTS 426; London: T & T Clark International, 2005), 271–82. On social stratification amongst scribes see the comments of Juhana M. Saukkonen, "Dwellers at Qumran: Reflections on their Literacy, Social Status, and Identity," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 615–27 (622–24).

[65] Not mutually exclusive, since both might be understood as ways of the scribe paying respect to the divine name.

Jonathan Siegel has argued that its use forestalled the possibility of erasure of the divine name.[66] On the other hand, Patrick Skehan has argued that the practice was intended to prevent the reader of a manuscript inadvertently pronouncing the divine name.[67] What might the case actually be? Siegel depends on later tannaitic practice for his suggestion; Skehan's proposal cannot explain why the system was not used consistently and widely. My inclination is to consider that possibly, Skehan's view should be given priority and the inconsistent use of the paleo-Hebrew tetragrammaton explained by reference either to the function of the manuscript or to those who might read it, especially in public. Perhaps manuscripts of pesharim with the divine name in square Hebrew were copies for expert use, such as being scribal base text exemplars or archive copies; those with the divine name in paleo-Hebrew might have been produced to be used by the less adroit, perhaps in public performance as the prophetic texts were studied afresh by novices and longstanding members in the community.[68] Not all copies of the continuous pesharim need to have been produced for the same purpose.

Conclusions

Where have we arrived after this brief survey of various aspects of the physical character and scribal data of the so-called continuous pesharim from Cave 4?

It seems that this type of literature was generally produced on short scrolls of between 1.5 and 2.25 m in length, though there could well have been exceptions. On scrolls of such length the size of the writing block varied between 12 (*Pesher Nahum*) and 27 (*Pesher Psalms A*)

---

[66] Jonathan P. Siegel, "The Employment of Paleo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources," *HUCA* 42 (1971): 159–72 (169).

[67] Patrick W. Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980): 28.

[68] The oral performance of the pesharim might be suggested by the description of the Teacher of Righteousness in *Pesher Psalms A* 3–10 iv 26–27 as the one whose pen is his tongue (Ps 45:2b); the oral character of teaching and learning in the community is laid out by André Lemaire, "Lire, écrire, étudier à Qoumrân et ailleurs," in *Qoumrân et le Judaïsme du tournant de notre ère: Actes de la Table Ronde, Collège de France, 16 novembre 2004* (ed. A. Lemaire and S. C. Mimouni; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 63–79 (77).

lines in height and between 10 and 16 cm in width. The dimensions of the margins fall within what is found commonly. Probably all the continuous pesharim that survive are copies; some of them more definitely than others.

We should probably assume that all literature was produced orally, either by dictation or by recitation. All literature would have been used orally too, though in many different contexts. It is possible that in the second half of the first century B.C.E. and later the increasing tendency for copies of the pesharim to use the tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew indicates a change in the dominant use of such compositions. Perhaps, increasingly, they were performed by community members in contexts where those with less knowledge of the Hebrew scriptures might inadvertently pronounce the divine name. Or, if such developments overstate the precision of the dates of the texts, it could simply be that some copies were produced for some kinds of public contexts, such as being read in community study sessions, whilst others were produced for other purposes.

In two respects what survives physically and scribally in the Cave 4 continuous pesharim gives the impression that these compositions were not considered to be extraordinary. Physically they share dimensions with numerous other small scrolls; they are not "de luxe," especially authoritative compositions with a physical attire to match. Scribally, in all but one instance (*Pesher Psalms A*) the interpretation is clearly distinguished from the scriptural prophetic text: some element of difference and discontinuity between the Qumran interpretative practices and the words of the prophets needs to be kept in mind, for all that the contents of these continuous pesharim encourage one to think of the commentaries as in some way conveying a prophetic authority of their own.

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE DIFFUSION OF BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS IN ANTIQUITY

Emanuel Tov
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The purpose of this paper is to offer some thoughts on the diffusion of biblical manuscripts in antiquity and to find out whether our knowledge of the Dead Sea Scrolls aids us in understanding the state of affairs in the period when the scrolls were written as well as in earlier periods. The available evidence is limited, but nevertheless we will be able to obtain some valuable insights.

When speaking of the diffusion of the biblical scrolls, we refer to the number of copies that were circulating, their origin and possible patterns of distribution.

The Number of Scripture Scrolls Present at Qumran

The number of Scripture texts circulating in Israel as a whole when the Dead Sea Scrolls were written is unknown, but the Judean Desert sites at least provide some clues for that region. Some 230 fragmentary biblical scrolls were found at Qumran alone and some 25 at other sites, totaling 255 scrolls. On the one hand, I would deduct around fifty from the list of Qumran texts that, in my view, are not biblical;[1] on the other hand, we would have to add an unknown number of texts that have perished since 68 C.E. We therefore retain the number of 230 texts for Qumran.

In the last centuries B.C.E. and the first century C.E., Scripture books circulated separately, and while 230 sounds like a large number, these scrolls represent only individual books and not collections

[1] For example, I consider most of the Qumran Psalms texts to be liturgical and not biblical. By the same token, I would disregard scrolls containing only part of a book such as 4QDeut^{q} probably containing only the Song in Deuteronomy 32, and three scrolls containing only Psalm 119 (4QPs^{g}, 4QPs^{h}, 5QPs). All these are not Scripture scrolls in the usual sense of the word.

(complete Bibles, in modern parlance). This number equals approximately ten complete copies of the Bible if we calculate according to the traditional reckoning of twenty-four books in the Bible. This would be a very rough calculation since the biblical books are represented in the Judean Desert in different quantities. For example, the Torah is represented more frequently in the Judean Desert finds than the other books.[2] Further, some books are represented at Qumran by many copies,[3] while others are only infrequently seen among the Qumran scrolls.[4]

The number of 230 biblical scrolls represents the sum total of the manuscripts found at Qumran when the community was destroyed in 68 C.E. Since the material of the scrolls was preserved for many centuries in the dry climate of Qumran, the 230 items represent scrolls taken to Qumran during the whole period of its occupation as well as those written on site. This calculation pertains to the six or seven generations of settlement at Qumran, from 100–50 B.C.E. onwards, according to the revised chronology of Magness,[5] until 68 C.E.

We now turn to some speculations regarding the scrolls found at Qumran. These speculations are interesting in their own right, and also have a bearing on scroll production in ancient Israel as a whole.

The dates assigned to the Qumran scrolls,[6] summarized in Table 1, reveal the presence of differing numbers of scrolls in the various time periods, which may be interpreted in different ways.

---

[2] Within the biblical corpus, a special interest in the Torah is visible at all the sites in the Judean Desert: 87 texts or 43.5 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus represent the books of the Torah. At sites other than Qumran this percentage is even greater: fifteen of the twenty-five biblical texts or 60 percent represent the Torah.

[3] For example, Deuteronomy is represented by 30 copies and Isaiah by 21 copies.

[4] For example, only two copies of Joshua and three copies of Judges were preserved at Qumran.

[5] Jodi Magness, *The Archeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 65. At an earlier stage of the research, the occupation of Qumran was usually accepted as being from 130 B.C.E. following the chronology of Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Schweich Lectures, British Academy, 1959; London: Oxford University Press, 1973).

[6] The numbers are based on the list of Brian Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts Found in the Judaean Desert," in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD 39; ed. E. Tov; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 351–446.

Table 1 Number of dated biblical scrolls found at Qumran

250–200 B.C.E.	3
199–150 B.C.E.	12
149–100 B.C.E.	16
99–50 B.C.E.	40
49–1 B.C.E.	46
1–50 C.E.	51
51–68 C.E.	5
Sum total	173

Starting with the earliest scrolls found at Qumran, dating to 250–200 B.C.E., an increasingly larger number of scrolls was found for each subsequent period. The peak years of scroll production, at least for those found at Qumran, were between 100 B.C.E. and 50 C.E., again in ever-increasing numbers. These numbers reflect the copying of scrolls at Qumran and elsewhere and they refer only to the production date of the scrolls and not to the date of their introduction to the Qumran community. Nevertheless, there is a striking correlation between the peak years of Qumran scroll production and the dates of Qumran settlement (that is, in their most comprehensive understanding, between 100 B.C.E. and 50 C.E.). In other words, the greatest number of scrolls was produced, at Qumran and elsewhere, while Qumran was inhabited. This situation implies that most scrolls were used and read close to the date of their production. The presence of older dated scrolls before the assumed occupancy at Qumran (100–50 B.C.E.) requires a special explanation. The inhabitants must have taken these scrolls there. The relatively small number of early scrolls dating to the period before the beginning of settlement at Qumran (31 biblical scrolls) does not necessarily indicate that fewer scrolls were available in earlier centuries in ancient Israel. The evidence only shows that the inhabitants took with them a small number of such early scrolls. However, it is likely that fewer scrolls were indeed available in the century prior to habitation at Qumran. The equally small number of scrolls written after 50 C.E. may be due to the political turmoil in the country and the sudden destruction of the Qumran community. It is likely that fewer scrolls were produced in Palestine as a whole in those turbulent years.

The gradually increasing numbers of scrolls dated between 100 B.C.E. and 50 C.E. show a growing scroll presence within the Qumran community, but this fact does not necessarily point to the diffusion of scrolls throughout Israel as a whole. Regardless of whether the main

activity of the Qumran community was scroll production[7] or whether the community merely produced and assembled scrolls in order to facilitate their religious activity, the fact remains that many scrolls were produced at Qumran itself. According to my own calculation, the Qumran community, either at Qumran or elsewhere, produced at least a third of the scrolls found at Qumran.[8] If altogether some 170 biblical and nonbiblical scrolls were indeed copied by the Qumran scribes, as I believe (see n. 8), this is not a large number for the 118–168 years of Qumran occupancy, averaging no more than one scroll per year.[9]

One additional factor needs to be considered for Qumran. It is natural that each subsequent generation would have possessed a greater number of scrolls, since they had not only the scrolls produced during their generation, but also those produced at earlier times. Accordingly, the scrolls left behind at Qumran in 68 C.E. represent the sum total of the scrolls taken to Qumran, and those produced there in earlier generations, including scrolls discarded but not destroyed during all those years. Indeed, we do not know how many of the Qumran scrolls had been discarded by the community and placed in a *genizah* at Qumran, like the two scrolls found under the floor of the synagogue at Masada.[10]

I now turn to the patterns of the possession of scrolls by the Judean Desert communities. At the Qumran site, which was probably inhabited between 100 B.C.E. and 50 C.E., biblical and nonbiblical scrolls were found dating to the period between 250 B.C.E. and 80 C.E., while most of them are dated between 100 B.C.E. and 50 C.E. As stated above, the dates of scroll production correspond with those of the occupation of Qumran by the *yaḥad*. A similar assumption pertains to the later Judean Desert sites that preserve scrolls dated *later* than

---

[7] Thus Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill, 1998), 51–5.

[8] Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004), 263.

[9] This point is stressed by Philip S. Alexander, "Literacy among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran," in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (OLA 118; ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 3–24 (6–7).

[10] See my analysis "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in my *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran—Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 171–88.

the Qumran scrolls. Thus, at the sites dating to the Bar Kochba revolt (132–135 C.E.), Wadi Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Arugot, and Naḥal Ṣe'elim, scrolls were found that date to the period between 20 and 115 C.E. (see Table 2),[11] *averaging* to a later period than the Qumran scrolls. Table 2 also includes the Masada scrolls, for which the *terminus ante quem* is identical to that of Qumran, while the Masada scrolls have a later average date than those from Qumran.

The pattern emerging from Tables 1 and 2 is that the Judean Desert communities possessed both recent and older scrolls (those written 100 years or more earlier). We lack the necessary controls, and among other things we do not know which of the Judean Desert scrolls had

Table 2 Biblical scrolls found in the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran arranged by date

Name	*Dates ascribed to scrolls in the editions*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
XJudg[a]	30–1 B.C.E.	16 B.C.E.	MT
MurDeut	20–50 C.E.	35 C.E.	MT
MurIsa	20–84 C.E.	52 C.E.	MT
XJosh	40–68 C.E.	55 C.E.	MT
5/6HevNum[a]	50–68 C.E.	59 C.E.	MT
XHev/SeNum[b]	50–68 C.E.	59 C.E.	MT
XHev/SeDeut	50–68 C.E.	59 C.E.	MT
5/6HevPs	50–68 C.E.	59 C.E.	MT
ArugLev	50–68 C.E.[12]	59 C.E.	MT
SdeirGen	50–100 C.E.	75 C.E.	MT
MurGen[(a)] (published as: Gen)	115 C.E.	115 C.E.	MT
MurNum	115 C.E.	115 C.E.	MT
MurXII	115 C.E.	115 C.E.	MT
MasPs[b]	50–25 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	MT
MasEzek	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	MT
MasLev[a]	30–1 B.C.E.	16 B.C.E.	MT
MasDeut	30–1 B.C.E.	16 B.C.E.	MT
MasPs[a]	30–1 B.C.E.	16 B.C.E.	MT
MasLev[b]	30 B.C.E.–30 C.E.	1 C.E.	MT

[11] XJudg[a] is listed in the table, but not included in the calculation since its place of origin is unknown.

[12] See Hanan Eshel et al., "Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004," *DSD* 13 (2006): 55–60 (57).

been removed from general use (discarded) before being left behind in the first and second centuries C.E. The Bar-Kochba sites contained scrolls that were no older than 100 years when they were left behind, but we also found scrolls there that had been written as little as 20 years before the revolt. It is unlikely that the Bar Kochba sites, which were inhabited by migrant communities, contained discarded scrolls, but it would not be impossible. Accordingly, these communities moved around with relatively recent scrolls. Likewise, the inhabitants of Masada left behind in 70 C.E. a group of texts that were at most 85 years old, while some were written some 30–35 years before the destruction of the community.

At Qumran, we reveal a different picture. The Qumran community preserved many scrolls that were copied prior to their habitation at Qumran, and these scrolls remained there for the duration of the settlement. According to the list in DJD 39,[13] no less than 86 biblical *and nonbiblical* texts (34 of which are written in the Cryptic A script) have been assigned a mid-point date before 100 B.C.E. These scrolls could have been taken to Qumran at any point during the settlement at the site, but they were likely taken there at the beginning. Most Qumran scrolls, however, were produced during the peak years of settlement. The modern concept of the turnover of older books in favor of newer ones does not apply to these communities, since old and newer scrolls were used in conjunction with one another. In the case of Scripture, it would stand to reason that older copies would be used more often than new ones, but we have no clues as to how the different types of scrolls were used by the Qumran community. We do not know whether the *yaḥad* members singled out certain choice scrolls for use by the community in its religious gatherings, while using other scrolls for private reading. Or possibly the members nevertheless distinguished between the different scrolls. For example, it would make sense for the members of the *yaḥad* to have used the large Isaiah scroll, which in my view was produced by community scribes, rather than 1QIsa^{b} when composing their community writings, but it is very hard to prove that assumption.

Returning to the concept of turnover, we do not know the community's approach to the various revisions of the *Community Rule*, the *War Scroll*, and the *Damascus Document*. If scholars would agree that

[13] See n. 6.

the Cave 1 scrolls represent the older copies, it would be a convenient assumption to surmise that that cave served as an archive for older copies, while the newer ones from Cave 4 were in daily use.[14] However, this is not the case, since scholars approach the relation between the Cave 1 and Cave 4 copies of these compositions in different ways.[15]

The Judean Desert communities possessed different types of biblical scrolls, making it even more difficult to describe the diffusion of scrolls in ancient Israel as a whole. However, the finds at Qumran illustrate certain aspects of scroll circulation; some types of scrolls were in greater circulation because the community or communities using them copied them more frequently than, or to the exclusion of, other scrolls.

The differing textual character of the manuscripts found at Qumran and at the other Judean Desert sites can be recognized best by contrasting the scrolls that are dated to exactly the same period from Qumran to those from the other sites, from 35 B.C.E. (mid-point) until 70 C.E. For this period, the communities at the Bar-Kochba sites and Masada possessed only proto-Masoretic texts (Table 2), while Qumran displays only a minority of proto-Masoretic texts (Table 3). Thus, the differences between Qumran and the other sites are not chronological, as is often claimed,[16] but socio-religious. We have voiced this assumption also in the past (see n. 16), but have not shown its validity by contrasting manuscript finds from exactly the same period.

---

[14] Daniel Stökl ben Ezra ("Old Caves and Young Caves—A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *DSD* 14 [2007]: 313–33) takes a different approach when studying "the average scroll age" of each individual cave. In his analysis, both Caves 1 and 4 are "old caves" because he looks at the average age of all the scrolls found in a specific cave.

[15] For some references to these views see my study "The Writing of Early Scrolls: Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture," in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*, 206–20 (212–3).

[16] The claim that as time progresses there is a growing acceptance of the proto-MT text, often expressed in the literature with the term "stabilization," is not supported by the Masada evidence that is contemporary with that of Qumran (for an example of the use of this term, see Moshe Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from the Judean Desert," *JAOS* 76 [1956]: 157–67). Rather, it shows a predominance of texts identical to the medieval MT in contrast to the virtual lack of such texts at Qumran. On the other hand, Qumran preserves a great number of proto-MT texts that are *close* to the medieval text (see Table 3). For the distinction between the two types of text see my studies "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible" (n. 10 above) and "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Bible," (forthcoming).

Table 3 The scrolls found at Qumran dating to the same period as scrolls from other sites in the Judean Desert[17]

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
4QRP^{b}	40–10 B.C.E.	26 B.C.E.	QSP + SP/ind
4QRP^{c}	40–10 B.C.E.	26 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QRP^{d}	40–10 B.C.E.	26 B.C.E.	ind
4QNum^{b}	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP + SP/LXX
4QIsa^{g}	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	"MT"/LXX
4QDeut^{h}	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	ind
4QDeut^{m}	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QPs^{l}	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	ind?
4QJob^{b}	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	—
4QDeut^{q}	50 B.C.E.–10 C.E.	20 B.C.E.	LXX
4QXII^{g}	35–1 B.C.E.	18 B.C.E.	QSP? + ind
2QNum^{b}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4QDeut^{k1}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QDeut^{k2}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QDeut^{n}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	ind
4QJudg^{b}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	"MT"
4QPs^{o}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4QLam	30 B.C.E.–1 C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QIsa^{e}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	"MT"/LXX
4QJer^{c}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	"MT"
11QPs^{b}	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QCant^{b}	15 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	ind
4QDan^{d}	25–1 B.C.E.	13 B.C.E.	ind?
4QProv^{a}	50 B.C.E.–30 C.E.	10 B.C.E.	"MT"
4Q[Gen-]Exod^{b}	30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.	5 B.C.E.	QSP + ind/LXX
4QPs^{q}	30 B.C.E.–30 C.E.	1 B.C.E.	ind
4QProv^{b}	30 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	10 C.E.	"MT"
4QRuth^{b}	30 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	10 C.E.	"MT"/LXX
11QEzek	10 B.C.E.–30 C.E.	10 C.E.	"MT"
4QGen^{k}	1–30 C.E.	15 C.E.	ind
4QExod^{j}	1–30 C.E.	15 C.E.	—
4QDeut^{g}	1–25 C.E.	15 C.E.	"MT"/SP
4QEzek^{b}	1–30 C.E.	15 C.E.	"MT"?
2QGen	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
8QGen	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—

[17] The scrolls are arranged chronologically according to their mid-point. The following characterizations are used: MT, LXX, (ind)ependent, — (insufficient data). In this table, "MT" refers to texts that are close to the medieval MT, while the MT texts in Table 2 are identical to that text.

Table 3 (*cont.*)

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
2QExod[a]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
2QExod[b]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP?/ind?
2QNum[c]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
2QDeut[b]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
2QJer	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP/ind
3QEzek	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
2QPs	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
4QPs[h]	30 B.C.E.–70 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
2QJob	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
3QLam	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
4QPs[p]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
4QPs[r]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	ind
4QpapGen or papJub[j]?	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	—
11QpaleoLev[a]	1–50 C.E.	25 C.E.	ind
11QPs[a]	1–50 C.E.	25 C.E.	ind
11QPs[c]	1–50 C.E.	25 C.E.	ind
5QIsa	15 B.C.E.–70 C.E.	27 C.E.	—
2QDeut[c]	1–68 C.E.	35 C.E.	QSP?
4QDan[b]	20–50 C.E.	35 C.E.	ind?
4QGen[c]	20–68 C.E.	44 C.E.	"MT"/SP
5QAmos (= 5QXII)	1–100 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
3QPs	1–100 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
5QPs	1–100 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
8QPs	1–100 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
2QNum[a]	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
4QIsa[c]	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	QSP/ind
4QIsa[d]	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	"MT"/LXX
4QPs[b]	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	ind
4QPs[e]	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	ind
11QPs[d]	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	QSP?/ind
11QLev[b]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	ind?
11QDeut	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
4QDeut[j]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	QSP/ind
4QDeut[k3]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
4QPs[g]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	MT
4QPs[j]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
4QPs[u]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
6QpapPs?	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	—
2QRuth[a]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	"MT"/LXX
6QCant	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	ind
5QLam[a]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	—

Table 3 (*cont.*)

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
6QpapDan	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	ind
4QPs^{c}	50–68 C.E.	59 C.E.	"MT"
4QPs^{s}	50–68 C.E.	59 C.E.	—
4QPs^{t}	50–68 C.E.	59 C.E.	—
4QGen^{b}	30–100 C.E.	65 C.E.	"MT"
4QExod^{k}	30–135 C.E.	82 C.E.[18]	—

A comparison of Tables 2 and 3 enables us to determine that:

1. The Bar Kochba sites (Table 2), which are later than Qumran, naturally include a number of texts that are later than the Qumran texts;
2. Qumran contains a wide range of biblical texts of different textual nature, unlike the other Judean Desert sites that contain only proto-Masoretic texts;
3. During the period that Qumran was inhabited by the *yaḥad*, more scrolls were produced locally and taken to Qumran than before or afterwards. This point is further corroborated by the data in Table 4, which records the texts written in the Qumran Scribal Practice (QSP). This table presents the remarkable chronological distribution of the biblical scrolls written in the QSP.[19]

Table 4 The chronological distribution of the biblical scrolls written in the Qumran Scribal Practice[20]

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
4QQoh^{a}	175–150 B.C.E.	162 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
1QIsa^{a}	150–100 B.C.E.	125 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QSam^{c}	100–75 B.C.E.	87 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QIsa^{c}	85 B.C.E.	85 B.C.E.	QSP + ind

[18] Judith E. Sanderson (DJD 12 [1994]: 151) asserts: "…is not impossible…that this is a stray piece from one of the caves of the Second Revolt."

[19] These data were not included in my analysis in *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

[20] The assumption that a scroll is written in the QSP is recorded in this table (sometimes with "?") together with an indication of its textual character ("ind," "LXX").

Table 4 (*cont.*)

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
4QXII[c]	75 B.C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QXII[e]	75–50 B.C.E.	62 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QNum[b]	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP + SP/LXX
4QDeut[m]	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QXII[g]	35–1 B.C.E.	18 B.C.E.	QSP? + ind
2QNum[b]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4QDeut[k1]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QDeut[k2]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4QPs[o]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4QLam	30 B.C.E.–1 C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
11QPs[b]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP + ind
4Q[Gen-]Exod[b]	30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.	5 B.C.E.	QSP + ind/LXX
2QExod[b]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP? + ind?
2QJer	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP + ind
11QPs[c]	1–50 C.E.	25 C.E.	QSP? + ind
11QPs[a]	1–50 C.E.	25 C.E.	QSP + ind
2QDeut[c]	1–68 C.E.	35 C.E.	QSP?
4QIsa[c]	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	QSP + ind
4QDeut[j]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	QSP + ind
11QPs[d]	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	QSP? + ind
1QDeut[a]	—		QSP
4QPhyl A	200 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4QPhyl B	200 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4QPhyl G-I	200 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP?
4QPhyl J-K	200 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4QPhyl L-N	200 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4QPhyl O	200 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4QPhyl P	200 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4QPhyl Q	200 B.C.E.–50 C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP

When taking 100 B.C.E.–68 C.E. as the period of settlement at Qumran, the great majority of the scrolls written in the QSP were written within that period (22 texts). Only two scrolls were written earlier (1QIsa[a] and 4QQoh[a]).[21] If the scrolls designated as QSP were indeed copied by the Qumran community, their assigned dates corroborate

[21] One scroll was not dated, and the eight *tefillin* are not taken into consideration.

that assumption. A similar picture obtains for the nonbiblical Qumran scrolls (see the Appendix).

Remarkably, only four of the 134 *non*biblical texts written in the QSP (see the Appendix) fall outside the chronological framework of the settlement at Qumran, viz., 4QDibHam[a], 4QT[b], 4QVisSam, and 4QSap-Hymn Work A.[22] Circular reasoning in matters paleographical needs to be considered a possibility if indeed scholars were hesitant to date texts to before or after the assumed period of settlement. However, all the texts were dated before the publication of Magness's revised chronology (see n. 5), when scholars were still ascribing the beginning of the settlement to 150–130 B.C.E. At that time, very few scrolls were ascribed to 150–100 B.C.E. (the fifty additional years of assumed settlement), which probably implies that no circular reasoning was involved.

These few facts about the Judean Desert scrolls represent the extent of our knowledge about the communities who left the scrolls in the Judean Desert. We do not know whether the Essenes took *all* their scrolls to Qumran for safekeeping at a certain point, in which case the total number of Qumran scrolls would give us an indication of the number of scrolls owned by that community.

An even bigger question is how the number of scrolls found at Qumran and the other sites in the Judean Desert relates to the total number of scrolls throughout Israel. Would these scrolls be a multiplication by a factor of two or ten of the number of the Judean Desert scrolls? We have no information with which to answer this major question.

Next, we turn to the question of the ownership of scrolls. In the last centuries B.C.E., with limited literacy, which was even more pronounced in earlier times, individuals would not have owned private scrolls.[23] Individuals did not have their own pre-Samaritan scrolls at home, or a copy such as 4QRP. I presume that Scripture scrolls were only found in intellectual centers such as the Qumran community, the Temple, houses of learning, and houses of religious gathering (synagogues). In these places, MT must have held a dominant position,

[22] Ten texts included in the Appendix have not been dated.

[23] On the other hand, the evidence of 1 Macc 1:56–57 may indicate that at least some individuals did own private copies. In the religious persecutions of 166 B.C.E., copies of "the books of the Law" were burned (v. 56) and individuals who owned the "Book of the Covenant" were killed.

and it must have been as dominant in certain circles as it was in the Judean Desert sites beyond Qumran. Even at Qumran a large number of scrolls were close to MT, although they were one stage removed from the text that was to become the medieval MT text. We do believe that there was a correlation between the strength and influence of the communities that produced and circulated the scrolls and the extent of their circulation. Thus, the stronger the influence of the Pharisees, the more scrolls of their assumed making were circulated in Israel. At the same time, we admit that we do not have a clue as to the absolute number of scrolls circulating in Israel beyond Qumran when that site was occupied by the *yaḥad*.

One might ask from which sources did the *yaḥad* members take the scrolls that scholars ascribe to an extra-Qumranic provenance. Did they derive from a center of learning, an archive, or specific scribes? I believe that the Cave 7 scrolls came from a special archive, since that cave contained only Greek texts. At the same time, we know nothing of the origin of the Hebrew biblical and nonbiblical texts taken to Qumran.

The Number of Scrolls Circulating Before the Settlement at Qumran

In the first part of this study, we pointed out that the Qumran evidence provides some clues regarding the diffusion of manuscripts in the last centuries B.C.E. and the first century C.E. In the second part of this study, I turn to the number of scrolls circulating in ancient Israel in the centuries before the "Qumran era." I submit that the Qumran scrolls may mislead our thinking about the diffusion of manuscripts in ancient Israel. The Dead Sea Scrolls attest to an abundance of texts in the last two centuries B.C.E. and the first century C.E., but the reality of earlier centuries (seventh to third) must have been a far cry from that in the Qumran era. If the first part of this study was speculative, the second part is even more so.

The only facts available regarding the diffusion of scrolls for the period before the settlement at Qumran is the presence at that site of three biblical manuscripts dating to 250–200 B.C.E. and twelve that date to 199–150 B.C.E. Altogether, 86 biblical and nonbiblical texts (34 of which are written in the Cryptic A script) that have been assigned a mid-point date before 100 B.C.E. were found at Qumran. There would

have been many more manuscripts throughout ancient Israel in those early centuries, but how many? The further back we go in time, the fewer copies there would have been in circulation. We turn to some speculations regarding the number of biblical scrolls extant in ancient Israel in preexilic, exilic, and postexilic times. This issue is usually not discussed in the literature, but one receives the impression that scholars conceive of a sizable number of texts. Any thoughts in this direction subsequent to 1947 were unconsciously influenced by the large number of scrolls found on the shores of the Dead Sea, and prior to that year scholars were easily misled by the abundance of manuscripts of the medieval MT and of the ancient translations. Actually, very little attention has been devoted to the number of copies circulating in antiquity, since this issue is clearly beyond our textual horizon.

Exceptions to this trend are studies by Lohfink and Haran, whose main thesis of a minimal number of scrolls I accept. In an impressive study of the "deuteronomistic movement,"[24] Lohfink suggested that writing and book culture were not advanced in the *preexilic period*, and that in that era possibly only single copies of each Scripture book were available for long periods of time;[25] they were written and deposited in the Temple, and possibly further rewritten there.[26] 2 Kings 22:8 indeed states that Hilkiah said: "I found *sepher hattorah*," "*the* book of the law."[27] This formulation may imply that the book existed in a single copy. In any event, there is no evidence, literary or archeological, for privately owned copies at that time.

Lohfink's point of departure is the deuteronomistic composition Deuteronomy–2 Kings, but he turns also to the books of the Prophets, which in his view also existed only in single copies, preserved by the students of the prophets.[28] This assumption thus precludes the circulation of the biblical books in the preexilic period, as suggested previ-

---

[24] Norbert Lohfink, "Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?" in *Jeremia und die "deuteronomistische Bewegung"* (ed. W. Gross; BBB 98; Weinheim: Beltz Athenaum, 1995), 313–82 (335–47) = idem, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur* III (SBAB 20; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1955), 65–142 (91–104).

[25] Thus already Carl Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912), 101.

[26] "Es ist leicht vorstellbar, das sie <die Texte> bisweilen ergänzt und überarbeitet wurden, vor allem, wenn man sie etwa in der Tempelschule im Unterricht brauchte." (Lohfink, "Bewegung," 338).

[27] Thus the NRSV; not "a scroll of the Teaching" as in NJPST.

[28] Lohfink, "Bewegung," 340.

ously by Haran, who believed that distribution started only with the official acceptance of these books as authoritative.[29]

There is no solid evidence in favor of the idea that in early centuries there were very few or no copies of the biblical books in the private domain and that such copies were found only in the Temple, but we consider the following arguments to be reasonably convincing.

1. In early centuries, the literacy rate was very low, and this assumption makes it unlikely that there would have been more than a few copies of the biblical books among the public in those centuries (thus Millard[30] and Haran[31]). In the words of Millard, "While the number of ancient Israelites who regularly read and wrote may have been very small and mostly professional scribes, the number who possessed marginal literacy was larger, and still more would likely have been able to recognize and write their names."[32]

2. The story of the discovery of a scroll in the Temple during the reign of Josiah (2 Kgs 22:8; 23:2, 24; 2 Chr 34:15, 30) must be taken at face value. The book of Deuteronomy was kept in the Temple and was not known to the outside world.

3. One of the theoretical models for the creation of most biblical books is a "production line" in a linear fashion, stage after stage. In this model, the creation by editor/scribe 1 formed the basis for an edition by editor/scribe 2, which, in turn was the basis for a creation by editor/scribe 3.[33] The alternative model would be the assumption of parallel versions of the same biblical book. Both abstract models have their internal logic, and therefore the only way to decide between these options is to see whether one of them is supported by textual evidence. We believe that there is no evidence for the option of parallel creation,

---

[29] In the words of Menahem Haran ("Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins," *HUCA* 54 [1983]: 111–22 [113]) in the preexilic period "…the people at large had no direct access to this literature, which was entrusted to special circles of initiates—priests, scribal schools, prophets, poets trained in the composition of psalmodic poetry and the like."

[30] Alan R. Millard, "Literacy, Ancient Israel," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D. N. Freedman; 6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 4:337–40.

[31] Menahem Haran, "On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel," VTSup 40 (1986): 81–95.

[32] Millard, "Literacy," 340. The evidence for writing and reading relates to seals, tax collecting, owners' labels on jars, etc., mainly referring to the final 150 years of Judah's history. Ian Young, "Israelite Literacy: Interpreting the Evidence," *VT* 48 (1998): 239–53, 408–22 (419) reached similar conclusions ("ancient Israelite scribes, priests and the upper class of society.")

[33] See my study "The Writing of Early Scrolls."

and accordingly we believe that the production line in early centuries could only have been linear.[34] Linear creation necessitated the accessibility of the earlier copies in a central location, and in fact a single copy sufficed for this purpose. Our description almost necessitates the assumption that all rewriting took place in one location, probably a central one, where books were written, deposited, and rewritten. Otherwise, it cannot be explained how any editor/scribe would have been able to continue the writing of his predecessor. The only such place I can think of would be the Temple. This center presumably had sufficient authority to prevent the writing of rival versions elsewhere. Besides, there is no evidence for parallel versions.

The suggestion that Scripture books were deposited in the Temple no longer needs to remain abstract, as it is supported by evidence in Scripture and elsewhere. For example, Samuel deposited a binding document in the Temple: "Samuel expounded to the people the rules of the monarchy (משפט המלוכה), and recorded them in a document that he deposited before the Lord" (1 Sam 10:25). The clearest proof for the depositing of books in the Temple is probably the story of Josiah referred to above.[35] Beyond Israel, the depositing of scrolls in the Temple, which runs parallel to the modern concept of publishing, is evidenced for Egypt as early as the third millennium B.C.E. as well as in ancient Greece and Rome. In later times, rabbinic literature often mentions "the copy of the Torah (once: three copies) in the temple court."[36]

---

[34] The main question for discussion is whether we can detect among the early textual witnesses any proof of the existence of two or more parallel versions of a biblical book that differed in matters of content. All textual witnesses differ in details created during the course of the textual transmission, but are there differences that require the assumption of independent writing or rewriting of a text unit in different sources? In other words, is there a chapter or part of a chapter of a biblical book known in alternative formulations? It seems to me that such evidence cannot be found, and therefore all differences between the textual witnesses must have resulted from a linear development, mainly the creation of a long text from a short one or vice versa. Focusing on the largest differences among textual witnesses, it seems that the long and short texts of MT (= 4QJer^{a,c}) and the LXX (= 4QJer^{b,d}) in Jeremiah, as well as in Ezekiel, Joshua, and the story of David and Goliath, indicate a linear development from short to long or long to short versions.

[35] Whether or not all Scripture books were deposited in the Temple is a matter of speculation. In later times, probably all authoritative Scripture books were deposited there, but it is possible that previously only the legal and historical books Genesis–Kings were placed in the Temple.

[36] For a detailed analysis of the evidence see my "The Writing of Early Scrolls."

Current views on the development of the Scripture books allow for and actually require the assumption of a single copy in the Temple.

1. Only a single revision is known of the historical books and Jeremiah in the spirit of Deuteronomy. Unrevised copies have not survived, and the best supporting theory for the Dtr revision would be centralized activity in the Temple.

2. Mere knowledge of the Torah, such as in the case of Hosea and Deutero-Isaiah, does not require physical proximity to copies of the Torah since traditions circulated orally.[37] However, there must have been exceptions. The type of quotation from Deuteronomy made by Jeremiah,[38] which displays an intimate knowledge of Deuteronomy, makes it likely that the prophet in his role as a priest[39] consulted the books in the Temple. Likewise, Ezekiel the priest,[40] who had an intimate knowledge of Leviticus and Deuteronomy,[41] would have consulted the Torah kept in a central location in exile. Indeed, when discussing Ezekiel's dependence on other prophets and the legal literature, Zimmerli goes as far as saying that Ezekiel had scrolls in front of him containing parts of the Torah and Jeremiah.[42] Miller had reached similar conclusions earlier with regard to Ezekiel's use of Jeremiah.[43] Likewise, according to Holladay,[44] Jeremiah had the Psalter in front of him and adapted the text for his own purposes. Fischer goes even further: "At this point, it is possible to answer the remaining questions posed at the

---

[37] For Deutero-Isaiah's knowledge of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Isaiah son of Amotz, Psalms, and Lamentations, see the tabulations by Shalom M. Paul, *Isaiah 40–66, Introduction and Commentary* (Mikra LeYisrael; Heb.; Tel Aviv: Am Oved and Jerusalem: Magnes, 2008), 35–45.

[38] For example, Deut 24:1–4 quoted in Jer 3:1–2.

[39] Jer 1:1 "The words of Jeremiah son of Hilkiah, one of the priests at Anathoth in the territory of Benjamin."

[40] Ezek 1:3 "The word of the Lord came to the priest Ezekiel son of Buzi, by the Chebar Canal, in the land of the Chaldeans."

[41] For detailed evidence of Ezekiel's knowledge of these books see Rimon Kasher, *Ezekiel, Introduction and Commentary* (Mikra LeYisrael; Heb.; Tel Aviv: Am Oved and Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004), 54–65.

[42] Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 44–52 (44, 45).

[43] John W. Miller, *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1955), 118.

[44] William L. Holladay, "Indications of Jeremiah's Psalter," *JBL* 121 (2002): 254–61. On p. 261, Holladay asserts: "…the general outline of Books I–III of our present Psalter were in existence in Jeremiah's time (excluding any intrusive psalms, such as Psalm 8 seems to be), and that scattered psalms outside these three books (exemplified for us by Psalms 122 and 139) were in use as well."

outset: Jeremiah shows literary rather than oral dependence on a good half of what would later become the Old Testament…"[45] In my view, Jeremiah and Ezekiel are exceptions.

In short, it is probable that in early centuries only single copies of the books were extant in the Temple and some of them were rewritten there. At an unknown point, books started to circulate beyond the Temple, possibly when they were accepted as Scripture.[46] These developments must have taken place in the postexilic period before the third century, because at that time several copies were already circulating. Undoubtedly, the exiles must have taken Scripture copies with them, but we do not know how many copies left Israel and how many new ones were created in exile.

In sharp contrast, we note the relatively large number of copies found among the Judean Desert scrolls that relate to the last two centuries B.C.E. and the first centuries C.E. However, that number does not necessarily reflect the numbers available in earlier centuries when far fewer copies circulated in Israel. However, there are no hard facts about the period between the return from the exile and the third century B.C.E. We only know that a copy of the Torah was taken to Egypt in approximately 280 B.C.E. for the translation of the Torah (according to the *Epistle of Aristeas*). Further details about the distribution in those early centuries are lacking.

---

[45] Georg Fischer, "Il libro di Geremia, specchio della cultura scritta e letta in Israele," *RivB* 56 (2008): 393–417 (417). See also, by the same author, *Jeremia, Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2007): 134–43. The title of the analysis ("Was Jeremia vorausliegen dürfte") implies a written form.

[46] Possibly more advanced technologies in the preparation of leather as writing material also played a role.

Appendix

The chronological distribution of the non*biblical scrolls written in the Qumran Scribal Practice*

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
4Q504 4QDibHam[a]	150 B.C.E.	150 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q524 4QT[b]	150–125 B.C.E.	137 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q160 4QVisSam	150–75 B.C.E.	112 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q426 4QSap-Hymn Work A	150–75 B.C.E.	112 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q175 4QTest	125–75 B.C.E.	100 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q422 4QParaGen-Exod	150–50 B.C.E.	100 B.C.E.	QSP
1Q28b 1QSb	125–75/85 B.C.E.	100/85 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q176 4QTanḥ	150–30 B.C.E.	90 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q257 4QpapS[c]	100–75 B.C.E.	87 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q428 4QH[b]	125–50 B.C.E.	87 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q443 Pers Prayer	100–75 B.C.E.	87 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q503 papPrQuot	100–70 B.C.E.	85 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q512 papRitPurB	85 B.C.E.	85 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q163 4Qpap pIsa[c]	85 B.C.E.	85 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q502 papRitMar	85 B.C.E.	85 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q219 4QJub[d]	110–50 B.C.E.	80 B.C.E.	QSP?
1Q28 1QS	100–50 B.C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
1Q28a 1QSa	100–50 B.C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q266 4QD[a]	100–50 B.C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q377 apocPent B	100–50 B.C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q382 pap para Kgs	75 B.C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q433a papH-like	75 B.C.E.	75 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q505 4QpapDibHam[b]	70–60 B.C.E.	65 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q509 4QpapPrFêt[c]	70–60 B.C.E.	65 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q223–224 4QpapJub[h]	75–50 B.C.E.	62 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q400 ShirShabb[a]	75–50 B.C.E.	62 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q405 ShirShabb[f]	75–50 B.C.E.	62 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q222 4QJub[g]	75–50 B.C.E.	62 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q419 4QInstr-like Comp A	80–40 B.C.E.	60 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q496 4QpapM[f]	55 B.C.E.	55 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q513 4QOrd[b]	55 B.C.E.	55 B.C.E.	QSP
1Q26 1QInstr	100–1 B.C.E.	50 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q280 4QCurses	50 B.C.E.	50 B.C.E.	QSP?
11Q13 11QMelch	75–25 B.C.E.	50 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q522 Proph Josh	65–30 B.C.E.	47 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q271 4QD[f]	50–30 B.C.E.	40 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q429 4QH[c]	40 B.C.E.	40 B.C.E.	QSP?

Table (*cont.*)

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
4Q221 4QJub[f]	50–25 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q259 4QS[e]	50–25 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q375 apocrMos[a]	50–25 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q416 4QInstr[b]	50–25 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q427 4QH[a]	75–1 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q438 4QBN[e]	50–25 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q460 Narr Work	75–1 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q462 4QNarr C	50–25 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q501 apocrLamB	50–25 B.C.E.	37 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q292 4QWork Cont. Prayers B	30 B.C.E.	30 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q418 4QInstr[d]	40–20 B.C.E.	30 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q364 4QRP[b]	40–10 B.C.E.	26 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q365 4QRP[c]	40–10 B.C.E.	26 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q365a 4QT[a]?	40–10 B.C.E.	26 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q303 MedCrea A	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q398 papMMT[e]	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q401 ShirShabb[b]	25 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q402 ShirShabb[c]	25 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q418a 4QInstr[e]	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q525 Beatitudes	50–1 B.C.E.	25 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q158 4QRP[a]	40–1 B.C.E.	20 B.C.E.	QSP
1Q33 1QM	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
1Q34 1QH[a] scribe A	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
1Q34 1QH[a] scribe C	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q159 4QOrdin	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q165 4QpIsa[e]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q174 4QFlor	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q177 Catena A	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q181 AgesCreat B	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q227 4QpsJub[c]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q251 Halakha A	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q256 4QS[b]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q260 4QS[f]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q267 4QD[b]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q269 4QD[d]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q273 4QpapD[h]	15 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q274 4QToh A	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q277 4QToh B	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q285 Sefer ha-Milhamah	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q394 4QMMT[a]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q403ShirShabb[d]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP

Table (*cont.*)

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
4Q410 Vision Int	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q415 4QInstr[a]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q417 4QInstr[c]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q432 4QpapH[f]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q440 H-like C	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q473 Two Ways	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q474 4QRachJos	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q491 4QM[a]	30–1 B.C.E.	15 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q254 ComGen C	25–1 B.C.E.	13 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q200 4QTobit[e]	30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.	5 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q215 4QTNaph	30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.	5 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q225 4QpsJub[a]	30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.	5 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q393 ComCon	30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.	5 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q397 4QMMT[d]	30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.	5 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q186 4QHorosc	30 B.C.E.–30 C.E.	1 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q396 4QMMT[c]	30 B.C.E.–30 C.E.	1 B.C.E.	QSP?
4Q511 4QShir[b]	1 B.C.E.	1 B.C.E.	QSP
4Q215a 4QTimes	30 B.C.E.–20 C.E.	5 C.E.	QSP
4Q420 4QWays[a]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	10 C.E.	QSP?
4Q436 4QBN[c]	50 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	10 C.E.	QSP
4Q268 4QD[c]	1–30 C.E.	15 C.E.	QSP
11Q19 11QT[a]	1–30 C.E.	15 C.E.	QSP
4Q166 4QpHos[a]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP?
4Q369 4QPrayer Enosh	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP?
4Q414 RitPur A	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP
4Q423 4QInstr[g]	10–50 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP
4Q435 4QBN[b]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP?
4Q437 4QBN[d]	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP
4Q464 4QExp Patr	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP?
4Q471 WarText B	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP
4Q477 4QRebukes	30 B.C.E.–68 C.E.	20 C.E.	QSP?
1QpHab	1–50 C.E.	25 C.E.	
4Q421 4QWays[b]	1–50 C.E.	25 C.E.	
11Q16 11QHymns[b]	1–50 C.E.	25 C.E.	
4Q289 4QBer[d]	20–50 C.E.	35 C.E.	QSP?
4Q299 4QMyst[a]	20–50 C.E.	35 C.E.	
4Q384 4Qpap apocr Jer B?	20–50 C.E.	35 C.E.	QSP?
11Q20 11QT[b]	20–50 C.E.	35 C.E.	
11Q14 11QSefer ha-Milhamah	30–50 C.E.	40 C.E.	
4Q180 AgesCreat A	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	
4Q286 4QBer[a]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	

Table (*cont.*)

Qumran manuscript	*Date*	*Mid-point*	*Textual character*
4Q287 4QBer[b]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	
4Q301 4QMyst[c]?	30–68 C.E.	50 C.E.	
4Q506 4QpapDibHam[c]	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	
5Q13 5QRule	1–100 C.E.	50 C.E.	QSP?
6Q18 papHymn	1–100 C.E.	50 C.E.	
11Q12 11QJub + XQText A	50 C.E.	50 C.E.	
11Q11 11QapocPs	50–70 C.E.	60 C.E.	
1Q14 1QpMic	—		
1Q22 1QDM	—		
1Q27 1QMyst	—		QSP?
1Q35 1QH[b]	—		QSP?
1Q36 1QHymns	—		
4Q161 4QpIsa[a]	—		
4Q171 4QpPs[a]	—		
4Q184 4QWiles	—		QSP?
4Q265 Misc Rules	—		QSP?
11Q27 11QUnid C	—		QSP?

ASSESSING EMANUEL TOV'S "QUMRAN SCRIBAL PRACTICE"

Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

> Correlations might be enough for us,
> but it's not evidence, you know—
> not enough to do anything with.
> China Miéville, *The City & the City*

1. *Introduction*

Emanuel Tov's assumption of a so-called "Qumran scribal practice" is largely inductive. Tov has collected many thousands, perhaps even tens of thousands, of small technical details pertaining to how the Dead Sea Scrolls and other texts from Antiquity were written. In his book *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, he explains the reason for collecting all these data:

> These details are important in their own right for improving our understanding of these scribes and the compositions they copied. They should be added to the storehouse of knowledge relating to the biblical and nonbiblical compositions found in the Judean Desert.[1]

The collection of all those data also enables the scholar to analyze possible correlations of different sets of data. Indeed, Tov's work is full of observations, queries, and analyses of correlations. Sometimes these are simple observations, such as "that all the texts from Qumran written in the paleo-Hebrew script are inscribed on leather rather than papyrus."[2] More often, one first needs to collect and analyze large sets of data before one can describe differences between scrolls, such as

---

[1] Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), xix.

[2] Idem, 33, where this simple correlation is connected to other features. For a fuller discussion of writing in the paleo-Hebrew script, see idem, 238–48. See also Steve Delamarter, "Sociological Models for Understanding the Scribal Practices in the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Methods and Theories in the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. L. Grossman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, forthcoming).

the varying size of the writing blocks of scrolls. With respect to this example, there are multiple correlations. There is a general correspondence between size of the composition and the height of a column. But some scrolls with a shorter column may have been used liturgically, which suggests that liturgical scrolls had a smaller format than other ones.[3] Or one may correlate many different sets of data. For example, Tov studied in detail the character of the very large scrolls or *de luxe* editions, and analyzed relations between textual character, date, and number of corrections in the text. Tov's work is full of analyses of such correlations, which shed light on the character of types of scrolls, but also on the practices of the scribes who wrote them. Some of those practices are related to the kinds of scrolls they wrote, for example, biblical texts or *tefillin*. Other scribal practices may have been conventions of specific groups of scribes.

This paper addresses Tov's construction and analysis of one such scribal practice, the one that he connects to the scribes at Qumran, who would have had a set of scribal conventions that was clearly distinct from that of other, nonsectarian, scribes. Tov refers to this scribal practice as the "Qumran scribal practice," which is in part a statistical construction, based on analysis and reconstruction of correlations between many different sets of data, and in part an hypothesis or theory, inasmuch as it proposes an explanation of this construction. In fact, one can observe that even the statistical reconstruction itself is based on specific suppositions. I therefore call Tov's "Qumran scribal practice" a scholarly construct, and, when we assess it, we can look both at the building blocks and at the way the building has been raised.

Tov's "Qumran scribal practice" has been for many years a work in progress, gradually developing from its first tentative description in the 1980s[4] to the more comprehensive formulation in his 2004 *Scribal Practices and Approaches*.[5] This development was due to three factors. First, in the 1980s many scrolls, which during the 1990s and early 2000s

---

[3] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 82–99.

[4] Note especially Emanuel Tov, "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls," *Textus* 13 (1986): 31–57; idem, "Hebrew Bible Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," *JJS* 39 (1988): 5–37.

[5] This 2004 volume integrates more than thirty earlier published contributions, which have been edited to varying degrees. See idem, xx–xxi. See also my review of Tov's volume in *DSD* 14 (2007): 368–72.

were published, were not yet known. Second, the original formulation of the hypothesis was mainly based on the analysis of orthographic and morphological data, but later Tov included in his analysis other kinds of scribal features. Third, scholarly criticisms forced Tov to deal with many issues in detail. For the sake of convenience, I will mainly refer to Tov's construct as it appears in his 2004 *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, even though he has continued working on parts of his construct. Because Tov's work has been a work in progress, some older criticisms of Tov's work may not be relevant anymore, often because Tov himself has addressed those criticisms extensively.

2. *A Close Reading of Tov's Formulation of the "Qumran Scribal Practice"*

Tov's most recent summary of the "Qumran scribal practice" runs as follows:

> Within the Qumran corpus, a group of some 160 nonbiblical and biblical texts has been isolated as reflecting an idiosyncratic practice, the characteristics of which are visible in peculiarities in orthography, morphology, and scribal features. This group of texts is closely connected with the Qumran community since it includes virtually all commonly agreed upon sectarian writings (with the exception of seven or eight sectarian texts which do not display these characteristics). The texts found at Qumran can thus be subdivided into texts presumably copied by a sectarian group of scribes, and other texts which were presumably taken there from elsewhere. The combined evidence shows that the great majority of the distinctive scribal features is more or less limited to texts that also display the Qumran orthography and morphology. The texts written in the Qumran scribal practice could have been penned anywhere in ancient Israel, but they were probably written mainly at Qumran.[6]

Tov is generally very careful in his writing, and this summary is very much like ones he wrote earlier. We may therefore closely analyze this summary. In the first sentence, "Within the Qumran corpus, a group of some 160 nonbiblical and biblical texts has been isolated as

[6] Emanuel Tov, "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls" (paper presented at the Symposium of the Orion Center 2008), but see almost similar wording already in his *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 261–62. The main difference in wording is the change from "a group of 167 nonbiblical and biblical texts," to "a group of some 160 nonbiblical and biblical texts."

reflecting an idiosyncratic practice, the characteristics of which are visible in peculiarities in orthography, morphology, and scribal features," Tov does *not* state that there are some 160 manuscripts that display a number of specific orthographic, morphological and scribal features. Instead, he claims that on the basis of these features one can construct a specific scribal practice, and that about 160 manuscripts display one or more features that reflect this practice. This distinction is theoretically important because it argues that these features are correlated; it is methodologically important because in some cases one or two features would be enough to reflect the practice. Here the term "idiosyncratic" as in "idiosyncratic practice" should probably be taken in its etymological sense, and not in the usual meaning of "unconventional" or "eccentric." A similar ambiguity appears in the word "peculiarities," which should probably be understood as "characteristics," and not as "abnormalities" or "irregularities." The exact meaning and intent of those words here is important, since in his discussion of the orthography and morphology Tov uses binary oppositions, which in some cases present the form of the "Qumran scribal practice" as different from the "regular" form we know from the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, and most other forms of Hebrew. Most of the orthographic and morphological features of Tov's "Qumran scribal practice" are indeed irregular vis-à-vis the wording of the Masoretic text, but several critics have questioned what they saw as the implicit suggestion that all these forms were linguistically irregular in Hebrew of that period.

Tov continues with "[t]his group of texts is closely connected with the Qumran community since it includes virtually all commonly agreed upon sectarian writings (with the exception of seven or eight sectarian texts which do not display these characteristics)." This description assumes the position that was commonly held amongst textual scholars, namely that the scrolls belonged to a sectarian community residing at or related to Qumran, and that we can confidently isolate some compositions that are specifically sectarian, even though there is a dispute about other writings.[7] In this respect, Tov's distinction

[7] We now have to write "was commonly held," since in the past decade most elements of this position have been questioned. See, most recently, Sarianna Metso and Hindy Najman, eds., *The Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls = DSD* 16.3 (2009), which is an extremely helpful collection of essays representing the present views on the Community. See also John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

between sectarian writings (i.e., compositions) and sectarian texts (i.e., manuscripts) is important, but also confusing. There are several suppositions involved, namely (a) that sectarian compositions must have originated and have been copied in the sectarian community of Qumran;[8] (b) that hence the scribal practice reflected in those texts must have been that of scribes at Qumran; (c) the fact that virtually all sectarian compositions were copied in this practice indicates that it was not just one of several scribal practices at Qumran, but specifically one connected to sectarian manuscripts. Tov acknowledges that there are a few manuscripts of sectarian compositions that are not copied according to this practice, but he ventures no explanation.[9]

"The texts found at Qumran can thus be subdivided into texts presumably copied by a sectarian group of scribes, and other texts which were presumably taken there from elsewhere." Many scholars nowadays might allow for the fact that some texts were written by a sectarian group of scribes, and other texts taken there from elsewhere—something that was still disputed when Tov first launched his hypothesis. However, Tov suggests that this differentiation more or less corresponds to that between one group of texts written according to the "Qumran scribal practice," and another group of texts that do not reflect this practice. The basic supposition is that scribal practices are conventions of groups of scribes, and that it is unlikely to find two quite different conventions within one sectarian community. In his very first construction, Tov added another socio-religious argument which we do not find anymore in his later work, namely that the different scribal practices reflected in the biblical manuscripts, actually show two opposite, incompatible approaches to the biblical text, that cannot be imagined in one community.[10] Nonetheless, the idea of mutual exclusiveness still remains at the basis of his construct.

"The combined evidence shows that the great majority of the distinctive scribal features is more or less limited to texts that also display the Qumran orthography and morphology." This is a crucial element of Tov's construct, because his research shows that the orthographic

---

[8] This is not specifically Tov's supposition, but one that was assumed by most scholars until recently.

[9] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 262, again acknowledges there are some exceptions, but does not discuss this phenomenon.

[10] Thus, apodictically, in "Orthography and Language," 40–41, but he dismissed this position *de facto* already in "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 33–34.

and morphological peculiarities are not random, but are correlated to other features, and hence reflect an actual scribal practice. Of course, Tov's restrictive qualification "more or less" invites one to carefully study those correlations. One should also note the use here of the term "Qumran orthography and morphology" which was originally the main element of Tov's hypothesis.

"The texts written in the Qumran scribal practice could have been penned anywhere in ancient Israel, but they were probably written mainly at Qumran." From the beginning Tov has emphasized that the features of the Qumran orthography and morphology need not have been exclusively limited to Qumran, but could have been more broadly Palestinian, which is also suggested by a few texts in his group that are dated paleographically before, or at the beginning of the settlement of Qumran. However, in view of the fact that the group comprises many sectarian texts, he assumes that most of them were copied at Qumran (or at other places where the sectarians stayed).

3. *Critical Reception*

From the late 1980s on, scholars have commented on earlier stages of Tov's hypothesis or construct. Even though Tov's present construct has refuted or integrated some of those criticisms, I will briefly categorize and summarize them.

A series of scholars has argued that from a linguistic point of view the peculiarities in orthography and morphology cannot be attributed uniquely to one sectarian group at Qumran, since some are attested, albeit scarcely, in the Hebrew Bible and other Hebrew traditions. Variations of this argument have been expressed by, for example, Cross, Freedman, Ulrich, Lübbe, Campbell, and van Peursen, in most cases briefly, and mainly pertaining to orthographic features.[11] Tov's reply

[11] Frank Moore Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*: *Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:1–14 (3–6); David Noel Freedman, "The Evolution of Hebrew Orthography," in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Orthography* (ed. D. N. Freedman et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 3–15 (14); Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 88 n. 22; John Lübbe, "Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of *4QSam*^{c}," *RevQ* 14/54 (1989): 255–65 (257–58); Jonathan Campbell, "Hebrew and its Study at Qumran," in *Hebrew Study from Ezra*

is succinctly addressed in his summary quoted above. First: not the individual peculiarities themselves, but the set of features that makes up the scribal practice is related to the sectarian community. Second: given the evidence we have now, this orthography and morphology is most clearly reflected in those texts that are connected to the Qumran community. In sum: Tov appeals to statistical data, rather than to linguistic reconstructions.[12]

Cross did, however, criticize one of the basic assumptions of Tov, namely the dichotomy between regular forms as found in the Masoretic text versus irregular forms as found in the Qumran scrolls, and he disagreed with Tov's statement of the 1980s that the scribes of the biblical scrolls with a Qumran orthography changed the original orthography as opposed to other scribes who had a conservative and careful approach. Cross thus questions the default value of the MT-like orthography, but unfortunately his own concrete examples are rare and problematic, such as his claim that in literary preexilic Hebrew, the second person masculine singular suffix was spelled with *kaf-he*, an argument based on his own idiosyncratic reading of the Bēt Layy inscription, which has been adopted by no one else.[13]

A second kind of objection that has been raised repeatedly is that there is no specific and consistent orthographic and morphological practice. Critics refer to inconsistent orthography within scrolls, that is, that the features are encountered only erratically within the scrolls,[14] or that Tov's Qumran orthography "form[s] a spectrum of diverse elements, unpredictable combinations of which may or may not appear in a particular document."[15] Tov has addressed most of these issues extensively. For example, in one of his forthcoming

---

to Ben-Yehuda (ed. W. Horbury; London: T&T Clark, 1999), 38–52 (41); Wido Th. van Peursen, "The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira" (Ph.D. diss., Leiden, 1999), 28.

[12] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 269, remarks that the rare presence of a few forms of the Qumran-type in MT or the oral tradition of the Samaritan Pentateuch "does not render our statistics for the Qumran texts less meaningful."

[13] For different readings of the Bēt Layy inscription, see Johannes Renz and Wolfgang Röllig, *Die althebräischen Inschriften: Teil 1 Text und Kommentar* (Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik 1; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995), 245–46.

[14] Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 111–12.

[15] Campbell, "Hebrew and its Study at Qumran," 41. See also Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58 (28 n. 15).

articles he demonstrates that even though some scrolls and scribes reflect inconsistency, the direction of scribal corrections is not inconsistent, but always towards the "Qumran scribal practice."[16] Other scholars do acknowledge, like Tov, specific orthographic practices, but they question his dichotomy. Thus, Vermes and Alexander posit a trichotomy of what they call, perhaps infelicitously, defective, full, and super-full orthographies.[17] Abegg does not categorize the texts at all in groups, but merely claims that most texts are somewhere on the spectrum between *plene* and defective.[18]

A third, and different kind of objection is that even though there may be a special scribal practice, this cannot be connected exclusively to a Qumran community, in view of important exceptions.[19] Thus, there are some commonly acknowledged sectarian texts, like 4Q258 (4QS^{d}), 4Q162 (4QpIsa^{b}), and 4Q169 (4QpNah), that are not penned according to the "Qumran scribal practice." Or, some texts related to the "Qumran scribal practice," like 4QQoh^{a} (4Q109)—one of Tov's group of 160—which has been dated paleographically from 175–150 B.C.E., precede the founding of the settlement of Qumran, and therefore must have been brought from outside to Qumran.[20] The latter example is

---

[16] Emanuel Tov, "Some Reflections on Consistency in the Activity of Scribes and Translators," in *Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit: Herrschaft—Widerstand—Identität. Festschrift für Heinz-Josef Fabry* (ed. U. Dahmen and J. Schnocks; Bonner Biblische Beiträge 159; Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2010), forthcoming.

[17] Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: Serekh Ha-Yaḥad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 8.

[18] Martin G. Abegg, Jr., "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:325–58 (328).

[19] For example, Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts," 28–29 n. 15; Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 11; idem, "Kriterien essenischer Texte," in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–69 (68–69); Dong-Hyuk Kim, "Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov's 'Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004): 72–81, who only considered Tov's very first paper, "Orthography and Language"—see the response in Emanuel Tov, "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's paper on 'Tov's Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004): 359–60.

[20] Lange, "Kriterien essenischer Texte," 68; cf. also Eugene Ulrich, "4QQoh^{a}," in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD 16; Clarendon: Oxford, 2000), 221–26 (222): "this may well indicate that such forms were in use in wider Palestine, not simply characteristic of Qumran scribes." Note that Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339, does not record that 4QQoh^{a} has the form הוֺא[ה, rather than הוא. See for similar examples, Esther G. Chazon, "Is *Divrei ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 3–17 (6).

not a problem for Tov, since he never claimed that the Community invented the "Qumran scribal practice," or was the only group that used its characteristics. Also, those few exceptions like 4Q258 may be troublesome, but statistically (if they would be only seven or eight) do not seriously invalidate the overall connection between so-called sectarian texts and the "Qumran scribal practice." However, those exceptions do shake Tov's division of the corpus into two clearly distinct groups, one written presumably at Qumran, the other brought presumably from outside. If some texts written in the "Qumran scribal practice" must have been taken to Qumran from elsewhere, how many more also could have come from elsewhere? And how many more texts written in defective script, and without special scribal features, except the seven or eight clear exceptions, might have been penned at Qumran?

A final issue concerns Tov's use of the term "sectarian." Thoughts about the sectarian character of writings and the community have gradually changed between 1986, when Tov first presented his construct, and now. Tov refers to commonly accepted views, expressed mainly by Dimant, and refined by Newsom, Lange, and Hempel.[21] However, for example, Dimant is gradually changing her views now, allowing for a third group standing somewhere in between sectarian and nonsectarian texts.[22] The overall question is whether Tov's construct can support a traditional distinction between sectarian and nonsectarian texts, or whether he will have to adjust his construct to changing views on the corpus and the community.[23]

---

[21] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 278 n. 339, referring to Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts"; Carol A. Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp et al.; Biblical and Judaic Studies 1; Winona Lake, Ind.; Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87; Lange, "Kriterien essenischer Texte"; Charlotte Hempel, "Kriterien zur Bestimmung 'essenischer Verfasserschaft' von Qumrantexten," in *Qumran kontrovers*, 71–85.

[22] Devorah Dimant, "Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E. G. Chazon et al.; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 105–34. See also Florentino García Martínez, "¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos," *RevQ* 23/91 (2008): 383–94.

[23] A good example of such changing views is the new model developed by Alison Schofield (*From Qumran to the* Yaḥad*: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* [STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009]), who attributes the corpus found in the caves to "broader scribal activity, not limited to Qumran," and at the same time agrees that "consistent [orthographic] variance underpins the idea that some development took place within different scribal circles" (129).

At present, the situation seems to me to be the following. Tov has collected thousands of details, analyzed the work of the scribes in their production of texts more carefully than anyone else in the field, drawn attention to statistical correlations, and has proposed general explanations for those correlations. Other scholars in the field have commented on his analysis and statistical correlation, but most of all they have questioned his explanations. In my opinion, a fair assessment of Tov's work needs to look at both his construct and his explanations. If his construct is problematic, namely the existence of an idiosyncratic scribal practice, than one should also question his explanations. On the other hand, it is conceivable that his construct makes sense, but that his explanations need to be modified or rejected.

In my own assessment, I will comment first on the core of his "Qumran scribal practice," namely his statistical analysis and interpretation of the orthographic and morphological peculiarities. Second, I will discuss a few of the correlations he observed between specific scribal features and the orthographic and morphological peculiarities. Third, I will discuss the correlations between the scribal practice and sectarian texts, including the issue of the exceptions. Fourthly, I want to use the same data as Tov has collected, and suggest a possible explanation for one subset of the corpus.

4. *Tov's Qumran Orthography and Morphology*

In his 2004 volume Tov states "The main argument in favor of the existence of a Qumran scribal practice is orthographic and morphological, however inconsistent, allowing a distinction between a group of texts displaying a distinctive system and texts which do not display these features."[24] The question that concerns us is to what extent we can really discern a distinctive *system*, and whether inconsistencies are compatible or not with the system. I propose to tackle this question by analyzing the different elements in Tov's system, and by repeating his statistical research from a different perspective, in order to see whether different approaches lead to different or to similar results.

Tov discusses the orthographic and morphological features that he considers distinctive for the system of the "Qumran scribal practice"

[24] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 262.

at different places in *Scribal Practices and Approaches*.[25] These are the same features he already described in 1986, except for one feature, which he dropped as being too complex.[26] In 2004 he lists eighteen categories which virtually all consist of binary oppositions: a regular form or spelling which is the common one in the Masoretic manuscripts of the Hebrew bible, versus a distinctive[27] one which is generally rare, or non-existent, in those Masoretic manuscripts but on the contrary rather common in the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially in many of the so-called sectarian nonbiblical manuscripts.[28] Statistically these categories seem related: some texts attest to very few if any of the distinctive categories, whereas other texts have distinctive forms and spellings from many of those categories. There are virtually no texts where the choice between regular or distinctive forms appears to have been absolutely random, and the realization of the different forms of those orthographic and morphological categories more or less seems to follow a system. However, whereas ideal-typically one might contrast two kinds of orthographic and morphological practice according to Tov's categories, the reality is more complex. The question is how those categories relate to one another, in what respects one can really speak about a special scribal practice with respect to orthography and morphology, how we can categorize texts if we have little or mixed evidence.

Tov subdivides his eighteen categories in ten categories pertaining to morphology and eight relating to orthography. The first five orthographic categories all relate to the use of *vav* as a vowel letter or mater lectionis for *o* or *u* in different circumstances. Tov singles out five common words, זאת, כה, משה, לא, and כל, for three reasons: (1)

---

[25] Idem, 266–70, 337–39.

[26] Tov (idem, 337) explains that "lengthened forms of the types *ʾeqṭelah* and *ʾeqṭolah* instead of *ʾeqṭol* have not been recorded because of the complex conditions of their occurrences, but they probably also serve as a good criterion for the Qumran scribal practice." The ואקטלה forms have ה both in *wᵉyiqṭol* and *wayyiqṭol* 1st person forms. This phenomenon is the rule in nonbiblical texts, both QSP and non-QSP, with only few exceptions in texts that imitate language of biblical texts. Tov in his "Orthography and Language" did not yet distinguish whether those first person imperfect forms were preceded or not preceded by *vav*.

[27] I choose to use the word "distinctive," as a neutral term opposite to "regular," rather than "idiosyncratic" or "peculiar."

[28] Actually, whereas in most cases the "Qumran scribal practice" form or spelling is either rare or non-existent in the Masoretic manuscripts, this is not the case with הם versus המה. Also, the spelling of the verbal form קטלתה, as opposed to קטלת, is not very rare in MT. See below.

because the words are very common, and the distinctive writing is often attested in the scrolls; (2) because they represent different categories of *plene* writing; and (3) because in the Masoretic text they are virtually always spelled defectively, without the *vav*.[29] The form זאת is chosen as representative of cases like ראש or צאן, or the *qal* imperfect of אמר and אכל, where an additional *vav* is added to, or replaces, quiescent *alef* that serves as mater lectionis.[30] The sixth orthographic category concerns the word כי, which is never written with additional *alef* in the Masoretic text, but often as כיא in the scrolls.[31] The seventh and eighth categories concern the spelling of the second masculine singular perfect and the second masculine singular suffix with a *he* as mater lectionis for the final *ā* (i.e., קטלתָ/קטלתָה, respectively ךָ–/כָה–). Forms with *he* are in fact sporadically attested in the Masoretic manuscripts, but much more often in the scrolls. All of the abovementioned spellings have sometimes been subsumed under the category of *plene* writing or full spelling, but they should be mentioned separately because they represent different cases, and because they do not occur in the same frequency. Note that Tov has not included rare cases of *plene* spelling such as *yod* as mater lectionis for *ē*, or *alef* for final *ā*.

All of Tov's morphological categories seem to represent two general phenomena, namely (1) the lengthening of specific forms (the independent pronouns הוא, היא, אתם, הם being lengthened to resp. הואה, היאה, אתמה, המה; the second and third plural suffixes; the affix of the second masculine plural perfect תם–; the adverb מאד) with *he* representing final *-ā*;[32] and (2) differences in some *qal o* imperfect forms.[33]

---

[29] The word לא seems to be an exception, since in the Codex Leningradensis it is spelled with *vav* 188 times, that is 3.5% of all cases of לא, but the vast majority of the cases is in הלוא (148x), and twenty of the other forty cases of לוא are in Jeremiah. Generally, where this article refers to Masoretic Text, it refers to the text of the Codex Leningradensis as electronically available through the Accordance BHS-W4 module.

[30] Another example is תאר, spelled as תור, תואר, תאר, and even as תר defective! This may suggest that רש also could be hypercorrective ראש. Orthographic loss of quiescent *alef* also occurs in words such as רשית, רשת, רישית, all for ראשית. Compare also שאר ("flesh") spelled as שיר, and even as שר.

[31] Similar forms like מיא or פיא, or even בוא, all with final *alef*, and perhaps spelled thus by analogy with כיא, are only found in very few scrolls.

[32] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 338 and table on 339–43, categories resp. cols. 1–6 and 9–10; idem, 268, categories 1–2 and 5–6.

[33] Idem, 338, and table on 339–43, categories resp. cols. 7–8; ibid., 268, categories 3–4.

Many scrolls are a witness to a general tendency towards lengthening of forms, also other forms than those mentioned by Tov.[34] Several of those forms, such as הואה or אתמה are only attested in writing in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but a form as המה alongside הם is common in the Masoretic Text, where roughly speaking the Pentateuch prefers הם above המה, but the prophets המה above הם. Likewise, lengthened masculine plural suffixes are attested only twice in the Masoretic Text against almost 10,000 short masculine plural suffixes, but the statistics are somewhat different with the feminine plural suffixes, where in the Masoretic Text 8% (21 out of 254 cases) are lengthened.[35] While specific lengthened forms and the general tendency towards lengthening might be assigned to Tov's "Qumran scribal practice," isolated occurrences of the independent pronoun המה have virtually no weight since they are not uncommon in the Masoretic Text.[36]

Second, in some cases the distinction between morphological and orthographic features is not a priori clear, since the assessment of the character of some variants is based on linguistic analysis and hypotheses. For example, for Cross and Freedman, the difference between the two writings of the second masculine singular suffix with merely *kaf* or with *kaf-he* is not merely orthographic, as in the vocalized Masoretic Text, but morphological, representing a double tradition. For them, forms such as קטלתה and כה– are not cases of full orthography, but examples of morphologically lengthened endings, vis-à-vis the short morphological form suggested by the consonantal writing of the Masoretic text.[37] Another problem are the *yiqṭólu* and *tiqṭólu* forms, both in free and final position, corresponding with the Masoretic pausal forms, but being morphologically different from the Masoretic *yiqṭ^{e}lú*

---

[34] Steven E. Fassberg, "The Preference for Lengthened Forms in Qumran Hebrew," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 227–40. For example, statistically שמה is on the rise against שם. Also the ואקט(ו)לה form, with its own rules, may belong to this category.

[35] Note that the only case of 2nd plural feminine suffix in Mishnah MS Kaufmann (but also Eshkol ed.) is *m. Soṭa* 1:6 זימתכנה. But MS Kaufmann has no other lengthened plural suffixes.

[36] Hence, the data in Tov's fourth column are largely supportive of other features, and have little or no importance on their own.

[37] Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence* (AOS 36; New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1952), 65–68 (67). Cross ("Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," 3–5) complicates the matter by arguing that the lengthened forms in the Dead Sea Scrolls are part of a baroque orthography imitating forms in older manuscripts where they marked the literary long form. Unfortunately, the pre-Qumran evidence for Cross's hypothesis is very meager.

and *tiqṭ^{e}lú* in free position. But we cannot a priori assume the Masoretic pronunciation *yiqṭ^{e}lú* for all cases where we have a defective spelling, and the Masoretic pausal form *yiqṭólu* when we see a *plene* spelling.[38]

There are very few manuscripts that have examples of all eighteen categories,[39] and it rarely occurs that manuscripts only have examples of the distinctive forms of the different morphological categories whenever they appear. But if a manuscript has some regular spellings or forms and some distinctive ones, how does Tov decide whether it is written in the "Qumran scribal practice" or not? Or, if we have a very fragmentary manuscript, what would be the necessary evidence to assign that manuscript to Tov's group? Tov does not explicitly explain those criteria, but a study of his tables and comments reveals some of his criteria. In the last column of the table in Appendix 9 of *Scribal Practices*,[40] many texts have a question mark,[41] indicating that Tov regards the evidence as indicative but not enough to be convincing. One possible reason is that the manuscripts are very fragmentary and there is very little evidence, as with 2QExod^{b}, 2QNum^{b}, or 4QPs^{o};[42] another possibility is that a manuscript has distinctive or Qumran spellings in some orthographic categories, but regular forms in the morphological categories. This holds true, e.g., for 4QDeut^{j} (cols I–IV),

---

[38] See also Eugene Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (DJD 15; Oxford, Clarendon, 1997), 46, who interprets such imperfect verbal forms as orthographic.

[39] 1QIsa^{a} has examples of all eighteen categories, and 1QIsa^{a} B includes them all, though does not use them consistently. Emanuel Tov, "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls" (paper presented at the Symposium of the Orion Center 2008; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming), follows the distinction made in earlier scholarship of two scribes, scribe A writing from the beginning of 1QIsa^{a} to the end of col. 27, and scribe B starting at the beginning of the next sheet at col. 28. Though the two parts of the scroll are orthographically clearly distinct, it is a moot point whether the handwriting warrants a distinction between two scribes. See Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, *Qumran Cave 1.II: The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD 32; Oxford: Clarendon, forthcoming). Therefore, I here simply refer to 1QIsa^{a} A and B to refer to two orthographically and morphologically clearly distinct sections in 1QIsa^{a}.

[40] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339–43. The column has mistakenly the heading "Sect. nature" where Tov clearly intends "QSP." The error probably has been made by copying the headings of the comparable tables that are use in Appendix 1 where the last column, "Sect. nature," refers to content.

[41] Fifty-one out of 170 texts (thirty percent), but elsewhere (idem, 266) he states that some forty percent of 167 Qumran texts present a somewhat less convincing case.

[42] Examples taken from Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339. Therefore, I do not understand why some manuscripts with much more "positive" evidence are not included in Tov's list. For example, 4Q375 (see idem, 287) has exclusively positive evidence in five categories, but this is there regarded as insufficient.

4QXII^{g}, or 1QDM.[43] It is clear that for Tov a few attestations of specific distinctive forms, such as הואה, אתמה, or lengthened pronominal plural suffixes, weigh heavier than multiple cases of simple *plene* spellings of כול, לוא, or זואת. His argument is that certain forms are not found in texts that reflect an orthography and morphology similar to that of the Masoretic Text,[44] or not found in texts not written according to the "Qumran scribal practice."[45] On the whole, Tov seems to be right, but there is some degree of circular reasoning involved, and there are exceptions. For example, 4Q185 is entirely written in a defective MT-like orthography, but with the one exception of אתסה.[46] It seems therefore that Tov takes both the quantity of distinctive forms and the idiosyncrasy of particular forms into account. Here we may relate to his own comments about the consistency and frequency of distinctive spellings and forms:

> The shared spellings which are used most consistently in all scrolls in this group are the *plene* writings זאות/זואת/(ה)זות, מושה, לוא, כול, and the long spelling of the second person singular suffix כה– in nouns and prepositions; the most frequently used forms are the lengthened forms of the verb of the type *(w)tqṭwlw* and *(w)yqṭwlw* and of מאד.[47]

If one peruses Tov's tables, then one gets the impression that Tov is less easily convinced if a manuscript has only those spellings and forms, and not any of the other less frequent spellings or forms. In other words, the more idiosyncratic categories weigh much heavier

---

[43] Examples taken from idem, 339–40. 1QDM has the form המה, but above I argued that המה is not really distinctive. But if a lack of distinctive forms is grounds for adding a question mark, one should also question 4Q227, 4Q271, 4Q277, 4Q292, 4Q377, 4Q393 (there is a mistake in column 6), 4Q403, 4Q460, 4Q471, 4Q506, 4Q509, 4Q512, 6Q18, all of which now have a "y" without question mark in the last column. But then, shouldn't one also question 4Q227? Or we may ask why 4Q437 is distinctive.

[44] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 337: "The distinction between texts written in the Qumran scribal practice and other texts is based on the assumption that texts which otherwise reflect an orthography and morphology similar to that of MT do not contain a single occurrence of ביא, הואה, or מלכמה, etc."

[45] Idem, 338 n. 385.

[46] The one occurrence of לוא in 4Q185 which Tov records (idem, 286) is actually in הלוא, which form should be excluded from the statistics. I also mentioned this example in my review of Tov's *Scribal Practices and Approaches* (*DSD* 14 [2007]: 368–72).

[47] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 268. This statement may not be entirely correct, perhaps because "consistent" and "frequent" are ambiguous. For example, the *qṭlth* forms versus *qṭlt* occur less frequently in absolute terms, but in relative terms more than *-kh* versus *-k*.

than the less distinctive ones.[48] One single case of הואה serves as a red flag, whereas multiple cases of לוא or כול are relatively common. At the same time it means that is it difficult to say with certainty that a fragmentary text does not reflect the "Qumran scribal practice," when it only has the stock set of full spellings. Put differently: whereas the distinctive spelling הואה is a strong positive indicator of the "Qumran scribal practice,"[49] the regular form הוא is not negative evidence, but neutral. This holds for virtually each of the morphological categories.

Of course, many of the uncertainties arise from the fragmentariness of the material: one hundred words more might have solved our problems. Yet, Tov's exercise in trying to determine which texts should be isolated also reveals a basic problem, namely that the exact drawing of the boundaries, determining whether a text is "in" or "out," is subjective.[50]

5. *Starting with "Not"*

In order to take a first approach to the issue, I decided to redo some parts of Tov's statistical analysis, to see to which extent I would reach the same or other conclusions. Initially, I started looking at the most idiosyncratic forms like הואה, but ran into the problem of paucity of data. I then turned to the opposite approach, and decided to start with the most common category in Tov's list: לא/לוא. My question is simple: what kind of correlations does the defective or *plene* spelling of לוא have with other spellings and forms?[51]

---

[48] This reminds us of Emanuel Tov, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies (by Frank M. Cross): Reply," in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 15–21 (16), where he replies to Cross that "to some extent, morphological differences are more far-reaching than orthographic ones." However, Tov does not repeat this view in his later work.

[49] Nonetheless, Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 286–87 shows that in spite of הואה/היאה, Tov regards the evidence pertaining to 4Q172 (which actually is not a manuscript, but a collection of heterogeneous fragments), 4Q321, and 6Q12 as insufficient.

[50] Tov is aware of this, and therefore states that the "scribal features…provide more objective criteria for analysis than the analysis of orthography and morphology" (*Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 162).

[51] In many respects this approach touches upon the same phenomena which Tov (*Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 268–69), discusses under the heading "Consistency and statistical analysis." Note, however, that my discussion is initially restricted to "biblical" manuscripts, and does not depart from the idea of a specific scribal practice.

I initially limited my research to a small corpus of texts, those included in Accordance's *Qumran Biblical Texts*.[52] The choice for this particular group of texts has the methodological advantage that one can compare both individual readings and general orthographic and morphological patterns to the Masoretic Text. Also, those manuscripts provide more usable data, because one can generally reconstruct partially preserved words on the basis of the Masoretic text.[53]

My first search was to see how the spellings לא/לוא were distributed among these texts, with disregard for all the לו, הלוא, בלוא, כלוא and ללוא spellings. This results in four groups of texts: (1) those that only have instances of the defective spelling לא; (2) those that have instances of both defective לא and full לוא spellings; (3) those that only have examples of the full spelling לוא; and (4) a large group of small manuscripts that have no clear case of לא.[54]

Many fragmentary manuscripts do not have any case of לא or לוא (group 4).[55] A slightly smaller number of manuscripts only have cases

---

[52] *Qumran Biblical Texts (Manuscript order)*. Version 1.1. Grammatical tagging by Dr. Martin Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook with Casey Toews, Trinity Western University, B.C., Canada. Copyright 2008 by OakTree Software, Inc. This module contains all the texts that have been classified as "biblical" in the series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, as well as the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, but not the manuscripts entitled 4QReworked Pentateuch[a–e] (4Q158; 4Q364–4Q367). It contains the biblical Psalms but not the other hymnic materials included in 4Q88 and 11Q5–11Q6. It also contains the biblical material from other locations in the Judaean Desert. The Accordance program allows one to restrict one's searches to specified parts of a module.

[53] For example, if ה[or אה[are preserved where the Masoretic text reads הוא, is it relatively certain that the manuscript read הואה.

[54] Of course I ruled out all cases where only the *lamed* or only the *alef* was preserved, and where the editor had reconstructed either a full or defective spelling. I also disregarded cases of transcriptions that presented the material as]לא or]לוא, because otherwise I would have had to check each single case as to whether the remaining traces were compatible or incompatible with the other reading. Tov has taken similar decisions when recording the data in his tables. In a few cases, where a transcribed spelling or form was very unexpected, or inconsistent with all other data, I checked the reading against the photographs.

[55] I include in this group also manuscripts that have incomplete לא, not enabling one to determine whether the text read לא or לוא. The groups consists of: 1Q1, 1Q6, 1Q10, 1Q11, 1Q12, 2Q1, 2Q3, 2Q4, 2Q5, 2Q6, 2Q7, 2Q8, 2Q9, 2Q10, 2Q11, 2Q12, 2Q14, 2Q15, 2Q17, 3Q1, 3Q2, 3Q3, 4Q3, 4Q4, 4Q7, 4Q8a, 4Q8b, 4Q8c, 4Q8d, 4Q10, 4Q12a, 4Q15, 4Q18, 4Q19, 4Q20, 4Q21, 4Q38c, 4Q39, 4Q44, 4Q46, 4Q49, 4Q50, 4Q62a, 4Q66, 4Q67, 4Q68, 4Q69, 4Q69a, 4Q69b, 4Q71, 4Q72b, 4Q74, 4Q75, 4Q77, 4Q86, 4Q89, 4Q90, 4Q91, 4Q92, 4Q93, 4Q94, 4Q95, 4Q97, 4Q98, 4Q98a, 4Q98b, 4Q98c, 4Q98d, 4Q98e, 4Q98f, 4Q98g, 4Q100, 4Q103a, 4Q104, 4Q105, 4Q106, 4Q108, 4Q116, 4Q117, 4Q118, 4Q131, 4Q132, 4Q133, 4Q143, 4Q146, 4Q149, 4Q151, 4Q152, 4Q153, 4Q154, 4Q576, 5Q2, 5Q3, 5Q5, 5Q7, 6Q1, 6Q2, 6Q3, 6Q5, 6Q7, 8Q1, 8Q2, 11Q2, 11Q3, 11Q7, 11Q9, XJosh, Murx. Most are very fragmentary: the above

of defective לא (group 1).[56] The group with only full spelling is considerably smaller (group 3),[57] and the group with both spellings is smallest (group 2).[58] Of course, all statistical comparisons are marred by the fragmentariness of the material. For example, groups 1 and 3 include many manuscripts that have only one single occurrence of לוא/לא,[59] whereas manuscripts in group 2 need at least two occurrences of /לא לוא.[60] Also, one would expect that the chance that a manuscript has samples of both spellings increases with the quantity of the preserved text. This, however, is hardly the case. If one looks at, for example,[61] the forty best preserved biblical manuscripts from Qumran,[62] the statistics are that twenty-seven only have לא (group 1), nine only have לוא (group 3), and only four have both לא and לוא (group 2).[63] The

---

mentioned manuscripts have an average of forty words (including partially preserved words) per manuscript. Here I understand a word to be any letter or sequence of letters that has been tagged as "adjective," "noun," "particle," "pronoun," or "verb," in the Accordance module. A sequence like ל]ובכ therefore counts as three words, even though it consists of only three letters.

[56] 1Q2, 1Q3, 1Q5, 1Q7, 1Q8, 1Q13, 2Q16, 4Q1, 4Q2, 4Q5, 4Q6, 4Q9, 4Q11, 4Q13, 4Q14, 4Q16, 4Q17, 4Q22, 4Q23, 4Q24, 4Q25, 4Q28, 4Q29, 4Q30, 4Q31, 4Q32, 4Q33, 4Q34, 4Q35, 4Q36, 4Q38b, 4Q38d, 4Q42, 4Q43, 4Q45, 4Q47, 4Q48, 4Q52, 4Q54, 4Q55, 4Q56, 4Q58, 4Q59, 4Q60, 4Q62, 4Q63, 4Q64, 4Q72, 4Q72a, 4Q73, 4Q76, 4Q79, 4Q81, 4Q84, 4Q85, 4Q101, 4Q102, 4Q103, 4Q107, 4Q112, 4Q114, 4Q130, 4Q141, 4Q145, 4Q150, 4Q155, 5Q1, 6Q4, 6Q6, 8Q3, 8Q4, 11Q1, 11Q4, XQ1, XQ2, XQ3, Mur1, Mur2, Mur3, Mur4, Mur88, Sdeir1, 5/6Ḥev1b, XḤev/Se2, XḤev/Se5, 34Se1, Mas1b–Mas1e, X4, XJudges.

[57] 1Q4, 1QIsa[a], 2Q13, 4Q12, 4Q27, 4Q38, 4Q38a, 4Q40, 4Q53, 4Q57, 4Q65, 4Q78, 4Q80, 4Q83, 4Q87, 4Q88, 4Q96, 4Q109, 4Q110, 4Q111, 4Q113 16–18 i+19–20, 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q135, 4Q137, 4Q138, 4Q139, 4Q140, 4Q142, 4Q144, 5Q4, 11Q5, 11Q6.

[58] 2Q2, 4Q26, 4Q37, 4Q41, 4Q51, 4Q61, 4Q70, 4Q82, 4Q99, 4Q134, 4Q136, 5Q6, 11Q8.

[59] This goes for twenty-five manuscripts in group 1 (1Q2, 1Q3, 4Q16, 4Q17, 4Q25, 4Q38b, 4Q38d, 4Q43, 4Q62, 4Q63, 4Q64, 4Q73, 4Q78, 4Q101, 4Q103, 4Q107, 4Q150, 4Q155, 6Q6, 11Q4, XQ2, Mur2, Sdeir1, Mas1c, X4), and five from group 2 (1Q4, 4Q12, 4Q40, 4Q88, 4Q96).

[60] In fact, 2Q2 and 11Q8 both have once לא and once לוא.

[61] One needs to take a sizable amount of texts. If one would look only at the six best preserved biblical manuscripts, the relations would be different. 1QIsa[a], 11Q5, and 4Q27 consistently use the spelling לוא; 1Q8 and 4Q22 consistently לא; and 4Q51 uses both spellings.

[62] Based on the number of hits for "adjective," "noun," "particle," "pronoun," "suffix," or "verb," ignoring words inside brackets, in the earlier mentioned Accordance module.

[63] In order of size: Group 1 1Q8, 4Q22, 11Q1, 4Q23, 4Q56, 4Q1, 8Q3, 4Q11, 4Q14, 4Q112, 4Q24, 4Q72, 4Q30, 4Q84, 4Q58, 4Q33, 4Q13, 4Q35, XQ3, 4Q45, 4Q55, XQ1, 4Q2, 4Q130, XQ2, 4Q76, 4Q128, 4Q85; Group 2 1QIsa[a], 11Q5, 4Q27, 4Q57, 4Q83, 4Q137, 4Q78, 4Q138, 4Q128; Group 3 4Q51, 4Q82, 4Q70, 4Q41. If one takes more manuscripts, these proportions change only slightly.

first conclusions can be relatively straightforward. The majority of the "biblical" manuscripts use לא and not לוא. None of the non-Qumran "biblical" manuscripts ever use לוא.[64] The vast majority of the manuscripts are consistent with regard to the spelling of either לא or לוא.

5.1

Do those groups of manuscripts correlate consistently with Tov's other categories? The group of manuscripts that always have defective לא (and never full לוא) overall have regular MT-like forms and spellings, and very few distinctive ones. None of those manuscripts has the distinctive lengthened forms הואה, היאה, אתמה, קטלתמה, none has the *yᵉquṭlenu* forms, and none the full spelling of the particle כה. In some other categories there are very few exceptions: one uncertain case of כי with *alef*;[65] five cases where those manuscripts read the independent pronoun המה against MT הם;[66] one possible case of a full spelling of a *yiqṭólu* form;[67] three cases of lengthened מאד;[68] one phylactery (4Q141) which has lengthened plural suffixes;[69] one text (4Q13) that consistently (five times) spells מושה full; a few texts that have distinctive spellings of זאת[70] or כל,[71] the latter consistently in 4Q130. However, besides those rare exceptions, there are, in comparison, a larger number of cases where the second masculine singular suffix and the second masculine singular perfect form were spelled with *he* against MT. Thus, *qṭlth* spellings with *he* are found fifteen times where MT does not have *he*,[72] and the suffix *kh*, five times.[73] One should note

---

[64] Except for הלואו and כלוא in Mur88.

[65] Mas1e 2:15 כיאֹ.

[66] 1Q7 2 2; 1Q8 28:7; 4Q14 1:42; 4Q22 3:33; 4Q63 1 4. On the other hand, 1Q8 24:29; 28:7 has הם versus MT המה.

[67] 4Q22 19:3 ישפו]טו.

[68] 4Q13 3 i-4 16; 4Q22 10:31; 4Q23 60–61 1.

[69] And possibly also 4Q23 85 1 (small unidentified fragment) and 4Q107 2 i 5.

[70] 4Q76 spells twice זות and twice זאת. 8Q3 1–11 i 8 spells once זאות against twice זאת.

[71] 4Q14 6:43 (uncertain reading); 4Q114 2:16; 4Q130 1 9–10, 12–14, 16, 20; 4Q145 1V 10; 8Q4 1 23. See also 4Q54 8 2 (uncertain reading) and 4Q58 16 3, but those fragments probably stem from other manuscripts.

[72] 1Q8 8:25; 4Q13 3 ii + 5–6 i 6 (2x); 4Q16 1 8; 4Q22 28:5; 32:10; 4Q76 2:4; 4Q114 1:15; 4Q130 1 4; 4Q141 1 i 5–6; 5Q1 1 1; XQ2 1:21 (2x); XQ3 1:20. In eight cases the קטלתה spelling is also found in MT. This should be compared to about 240 regular קטלת spellings.

[73] In total the suffix *kh* is found eleven times in this group of manuscripts. However, five times these are in Exod 13:16 where MT has ידכה, and once Deut 28:35

that in view of the large sample, the number of distinctive spellings and forms remains very small, and that many can be attributed to the same manuscripts.[74]

5.2

If one looks at the smaller group of biblical manuscripts that always spell *plene* לוא and never defectively, then the spelling is in many respects consistent within this group, with the important exception of 1QIsa[a] whose scribes or parts, especially the first one (A) are exceptionally internally inconsistent. How does *plene* לוא correlate to the other categories selected by Tov?

These manuscripts that only have *plene* לוא, and never defective לא, always have full spelling of מושה and of זאת with *vav*. More than 95% cases of כול are full—almost all exceptions are in 1QIsa[a].[75] They always have full כוה, except again for 1QIsa[a] A, which consistently has כה, and 4Q83 9 ii כה. With the exception of 1QIsa[a] A and 4Q135, they always write קטלתה and not קטלת. And, if one ignores 1QIsa[a], which has 120 of the 134 cases of ך, then more than 97% of the second masculine singular suffix are written כה rather than ך.[76] Unlike these orthographic examples, where, with the exception of 1QIsa[a], the distinctive spellings are the rule, כיא with *alef* is not the rule in these manuscripts. The spelling differs per manuscript, but all in all, regular כי is more common than distinctive כיא, which is attested mostly in 1QIsa[a].[77]

---

where MT has יככה. There are five cases of כה against MT ך, namely 4Q22 25:5 (עמכה); 4Q24 9 i-10–17 28 (לכה); 4Q59 where the reading of ה is not necessary; 4Q141 1 i 13, and Mas 1e 1:20.

[74] See especially 4Q13, 4Q22, 4Q130, and 4Q141. Actually, 4Q141 is orthographically and morphologically like the manuscripts of group 3; the defective spelling לא is an exception within the manuscript.

[75] Fourteen cases of defective MT-like כל in 1QIsa[a], thirteen in 1QIsa[a] A, and one by a corrector above the text of 1QIsa[a] B. The few other cases in this group are: 2Q13 9 ii–12 7; 4Q88 3:18; 4Q111 3:2; 4 1.

[76] If one disregards 1QIsa[a], then there are fourteen cases of ך as opposed to ca. 500 cases of כה. See 4Q12 1 4; 4Q37 41 1; 4Q78 48 1; 4Q135 1 11, 20; 11Q5 3:14; 12:15; 20:9, 12; 21:5.

[77] In absolute terms (occurrences), outside 1QIsa[a] the ratio is ca. 75% כי against 25% כיא, but those proportions are distorted by the many cases of כי in 11Q5. Virtually all those biblical manuscripts consistently use either כי (4Q78 [once כיא], 4Q83, 4Q87, 4Q88, 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q135, 4Q137, 4Q138, 4Q139, 4Q140, 11Q5) or כיא (1Q4, 2Q13, 4Q27, 4Q38a, 4Q57, 4Q111). 4Q57 23 7 has כי אם, but the spelling כי

With regard to forms, these manuscripts mostly have /מאדה/מואדה/ מאודה (24x) and there are only three instances without lengthening.[78] In this group of manuscripts, we always find אתמה, and never אתם.[79] The form קטלתמה seems to be about twice as common as קטלתם in these manuscripts.[80] In 1QIsa[a] the regular short forms of הוא and היא are twice as common as the distinctive long forms, but in the other manuscripts of this group the distinctive long forms are slightly more common than the short ones.[81] The lengthened suffix המה is more common in 1QIsa[a], but in other texts הם is more common.[82] The short suffix ם is overall more common than מה, which mainly is found in 1QIsa[a] and the phylacteries.[83] The lengthened suffix כמה is clearly more common than כם.[84] The *yiqṭolu* forms (or spellings?) are extremely common in 1QIsa[a], though there are a few *yiqṭ[e]lu* ones, but in other texts the cases of either form/spelling is rare, but more or less equally distributed. The same goes for the *yiqṭ[e]leni/y[e]quṭleni* form.

This short survey shows that with the exception of 1QIsa[a], especially the first scribe, who penned cols. 1–27,[85] and to a lesser extent also 4Q83

---

instead of כיא is probably influenced by אם. See 1QS which consistently has כיא, except for 1QS 5:15 כי אם.

[78] 1QIsa[a] 13:23; 46:26; 4Q83 1 7.

[79] The one exception is 4Q135 (twice אתם). Admittedly, the form does not occur very often, thirty times אתמה in these manuscripts.

[80] Twenty-six instances of קטלתם versus forty-nine of קטלתמה. Four manuscripts have both forms (1QIsa[a], 4Q27, 4Q38, 4Q78), one only קטלתם (4Q135), and eleven only קטלתמה (2Q13, 4Q40, 4Q57, 4Q80, 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q137, 4Q138, 4Q140, 4Q142, 4Q144, seven of which are phylacteries).

[81] Disregarding 1QIsa[a], twenty-four cases of the long form הואה or היאה in nine manuscripts (4Q27, 4Q38, 4Q40, 4Q53, 4Q57, 4Q111, 4Q128, 4Q138, 4Q140), and sixteen short forms in eight manuscripts (4Q27, 4Q57, 4Q65, 4Q80, 4Q109, 4Q111, 4Q128, and 11Q5). Note that 4Q27, 4Q57, 4Q111, and 4Q128 have both forms.

[82] The phylacteries 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q137, and 4Q138 consistently use the long form. Some manuscripts like 4Q37, 4Q38, 4Q83, 4Q88, and 4Q135 attest to the short form only, while larger manuscripts like 4Q27, 4Q57, 4Q78, or 11Q5 have predominantly short forms, and sometimes the longer ones.

[83] The use of ם—and מה—is complex, since the use of the long form is restricted to specific phonological environments. See Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), § 322.18; Shelomo Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," *VT* 38 (1988): 148–64 (158–59). This is probably the reason why Tov distinguishes in his categories between second and third plural suffixes in nouns and verbs, and second and third plural suffixes in prepositions.

[84] Some manuscripts only have the short form (e.g., 4Q57 and 11Q5), others only the long form (4Q78 and most phylacteries), some both (4Q27).

[85] For a detailed description and tables, see Tov, "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls."

(4QPs[a]),[86] those manuscripts that consistently write לוא, also quite consistently have the distinctive spellings which Tov listed, instead of the regular ones that are found in the MT. The one exception is the attestation of כי or ביא. With respect to the distinctive morphological forms, however, the correlations are more complex. The distinctive forms *mōʾdah* and אתמה are used fairly consistently, instead of the regular forms. In the other morphological categories the occurrence of the regular or distinctive form is less predictable, and differs per manuscript. Thus, some manuscripts, like 1QIsa[a] B and the Phylacteries 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q137, 4Q138, 4Q140, 4Q142, 4Q144 tend to use predominantly or exclusively lengthened morphological forms. Other manuscripts, like 11Q5 or 4Q135 usually have the regular forms, with very few examples of the distinctive lengthened ones, and 4Q83 has no attestations of the distinctive forms.

5.3

A different category is the small group of biblical manuscripts that employ both full and defective forms of לא. Those manuscripts are also unpredictable with regard to other spellings, some tending towards the defective and other ones to the *plene*, or being entirely mixed, but they have in common that they display hardly any of the lengthened forms of Tov's morphological categories.[87] The one exception is 4Q37, which, as Tov also records,[88] changes markedly with respect to spelling and morphology from col. 5 on, so that 4Q37 5–12 should actually be regarded as a לוא only section.[89] This relatively small group of manuscripts can be said to stand in between the fairly defective MT-like spelling, and the distinctive full spelling that Tov described.[90]

---

[86] Although 4Q83 always attests לוא, it actually displays a mixed spelling. E.g., it always spells אלהים defectively.

[87] 11Q8 1 2 has מואדה, and 4Q41 6 3 has the lengthened suffix המה.

[88] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339.

[89] Initially, I also had included 4Q139 in this group of texts that use both לא and לוא. According to Milik's transcription (*Qumrân grotte 4.II* [DJD 6; Clarendon: Oxford, 1977], 70) it has three cases of לוא (in lines 4 and 10), and one of]לאֹ, in line 2. I consider it possible that one should transcribe לוֹ]א, and I have transferred the manuscript to group 2.

[90] One of these in between manuscripts is 4Q51 or 4QSam[a], which Cross characterized as standing in between MT and what Cross calls the baroque or archaizing spelling. With respect to לא/לוא or כל/כול the text is inconsistent, but more often full than defective; likewise it prefers *qṭlth* forms above *qṭlt* ones. In other respects it is

5.4

On the basis of the correlations described above, many of the manuscripts of group 4 (no לא or לוא attested), may be assigned to one of the other groups. For example, the words כול במותמה in 2Q7 (2QNum[b]), strongly indicate it sides with the manuscripts of group 3. On the other hand, 4Q3 and 4Q4 consistently have defective spellings.

5.5

At this stage, one can make the following observations, exclusively with respect to those biblical manuscripts (and I assume that most or all of those have been seen by Tov):

(1) The majority of biblical manuscripts uses consistently defective לא, and has with regard to orthography and morphology a text that stands close to MT. Also, those manuscripts have virtually none of the idiosyncrasies of Tov's "Qumran scribal practice."

(2) A group of biblical manuscripts uses consistently full לוא. Those manuscripts also display a full orthography in other forms, both with regard to *vav* used for *u* or *o*, and with regard to final *he* for the second masculine singular perfect and suffix. These texts display more variation with respect to the morphological forms, ranging from having no or few distinctive forms, to having predominantly distinctive forms. A special case is 1QIsa[a] A, which is inconsistent with respect to both spellings and forms.

(3) In between these groups stand some manuscripts that display less consistency with respect to the spelling of לא and other orthographic issues, but generally are consistent in having the regular MT-like forms.

This brief investigation into the biblical manuscripts shows that we have to weigh and interpret the facts. We could classify the material in two, three, or even more groups, or organize the evidence on a spectrum. For example, on the basis of the biblical texts, we could classify the manuscripts broadly in (a) texts that are generally MT-like with defective spelling in the categories Tov uses and no lengthened forms; (b) texts with a mixed defective-full spelling, and only very rarely lengthened forms; (c) texts with a predominantly or exclusively

---

like MT, be it with some exceptions such as twice כיא with *alef* against twenty-eight times regular כי.

full spelling, and some degree of lengthened forms; (d) texts with full spelling and a comprehensive use of lengthened forms. Then, as well, one should also refer to the small group of manuscripts that have an "archaic" spelling that is more defective than that of MT.[91] Tov seems to categorize (c) and (d) as Qumran orthography and morphology, whereas Alexander and Vermes probably would call (c) full, and (d) super-full.

With respect to details, one should note that overall, also in the group of manuscripts that is very much like the MT, the *qṭlth* spelling is more common than in MT. To a lesser extent this also holds for the *kh* spelling of the suffix. This supports Tov's feeling that not all eighteen categories are equally important for discerning a specific practice. But it also might support Cross and Freedman's hypothesis that the Rabbinic consonantal text reflects a revision towards the vernacular.

6. *Correlations between Orthography/ Morphology and Scribal Features*

6.1. *Scribal Corrections*

Throughout his work Tov describes statistical relations between certain scribal features and the Qumran orthography and morphology. In particular he considers the correlation between cancellation dots and the Qumran orthography and morphology to be very strong, since he includes references to scribal corrections in his tables in Appendix 9, and repeatedly refers to the connection between this particular correction practice and the Qumran spellings and forms. In fact, the "Qumran scribal practice" could be described as consisting largely of the orthographic and morphological features on the one hand, and a few typical scribal features, particularly the cancellation dots, on the other. His argument runs as follows:

> The practice of using cancellation dots is evidenced in fifty-two biblical and nonbiblical texts written in the Qumran scribal practice, eight texts not written in that system, six texts of unclear orthographic practice, and three Aramaic texts. Since only half of the Qumran texts large enough for analysis reflect the features of the Qumran scribal practice, and the

[91] For example, 4Q52 (4QSam[b]). See the literature referred to in F. M. Cross, D. Parry, and E. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Clarendon: Oxford, 2002), 220.

> majority of the texts using the scribal dots are written in the Qumran orthography and morphology, the use of cancellation dots may be considered characteristic of that scribal practice.[92]

The complete list of those in total sixty-nine texts, of which fifty-two in the "Qumran scribal practice" (seven biblical and forty-five nonbiblical), is presented in chapter 5,[93] so that we can easily compare that list to that of the other lists of texts written in the "Qumran scribal practice."[94]

Actually three of the list of fifty-two are not mentioned in Tov's complete list of texts written in the "Qumran scribal practice," namely 4QDeut[c] (4Q30), 4QCal Doc/Mish C (4Q321a), and 4QBarkhi Nafshi[a] (4Q434). In the tables of Appendix 1 they are characterized as not having the "Qumran scribal practice," or, for 4Q321a, having no data.[95] Eleven more manuscripts of the list of fifty-two[96] are included in Tov's list of texts written in the "Qumran scribal practice," but with the question mark, which—as we saw—indicated that they belong to the group for which the evidence was less convincing (unclear or probable). This still leaves a respectable number of thirty-eight out of sixty-nine for which Tov regards the evidence for the "Qumran scribal practice" convincing,[97] and eleven for which he considers it possible or probable, but the overall figures have become somewhat less overwhelming.

Tov's other part of the argument (namely, that only half of the Qumran texts large enough for analysis reflect the "Qumran scribal practice," whereas the majority of texts using the scribal dots is written in the Qumran orthography and morphology) requires more reflection and scrutiny. Unlike the binary options of two different kinds of possible

---

[92] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 264.

[93] Idem, 196–98.

[94] Idem, 339–43. See also 279–87, the tables in Appendix 1.

[95] 4Q30 has some *plene* spellings (but always לא and כל), and only regular, no distinctive forms. 4Q434 is slightly more *plene*, though not consistently, and again has no distinctive, only regular forms. 4Q321a lacks relevant data, though it has the strange spelling בוא for בו.

[96] 1Q22, 4Q222, 4Q223–224, 4Q274, 4Q289, 4Q396, 4Q400, 4Q410, 4Q426, 4Q438, 4Q522.

[97] One of those cases contains a mistake. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 342, lists 4Q393 as having 0/1 in col. 6 (i.e., having one example of a lengthened 2d/3d plural pronominal suffix with a preposition), but this should be 1/0 (having one regular, short, case of the plural pronominal suffix), see 4Q393 3 7 להם. Then the only evidence for the "Qumran scribal practice" would be orthographic.

spellings of one word or realizations of a form in orthography and morphology, the practice of cancellation dots has not been contrasted to another alternative correction practice in texts that do not reflect the "Qumran scribal practice." One might compare the use of the cancellation dots with that of the crossing out of letters, and expect that one group of manuscripts would use one system, and another group of texts the other. However, Tov lists twenty-three manuscripts that cross out letters or words, nine of which also were recorded as using cancellation dots. In the case of crossing out words or letters with a line, thirteen are classified by Tov as written in the "Qumran scribal practice," and ten as not in that scribal practice.[98] Another scribal correction practice, the use of parenthesis signs, is found, thus Tov, in five texts written in the "Qumran scribal practice," and in three not written in that system.[99] Two of those texts also use cancellation dots,[100] and four others also crossed out with lines.[101] Tov adds three texts that indicate the elements to be omitted with a box-like shape around the letters, two of which actually also use cancellation dots.[102]

We should draw some cautious preliminary conclusions and explanations. First, apparently neither the so-called "Qumran scribal practice" texts, nor the non-"Qumran scribal practice" texts use one specific procedure. In fact, in both categories of texts there are combinations of similar correction procedures. One cannot argue, for example, that dots are typical of "Qumran scribal practice" texts, and crossing out of other texts. Second, the statistics of kinds of scribal procedures need to be correlated to that of scribal interventions per se. Tov's data also allow, for example, the explanation that the larger number of cancellation dots and other correction procedures in those "Qumran scribal practice" manuscripts may be due to the fact that they were written less carefully, and therefore had to be corrected more often than other manuscripts, but that the authors used the same practices as others did. Third, one wonders to what extent the correlation between corrections and "Qumran scribal practice" texts could be indirect: most

---

[98] Idem, 199–200. But Tov again includes 4QDeut^{c} as a "Qumran scribal practice" manuscript. The third of the examples of a biblical manuscript penned in the "Qumran scribal practice" which crosses out words or letters with a line is 4QQoh^{a}, which has וֹאה ה[as the only distinctive form.

[99] Idem, 201–2.

[100] 1QM and 1QS

[101] 4QQoh^{a}, 4QM^{a}, 4QDibHam^{a}, 4QCant^{b}.

[102] 4QD^{a}, 4QOrd^{b}, and 4QJub^{f}, see Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 202–3.

biblical texts are non-"Qumran scribal practice" texts, and most nonbiblical ones "Qumran scribal practice" texts.[103] If biblical texts generally would have been written with more care, they would have less correction procedures.

The fact that many "Qumran scribal practice" texts do not have those correction dots or lines, and that some non-"Qumran scribal practice" texts do have them, indicates that we are not talking about a peculiar, characteristic "Qumran scribal practice," but with one that for whatever reason was used more often in one group of texts than in another. One may assume that the use of cancellation dots was part of the scribal practice of the scribes of those manuscripts, but one cannot argue that this specific scribal feature supports the hypothesis of a Qumran orthography or morphology.

6.2. *Divine Name in Paleo-Hebrew Characters*

We can compare this with Tov's list of manuscripts with tetragrammata or the words אלהים or אל written in paleo-Hebrew characters.[104] Tov claims that virtually all nonbiblical manuscripts with tetragrammata or divine names written in paleo-Hebrew characters are written according to the "Qumran scribal practice."[105] He lists twenty nonbiblical compositions, of which he specifies one 4Q258 (4QS^{d}) as being an exception ("not Q"), and two more as uncertain ("Q?"; 4QShirShabb^{g} and 6QD). However, actually only thirteen of those twenty compositions are included in Tov's list of about 160 "Qumran scribal practice"

---

[103] The one hundred best preserved nonbiblical manuscripts, i.e., with the most remaining "words" in Accordance's Qumran module (11Q19, 1QH^{a}, 1QS, 1QM, 4Q418, 4Q266, 1QpHab, 4Q365, 4Q381, 4Q504, 4Q491, 4Q511, 4Q405, 11Q5, 4Q364, 3Q15, 4Q503, 4Q270, 4Q416, 4Q525, 4Q417, 4Q403, 4Q258, 4Q299, 11Q20, 1QSa, 4Q372, 4Q171, 4Q509, 4Q271, 4Q169, 4Q502, 4Q252, 4Q321, 4Q512, 1QSb, 4Q177, 4Q427, 4Q223–224, 4Q163, 4Q317, 4Q286, 4Q382, 4Q158, 4Q267, 4Q320, 1Q22, 4Q176, 4Q174, 4Q385a, 4Q394, 4Q216, 4Q274, 4Q434, 11Q17, 4Q379, 4Q378, 4Q319, 4Q428, 4Q259, 4Q265, 4Q251, 11Q11, 4Q423, 4Q400, 11Q13, 4Q175, 4Q256, 4Q522, 4Q185, 4Q390, 4Q200, 4Q422, 4Q387, 4Q521, 4Q184, 4Q397, 4Q385, 4Q396, 4Q365a, 4Q415, 4Q424, 4Q391, 1Q27, 4Q225, 4Q377, 4Q161, 4Q300, 4Q269, 4Q159, 4Q437, 4Q398, 4Q368, 4Q221, 4Q513, 4Q414, 4Q401, 4Q393, 4Q219, 4Q389) include sixty-one texts which in Tov's list of "Qumran scribal practice" manuscripts are marked as "y," and twelve more which are "y?" Only twenty-seven are not included in his list.

[104] Idem, 242–43.

[105] Idem, 241: "All nonbiblical compositions except for those specified as 'not Q' are written according to the Qumran scribal practice."

texts.[106] As for the seven biblical manuscripts with paleo-Hebrew characters for the divine name, five are too fragmentary for orthographic analysis, and only two are clearly written in the "Qumran scribal practice."[107]

Tov also lists "Qumran scribal practice" texts that write divine names in square characters,[108] which shows that not all manuscripts that have the features of Tov's "Qumran scribal practice" used the paleo-Hebrew script for those names. It had been suggested previously that the use of paleo-Hebrew script for divine names was a typically sectarian or Qumran phenomenon, and Tov's list suggests that within the corpus it is also restricted (with the one exception of 4Q258) to texts using the distinctive orthography and morphology.[109]

A comparison of the two phenomena—cancellation dots and paleo-Hebrew characters—shows that we have here two different kinds of conventions. Both are attested in multiple "Qumran scribal practice" texts, but in the case of the cancellation dots it is a non-exclusive, noncharacteristic convention; in the case of the use of paleo-Hebrew characters for the divine name, the feature seems to be exclusive and characteristic for texts written according to the "Qumran scribal practice" within the corpus. However, with regard to both conventions we also have multiple texts written in the "Qumran scribal practice" that do not use those conventions.

7. *Correlations between the "Qumran Scribal Practice" and Sectarian Texts*

No one will challenge the view that most of the orthographic and morphological peculiarities are found in those texts that traditionally

---

[106] Namely 1QpMic, 1QpHab, 1QMyst, 1QH^{a}, 1QH^{b} (even though Tov indicates that the evidence is insufficient), 4QpIsa^{a}, 4QpPs^{a}, 4QAges of Creation A, 4QD^{b}, 4QD^{c}, 6QpapHymn, 11QPs^{a}, and 4QpIsa^{a}; not in Tov's list on idem, 339–43 are the already mentioned 4QS^{d}, 4QShirShabb^{g}, and 6QD, as well as 1QpZeph, 4QpPs^{b}, 4QMidrEschat^{e}?, and 4QComposition Concerning Divine Providence. At the least, this shows a discrepancy between the various lists in the 2004 volume.

[107] 4QDeut^{k2} and 4QIsa^{c}. One should add 11QPs^{a}, which had already been included under the nonbiblical texts.

[108] Idem, 244, but the list is not complete. E.g., in section a., "Biblical Texts," one should add 1QDeut, 4QDeut^{k1}, 4QDeut^{m}, 4QXII^{e}, 4QLam—all of which are certainly—and 2QExod^{b}, 2QDeut^{c}, 4QExod^{b}, 4QExod^{j}, 4QXII^{g} which are possibly written according to the "Qumran scribal practice," according to Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339.

[109] Ignoring texts that are too fragmentary for orthographic analysis.

have most closely been connected to the Qumran Community, like the Cave 1 texts 1QS, 1QH[a], 1QpHab, and 1QM, as well as most of the pesharim. Also many other texts that are commonly closely related to those compositions exhibit many of the same features. Tov, however, goes one step further and sees the spelling and morphology as characteristic of the sectarian writings, and the lack of those features as indicating that those scrolls had been brought from elsewhere, even though he acknowledges there are "seven or eight sectarian texts [that] do *not* share those features."[110] Above, I already mentioned that this is more problematic than he suggests, but here I want to discuss the phenomenon of exceptions.

Tov mentions eight exceptions, but two of those, 4Q320 and 4Q395, have so little evidence that they should better be regarded as indecisive, not as exceptions. 4Q320 begins with full spelling and then continues with defective spelling, and 4Q395 only has one word—אהרן—that could give an idea about fullness or defectiveness. 4Q252, which according to Tov has sporadic "Qumranic" spellings, is mixed, and actually a good example of a text with several of the distinctive orthographic details but none of the morphological ones. In the remaining five manuscripts are the four crucial exceptions, the two pesharim 4Q162 and 4Q169 (4QpIsa[b] and 4QpNah) and the two Serekh manuscripts 4Q258 and 4Q264, as well as 4Q434 (4QBarkhi Nafshi[a]). Those texts are characterized by the lack of distinctive forms, and a virtually defective spelling.

One should note, however, that the lack of specific morphological peculiarities does not necessarily indicate that a text is an exception to the "Qumran scribal practice," since many texts that Tov assigns to this group have only few and sometimes no preserved distinctive forms. Therefore, only if the orthography of a text is predominantly defective, then we can assume that it does not have Tov's features, and is an exception. By that token a few other texts should be added to Tov's list of "exceptions," such as, e.g., 4Q270 (4QD[e]).[111] In general,

---

[110] Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 262, where he lists 4QpIsa[b] (4Q162), 4QpNah (4Q169), 4QCommGen A (4Q252), 4QS[d] (4Q258), 4QS[j] (4Q264), 4QCal Doc/Mish A (4Q320), 4QMMT[b] (4Q395), and 4QBarkhi Nafshi[a] (4Q434).

[111] But note the spelling צון, and possibly a ויכתו]בוהו, as well as once הכול (versus 15x כל). Note that even in texts that usually spell כל, there may be a tendency to write הכול rather than הכל. E.g. 4Q258 with 23x times כל, and twice כול, namely in הכול and מכול. But should we see a spelling like צון (or זות) as a full spelling, and does it belong to the same category as the ones with the digraphs או and וא? See spellings like ותומר and רוש in the Murabba'at manuscripts and רוש in 3Q15.

however, there are very few "sectarian" texts that are so defective that we have to exclude the possibility that they could have had features of the "Qumran scribal practice." We should combine this with our earlier observations: whereas many texts do not have enough evidence to assign them with confidence to Tov's group, likewise many others do not have enough evidence to rule out that they belonged to that group. But then, some nonbiblical texts with a consistently defective spelling, such as 4Q185 or 4Q273, suddenly have an unexpected lengthened independent pronoun like respectively אתסה and הואה. Put differently: the lack of positive evidence for the "Qumran scribal practice" is not necessarily the same as evidence for the contrary. In other words: we have a large group of texts that cannot easily be categorized, and only a small group that with certainty can be excluded from the "Qumran scribal practice."

8. *Preliminary Assessment*

The question is not whether or not there was something like a "Qumran scribal practice," but whether Tov's construct is methodologically sound and able to organize and explain a maximum of data, with a minimum of exceptions. Tov has forcefully, and on the whole correctly, emphasized the close connection between a set of orthographic and morphological peculiarities, and those texts that traditionally have been considered to be sectarian. He has also observed that specific scribal features occur more often in texts that display those peculiarities than in other texts, and has attributed the combination of those orthographic, morphological and scribal features to shared scribal conventions, or a specific scribal practice.

In his recent work on two manuscripts that are notoriously inconsistent with respect to spellings and forms, namely 1QIsa^{a} and 1QH^{a}, Tov has demonstrated that in spite of the inconsistency there is a tendency to correct towards a specific orthographic and morphological practice, and not randomly also the other way round. Tov's awareness of different degrees in which texts may display those characteristics is not entirely compatible, it seems to me, with his tendency to nevertheless dichotomize the material in two distinct groups, and to suggest that these two groups had clearly different origins. Though the suggestion that patently different scribal orthographic and morphological systems would indicate a different milieu is plausible, it is not the only

possible one. Also, as we have seen, the phenomenon of exceptions makes the dichotomy even more problematic.

In my opinion, the variety between the manuscripts can better be described with the model of a spectrum, than in clear-cut categories, even though we may want to use labels for specific clusters on the spectrum. Tov's "Qumran scribal practice" is such a cluster, but it covers a very large part of the spectrum, in fact, more or less all manuscripts that prefer full spellings above defective spellings. Tov's proposal of a relationship between this cluster to the *yaḥad* community and the site of Qumran needs much more reflection, regardless of the recent work of Ira Rabin and her Berlin colleagues who demonstrated that at least one "Qumran scribal practice" scroll, 1QH[a], was penned in the Dead Sea region.[112]

Another issue, which needs more attention, is the relationship between the majority of scrolls that are on the "Qumran scribal practice" side of the spectrum, and the small number that are clearly on the other side. It is interesting that within the corpus of biblical scrolls, the manuscripts with distinctive spellings and forms are a small minority, whereas in the corpus of nonbiblical scrolls the manuscripts with distinctive or full spellings, and often also distinctive forms, are in the majority. There, scrolls with defective spellings and regular MT-like forms are relatively rare.

Based on my searches this cluster would be no larger than about thirty to forty manuscripts.[113] It includes the five exceptions to Tov's "Qumran scribal practice," namely "sectarian" texts with entirely regular spelling (4Q162, 4Q169, 4Q258, 4Q264, 4Q434, but one should also add 4Q270), as well as two of the *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts (4Q366 and 4Q367). However, this category also includes a relatively large number of texts that have been classified as Apocrypha. Thus, 2Q22 (formerly called *apocrDavid?* but now identified as a copy of *Narrative and Poetic Composition*) and 4Q372 (Narrative and

[112] Ira Rabin, Oliver Hahn, Timo Wolff, Adimir Masic, and Gisela Weinberg, "On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot[a])," *DSD* 16 (2009): 97–106.

[113] The list should include 1Q34bis, 2Q22, 4Q162, 4Q169, 4Q185 (even though it has the one case of אתמה), 4Q216, 4Q258, 4Q264, 4Q270, 4Q366, 4Q367, 4Q368, 4Q372, 4Q374, 4Q379, 4Q385, 4Q385a, 4Q386, 4Q387, 4Q387a, 4Q389, 4Q392, 4Q393, 4Q434, 4Q514, as well as a series of badly preserved manuscripts.

Poetic Composition[b]),[114] 4Q216 and 4Q218 (4QJub[a, c]), 4Q368 (Apocr Pent A),[115] 4Q374 (Discourse on the Exodus Conquest Tradition), 4Q379 (*Apocryphon of Joshua*[b]),[116] 4Q385, 4Q385a, 4Q386, 4Q387, 4Q387a, 4Q389, 4Q390 (all *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* manuscripts, although there still is discussion whether they represent different manuscripts and compositions). On the basis of Tov's hypothesis, these would presumably have been brought from elsewhere, which would accord with the fact that these Apocrypha texts do not have any of the specifically sectarian terminology. As also Devorah Dimant indicates, in virtually all those manuscripts we see a language that is modeled on the biblical texts of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, while the orthography and morphology is remarkably much like that of the Masoretic tradition, and in 4Q387 and 4Q389 the orthography is even more defective. At the same time, a few slips of the pen in some of the copies demonstrate that the scribes were not completely used to this kind of spelling. This suggests that the scribes of Dimant's volume, except for the one of 4Q390, largely preserved an MT-like spelling. Here we may hypothesize, that these texts were copied in the kind of spelling that was associated with that of the biblical texts of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. One wonders, whether the scribes of 4Q387 and 4Q389, but also the one of 4Q379 (*Apocryphon of Joshua*[b]), were overdoing it, or whether they had knowledge of older, more defective biblical manuscripts, which they imitated. On the other hand, of some of these "apocrypha" compositions we also have copies with the distinctive spelling and forms.

In the cases of those regular MT spellings and forms, the manuscripts may have been penned by scribes who more or less copied the orthography and morphology of earlier copies. However, the clustering of defective spellings and regular morphological forms in this kind of apocryphal or pseudo-compositions may suggest a tendency to avoid the distinctive "Qumran" spellings and forms in special kinds of texts. Were those scribes only imitating what they thought to be the scribal practice of biblical texts, or can we go further and ask, speculatively, whether they expressed their attitude towards those texts by writing them in "biblical" orthography? Was spelling, at least for some

[114] MT-like orthography. But the other copies of this composition are *plene* or even QSP.

[115] This is a strange MS, mixing defective with some *plene* forms, partially in clusters.

[116] The orthography is sometimes even unusually defective, see, e.g., עלמי עד.

scribes, part of the strategies of authorization? Did defective spelling reflect that the scribes held the texts to be authoritative and of a different character than those which they copied in the more distinctive spelling and morphology which Tov related to the "Qumran scribal practice"? We should expand the discourse that Tov has started and introduce different parameters apart from the sectarian versus non-sectarian one.

Biblical manuscripts organized according to how they spell לא

	"Only לא" mss	"לא/לוא" mss	"Only לוא" mss
(1, 2) הוא vs הואה	never have הואה	never have הואה	mixed
(3) אתם vs אתמה	never אתמה	—	almost always אתמה
(4) המה vs הם	15 :: 4 where MT has הם	as in MT	המה; only twice הם
(5, 6) short suffixes 2nd/3rd plural vs lenghthened ones	no certain cases of lengthened suffixes[117]	99% short forms	mixed, depending both on texts (1QIsa[a] is not representative) and on suffix. כמה clearly more common that המה.
(7) *yiqṭ[e]lu* vs *yiqṭólu*	*yiqṭ[e]lu*, with one possible exception in 4Q22	*no relevant forms*	1QIsa[a] predominantly *yiqṭólu*; in other mss both, but with more cases of *yiqṭólu* than *yiqṭ[e]lu*,
(8) *yiqṭ[e]lenu vs y[e]quṭlenu forms*	no *y[e]quṭlenu* forms	no *y[e]quṭlenu* forms	mixed half/half
(9) קטלתם vs קטלתמה	never קטלתמה	never קטלתמה	קטלתמה about twice as common as קטלתם
(10) מאד vs מואדה	20 :: 3	4 :: 1	3 :: 24
(11) זאת versus זואת, זאות, זות[118]	זאת as a rule (but זאות once in 8Q3, and זות twice in 4Q76)	זאת as rule (but twice other form in 4Q41)	never זאת, but always a form with *waw*
(12) כה versus כוה	always כה	always כה	mixed (especially in 1QIsa[a]), but outside of 1QIsa[a] 1 :: 7
(13) משה vs מושה	always משה except in 4Q13	always (6x) מושה except for 4Q41.	always מושה
(14) לא vs לוא	לא	לא and לוא	לוא

[117] Except for 4Q141, which has many more distinctive spellings and forms, the defective spelling of לא is the exception in this manuscript, and the manuscript actually fits better in the לוא group.

[118] As opposed to MT these all are peculiar, but זות may actually belong to a different category.

Table (*cont.*)

	"Only לא" mss	"לא/לוא" mss	"Only לוא" mss
(15) כל vs כול[119]	more than 99% כל [if we ignore the 10 attestations of כול in 4Q130]	differing per ms, difficult to see system yet	more than 95% have כול, and only very rarely כל, and those mainly in 1QIsa[a].
(16) כי vs כיא	always כי, with the possible exception of Mas1e	95% כי	mixed, but all in all כי more common than כיא
(17) קטלת vs קטלתה	ca. 95% קטלת, and 5% קטלתה where MT has קטלת	mixed, all in all 50/50	with the exception of 1QIsa[a] scribe A and 4Q137, always write קטלתה and not קטלת
(18)	99% ך only four certain כה where MT has—ך	predominantly ך, but some ms mixed.	1QIsa[a] A clearly prefers ך, but in all other mss about 95% כה

[119] Note that in Mishna (ms Kaufmann) *kol* is spelled כל, but *kul(l)* (with suffix) generally (310 :: 76) as כול. In the Eshkol edition only once כול (*m. Sukk.* 3:12).

THE EVOLUTIONARY PRODUCTION AND TRANSMISSION OF THE SCRIPTURAL BOOKS

Eugene Ulrich
University of Notre Dame

When we pick up a Bible, it presents itself in a simple, single, and clear form. But that clear simplicity is the result of myriad decisions by editorial and ecclesiastical leaders regarding numerous principles, puzzles, and issues about the end product of a lengthy, complex history of production. In order to understand and use the Bible intelligently and responsibly, it is helpful to consider its entire history—how it came to be, from its earliest origins and through all the various processes that influenced its development and brought it to its final shape. This conference is ambitious. Since it aims at considering the production, transmission, and reception of ancient Jewish texts in general, hopefully the light shed by the scriptural texts may add illumination for some of the processes of production of compositions that were not intended to be "Scripture" or that were not eventually accepted as scriptural: the so-called nonbiblical, parabiblical, and postbiblical texts.

Before the Dead Sea Scrolls provided evidence for the organic development of the texts, the prevailing view was that the composition of many biblical books was complete in the earlier or middle part of the Second Temple period, that those completed forms constituted "the original text," and that the purpose of textual criticism was to unravel the errors and accretions that had subsequently crept into the finished text.

The line between composition and textual transmission, however, has slowly been erased as scholars gradually realized the significance of the process of developmental composition. The books grew through a series of successive "new and expanded" literary editions. For some time, the older and the newer editions circulated simultaneously, each separately gathering unintentional and intentional changes and growth. Thus, over and over, the literary period, the period of composition, was simultaneous with the transmission period, the period of copying and textual variants. This paper will examine issues, and

illustrate them with examples, of the overlap between composition, redaction, textual transmission, and reception.

I shall attempt an evolutionary overview of the history of the production of the biblical texts mainly chronologically, but also with an eye toward the types of growth and the motivations of the "scribes" or "handlers" of the text who produced the growth.[1] My attempt to view the whole process, from origins and production to reception of the books as established canon, will necessarily require lack of focus on many details. Moreover, many of the individual points will be already known; but I hope that putting the comprehensive picture together in one short essay is new and valuable. In short, I will use a number of familiar building blocks to illustrate the processes of composition, redaction, transmission, and reception.

We must begin by articulating a few background assumptions, most based on evidence presented in previous publications:[2]

First, a paradigm shift is needed in the textual criticism and editing of the Hebrew Bible. The Masoretic text is, of course, supremely important as a religious text and academically essential as the sole preserved collection in Hebrew of the full Hebrew Bible corpus. But textually, it is simply one among many witnesses to the biblical text, and each witness must be examined on its textual merits word-by-word on an egalitarian basis.

Second, since the contents of the Scriptures were not defined in the Second Temple period, the terms "Bible" and "biblical" are anachronistic for that period and thus tend to distort our understanding.[3] Similarly, since the status of certain books was unclear, we must attenuate the lines, later drawn sharply, between Scripture and non-scriptural

---

[1] For an insightful analysis of aspects of biblical editorial roles see John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006).

[2] Many of these assumptions have been explained in Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1999); idem, "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus," in *Congress* [IOSOT] *Volume Basel 2001* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108; and idem, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls—The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.: T&T Clark, 2000), 67–87.

[3] See James C. VanderKam, "Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 91–109. He writes: "In view of the evidence from Qumran, we should avoid using the words *Bible* and *biblical* for this period.... we should follow the ancient practice of using more general, less suggestive terms such as *scriptures* and *rewritten scriptures*, instead of *Bible* and *rewritten Bible*" (109).

(or "biblical," "rewritten Bible," "parabiblical," etc.).[4] Because, however, the territory often referred to as "rewritten Bible" is still in the not-fully-explored stages of pioneering and mapping, this essay will treat only compositions that appear to have been more widely recognized as Scripture in the late Second Temple period, and must leave intriguing works such as the *Temple Scroll, Jubilees*, and *1 Enoch*, for a future study.

Third, the scriptural scrolls from Qumran are not "sectarian" but present the Scriptures of general Judaism. They are the oldest, most valuable, and most authentic evidence for the shape of the Scriptures as they circulated in Palestine at the time of the origins of Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity.

Fourth, up until "the great divide" (sometime between the two Jewish Revolts) the text was pluriform, with the books circulating in variant literary editions simultaneously, each of which apparently enjoyed equal status.

Fifth, "evolutionary" is, I believe, an appropriate description of the production of the biblical books. *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary* defines evolution as "any process of formation or growth; development.... *Biol.* the continuous genetic adaptation of organisms or species to the environment by the integrating agencies of selection, hybridization, inbreeding, and mutation."[5] This is a good description of how many of the books of the Bible were composed.

Sixth, the terms "*Urtext*" and "original text" are more likely to produce confusion than clarity in discussions of the biblical text, in light of the evolutionary nature of the text. "*Urtext*" was a conceptual construct based on limited knowledge of textual history and, to some extent, on the imagined dictating by God of a finished book to a single author.

The main stages in the chronological growth of the biblical books are composition, redaction, transmission, and reception. But these are not able to be neatly distinguished, and so we will examine these stages from several perspectives.

---

[4] VanderKam ("Questions of Canon," 95) correctly suggests that "what are identified as 'biblical' manuscripts are often treated separately by scrolls scholars.... It seems to me that this segregation of texts is not a valid procedure in that it does not reflect what comes to expression in the ancient works found at Qumran."

[5] *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: Gramercy Books, 1994), 495.

Composition

Oral composition. Many of the stories that combine to form the longer narratives began in short, oral form and were handed down in oral form. For example, many of the stories in Genesis 12–22 probably circulated among the Canaanite or Aramean ancestors of Israel as isolated stories. Gen 12:10–19, for example, may well have been an old hero tale about a Canaanite chieftain taking his wife down to Egypt, risking the loss of her, and the resulting complications. Genesis 14 may have been an isolated old war tale, which included the blessing of a chieftain by the Canaanite god, El Elyon. Genesis 15 appears to be a Mesopotamian or Canaanite story of an inheritance-adoption problem, while Genesis 16 was a conflict story about the favorite but barren wife vs. the fertile concubine.[6] Finally, I would agree with those who see Genesis 22 as a narrative helping to motivate child sacrifice when it was deemed necessary. We shall return to these oral stories.

This last episode in Genesis 22 illustrates the complexity of the evolutionary process. Under the assumption that it originally promoted child sacrifice (cf. Exod 22:28 [22:29 Engl.]; 2 Kgs 3:27), it was later transformed into a polemic *against* child sacrifice and then augmented to serve as an etiology supporting the cultic sacrifice of an animal in place of the firstborn (cf. Exod 34:20). Eventually it was incorporated into the national epic as a story showing the fidelity of the patriarch before he dies and passes the promise on to his son. There were adaptations to the text at each of these developing stages.

Religious reflection and the production of texts. Regarding the production of texts that became Scripture, there is no evidence, and so we must rely upon trying to understand the salient points of a text and imagining what the author was thinking in order to produce such a text. It seems to me that a likely scenario would be someone taking some aspect of the phenomena of life experience or of the culture and reflecting on it. Such phenomena might be nature, events, social interaction, war, suffering, and so forth. Thoughtful people would reflect, asking, "how does this relate to the world of the divine, or how does it

[6] See the Mesopotamian (Nuzi) legal documents illustrating the underlying social and legal situations of Genesis 15–16 in *ANET*, 219–220.

fit in a God-centered vision of reality?" Possible results of such reflection may include:

> *Nature*:
> "When God began to create the heavens and the earth.... God saw everything that he had made, and indeed it was very good" (Gen 1:1, 31)
> "The heavens are telling the glory of God" (Ps 19:2)
> "I will give you your rains in their season, and the land shall yield its produce" (Lev 26:4)
>
> *Social interaction*:
> "The LORD appeared to Abraham by the oaks of Mamre.... He looked up and saw three men" (Gen 18:1–2, introducing the hospitality story)
>
> *War*:
> "I will sing to the LORD for he has triumphed gloriously: horse and rider..." (Exod 15:1)
> "I have handed over to you King Sihon the Amorite of Heshbon and his land" (Deut 2:24)
>
> *Suffering*:
> "Does disaster befall a city, unless the LORD has done it?" (Amos 3:6)
> "[They] comforted [Job] for all the evil that the LORD had brought upon him" (Job 42:11)

Such examples appear to be instances of people contemplating their lived experience and articulating it in terms of God's direct causality. This God-centered interpretation was not all that different from that of surrounding cultures. The creation stories, for example, already came to Israel from their foreign neighbors with a divine protagonist, and it is entirely predictable that the Israelites would adapt them to a Yahwistic context.

Foreign sources. This brings us to another factor in the production of the Scriptures: foreign sources. Just as Israel drew its monarchic form of government from its neighboring cultures, so too did it borrow for its own purposes certain stories, songs, and traditions from the cultures with which it came in contact. The creation and flood stories are obvious examples. But other probable examples are Genesis 22 (just described), Psalm 29 (probably originally celebrating Baal), Psalm 104 (with motifs from the Egyptian Hymn to the Sun God), the Book of Job, Daniel 4 (probably influenced by a tradition like that seen in 4Q*Prayer of Nabonidus* = 4Q242), and Song of Songs (similar to the Egyptian *wasfs*). These would each have been adapted for acceptability within the Yahwistic community.

Small collections. As time passed, individual stories, laws, or songs with a similar theme or of a similar genre were grouped into small collections. For example, disciples gathered the "words of Amos" or the sayings of other prophets into small collections; individual psalms, folk proverbs, and love poems were also grouped into collections. Adaptations from their "original" form may well have been made to fit those sources into their new framework.

Historiographers. On a larger scale historiographers constructed major histories.[7] They were built by collecting already existing traditions, placing them into a chronological and conceptual framework, and enhancing main episodes usually with a well-developed theological perspective. An individual or a group created a national epic, whether in oral form, as envisioned in Martin Noth's *Grundlage*,[8] or in written form, as usually associated with the Yahwist and Elohist. Resuming the discussion of Genesis 12–22 above, the historiographer assembled those individual, isolated oral stories and strung them together in a creative connecting narrative which produced a whole new pattern of what can be termed Salvation History, that is, that God had a master plan and a purpose behind all those seemingly random events. God chose and blessed Abraham and, despite the near loss of his wife, childlessness, and command to kill his eventually born, only son, the promise of progeny was fulfilled. Those individual old tales were the beads which, strung together, produced the epic sweep of Israel's religious origins.

Similarly the Deuteronomistic Historian assembled a vast number of sources, some already compilations of earlier sources, into a heavily theological interpretation of history from Moses and the gaining of the land, through the establishment of the monarchy and the secession and defeat of the North, down to the time of Josiah.[9] It is clear that his hand has heavily redacted the main episodes and speeches. The

---

[7] For these historiographers as true authors see Van Seters, *The Edited Bible*, 260–69.

[8] Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. B. W. Anderson; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

[9] There are differences of opinion concerning the precise construction, time of authorship, and redactional history of the Deuteronomistic History, but our purpose here is not to debate these; all different versions would illustrate the historiographic point being made.

Chronicler's History has in turn used and redacted large parts of the Deuteronomistic History.

Redaction and Types of Textual Development

It will have become clear that in speaking of composition and production one quickly notices that redaction, though theoretically distinct, is also closely related to the process of composition: it is one of the modes, one of the many stages of composition.

Redaction and new editions. One of the principal methods by which the biblical books developed from their origins as individual stories, laws, or sayings into small collections and eventually into the larger books we know today was the production of "new and expanded" literary editions. This is a general term that covers many types of new editions or formulations of an earlier text. Literary-critical study of the text of the Scriptures over the centuries since the Enlightenment demonstrates that the books are the result of a long literary development, whereby traditional material was faithfully retold and handed on from generation to generation, but also creatively expanded and reshaped to fit the new circumstances and new needs—whether historical, social, political, religious, or liturgical—that the successive communities experienced through the vicissitudes of history. We may term those major creative expansions of older traditions "new literary editions." A creative priest or scribe or thinker took a preexisting book or set of traditions and produced a major new form of it.

Those literary-critical analyses of earlier centuries just described, however, were hypothetical demonstrations: based not on material evidence but on the detection of literary and historical clues embedded within the final forms of the texts. Nonetheless, the analysis of passages such as the two creation stories in Genesis 1 and 2, and the clashing details of the two flood stories conflated into Genesis 6–9 was so convincing that the hypothetical aspect faded, and the literary stages of compilation were simply accepted as fact. Confirmation, however, of the legitimacy of those demonstrations was strongly provided by the scriptural scrolls from Qumran: the scrolls, together with evidence from the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint in light of the scrolls, displayed repeated new literary editions for at least half the books of the Hebrew Bible.

I would like to use the book of Exodus as an example of multiple new editions, from its very origins to its final frozen form. Although I have used this example previously, the earlier discussion was limited to the growth from the third century B.C.E. onwards, the period for which we had textual evidence. Insofar as we are discussing textual production, and in the hope that a larger perspective may elicit parallels for non-scriptural texts, let me attempt a broader chronological view. I wish to concentrate on the main points and thus will use traditional understandings of the growth of the scriptural text, such as the Documentary Hypothesis, Noth's tradition-history of Pentateuchal traditions, and Norman Gottwald's socio-literary approach to the origins of Israel.[10] I wish to focus on the main trajectories, not wishing to debate possible alternatives, but proposing that something analogous to this must have happened to produce the texts that we eventually inherit.

Some group fostered the remembrance of an escape from servitude in Egypt, and the articulation of that memory may have ranged from "Weren't we lucky!" by some to "God saved us!" by others, just as may happen today.[11] It is not difficult to see which articulation gained most currency and embedded itself in Israel's traditional memory. The retelling of that story was gradually augmented both with stories about the birth of Moses and with plague narratives leading to the deliverance, and it would eventually get linked to wilderness stories and Sinai traditions. Somewhere along this trajectory, the oral literary growth was sufficiently established that we can recognize the kernel of the narrative part of the Book of Exodus, the foundational origins story of a group we could term the "Egyptian ancestors" of eventual Israel. This could be considered the *first* edition of what will become the book of Exodus. When this literary tradition was sandwiched between the patriarchal traditions of Israel's "Canaanite ancestors" celebrating the promise of land and the gaining of the land, we can see the main components of Noth's *Grundlage*, Israel's premonarchic oral national epic. Certain adaptations would have been necessary for fitting the Exodus

[10] Norman K. Gottwald, *The Hebrew Bible—A Socio-Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

[11] For a discussion of the process from event to written text see Eugene Ulrich and William Thompson, "The Tradition as a Resource in Theological Reflection—Scripture and the Minister," in *Method in Ministry: Theological Reflection and Christian Ministry* (ed. J. D. Whitehead and E. E. Whitehead; rev. ed.; Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 1995), 23–42 (25–29).

tradition into the larger pan-Israel epic, yielding a *second* edition of Exodus.

In the monarchic era the Yahwist and the Elohist provided two differing versions or (*third* and *fourth*) editions of the Exodus narrative, and the redactor who joined J and E produced yet another, *fifth* edition of Exodus. When the Priestly narrative expansions were added to the Pentateuchal narrative, this produced yet another, *sixth* edition. The insertion of the large blocks of Priestly legal material, in this case the instructions for and execution of the construction of the tabernacle, yielding yet another edition, brought into view the basic text of Exodus that we encounter in our manuscript tradition. Thus, it had already undergone *seven* or more successive editions prior to our earliest MS evidence.

Yet more editions are visible within our preserved MSS. The Old Greek of chapters 35–40, concluding the common text of Exodus 1–34 presents the earliest edition (the *eighth*) attested in the MS tradition. The MT version rearranged chapters 35–40, to have the execution of the tabernacle match the instructions in 25–31 more closely, producing a *ninth* edition.[12] A *tenth* Jewish edition is attested in 4Qpaleo Exod^{m} (4Q22) with its Samaritan-like harmonizations and repetitions.[13] The Samaritans produced yet an *eleventh* edition with their small but significant variants promoting Mount Gerizim. Finally, 4QPentateuch (*olim* "4QReworkedPentateuch") indicates a probably more expanded edition, with its hymn of praise after the Exodus preceding Exod 15:22.[14] Thus, *twelve* literary editions marked the composition, production, redaction, and transmission of the Exodus traditions into the book of Exodus before the development ceased due to the Roman destruction and the new approach to the scriptural text adopted by rabbinic Judaism and Christianity.

---

[12] See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Septuagintal Translation Techniques—A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account," in her *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (rev. ed.; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 116–30; in contrast to David W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus* (TS 6; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

[13] For the text of 4QpaleoExod^{m} see Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 53–130. For analysis see Judith E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^{m} and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

[14] "4QRP^{c}" (4Q365) frg. 6a ii and 6c.

So the process of the composition of the Scriptures was organic, developmental, with successive layers of tradition, revised to meet the needs of the historically and religiously changing community.

In addition to the new and usually expanded editions that formed the major ways that the scriptural texts were produced, there are three smaller types of variation that operate separately, usually at the level, not of text production, but of copying and transmission.

Orthography. First, one minor, and usually not too significant, form of textual development is orthographic expansion. As the Second Temple period progressed, the ambiguity caused by the consonantal manner of Hebrew spelling was alleviated, increasingly and apparently widely, by a growing practice of inserting *matres lectionis* to aid in the reading and interpretation of texts.[15] Thus, some scribes copied new MSS deliberately or inadvertently with a fuller spelling practice than their source text had used. Sometimes this was quite necessary. For example, less common words, such as האבות, could be mistaken for routine forms ("fathers") and so scribes would insert a *mater lectionis* to assure correct reading and interpretation: האֵבות ("spirits of the dead," 1QIsa[a] 19:3); the Masoretes later attained the same goal by adding vowel points (הָאֹבות (MT).

Individual textual variants. All are familiar with another level of variation: individual textual variants. These inadvertent errors or intentional additions or clarifications used to be the primary focus of textual criticism prior to our realization of the developmental composition of the scriptural books. In general the collection of individual textual variants, though very large quantitatively, forms a relatively minor category, viewed from the perspective of textual production.

Isolated interpretive insertions. The Qumran scrolls have highlighted examples of yet another category, isolated interpretive insertions, which forms a relatively major factor in the growth of the scriptural texts, even though it is comparatively much smaller than that of new literary editions. Learned scribes occasionally inserted into the text

[15] Edward Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa[a])* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 3; Eleazar L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (ed. N. Avigad and Y. Yadin; Jerusalem: Hebrew University and Magnes Press, 1955), 31.

they were copying additional material that they considered valuable. Comparisons between the scrolls, the MT, the SP, and the LXX highlight insertions of up to eight verses[16] that some witnesses have but that others lack. We could envision these insertions as marginal readings, footnotes, helpful or pious thoughts, chronological updates, etc., now entered into the text. Some of these insertions provide additional information, instruction, nomistic solutions, prophetic apparitions, apocalyptic ideas, or simply related material. This type of activity was apparently a widespread factor in the development of all texts; indeed the indications are that it penetrated a large number of the biblical books.

Motives for Development in the Text

The types of creative development are legion, and thus the motives or rationales of the contributors are legion. But we can deduce many of the main ones by watching the effects in the examples, book by book.

Genesis. In the formative stages of the book of Genesis, a desire to preserve and transmit both of the differing forms and theologies of important stories seems unmistakable. The two creation stories, especially the two flood stories with their clashing and irreconcilable details, and the two accounts of the covenant with Abraham, etc., almost demand such a rationale. Developments visible in the preserved manuscript tradition would include the Masoretic, Samaritan, and Septuagintal variant numbering systems of the ages of the antediluvian and postdiluvian heroes: scribes noticed, and felt they had to correct, such problems as Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech still living when the flood begins (SP Gen 5:3–32), and Methuselah still living fourteen years beyond the start of the flood (LXX 5:26–30; 7:6), whereas Gen 7:23–24 reports that

[16] See especially the large insertion in Jer 7:30–8:3 visible in 4QJer[a]. For the text see Emanuel Tov, "70. 4QJer[a]," in *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (DJD 15; E. Ulrich et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 145–70 (155) and Plate 24; for two analyses see Tov, ibid., and Eugene Ulrich, "Qumran Witness to the Developmental Growth of the Prophetic Books," in *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 21; ed. K. D. Dobos and M. Kószeghy; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 263–74.

no humans remained except Noah and those with him in the ark.[17] In addition, a "supplementer" anticipated Jacob's dream in Gen 31:10–13 by adding after Gen 30:36 a report (in 4QRP^{b} and SP, not in the MT or LXX) of what the messenger of God said to Jacob in that dream.[18] Note that this example is similar to other accounts (in the MT and LXX as well as the SP) of dreams and the repetition of the details of those dreams at Gen 31:24 vis-à-vis 31:29, and 41:1–7 vis-à-vis 41:17–24.

Exodus. Examples are well known from 4QpaleoExod^{m} and the SP both of harmonization from Deuteronomy and of repetition of the Lord's commands to Moses and Aaron by word-for-word accounts of the execution of those commands. An additional minor example occurs in the execution of the command to make the priestly ephod. The commands are given to make the ephod (Exod 28:6), to make the breastpiece (15), to put the Urim and Thummim in the breastpiece (30), and then to make the robe, etc. (31). The execution of those commands is given in the MT as ephod (Exod 39:2), breastpiece (8), and robe, etc. (22), but nothing is reported about the Urim and Thummim. Frank Cross noticed that 4QExod-Lev^{f} and the SP do report "the Urim and Thummim" in its proper place (39:21).[19] This addition is a minor example of the 4QpaleoExod^{m}–SP pattern of having the execution match the command. Yet one more expansion that is not in any of our other witnesses appears in 4QPentateuch: a hymn of praise for God's saving Israel from the Egyptians is inserted just before Exod 15:22.[20]

Numbers. Both 4QNum^{b} and 4QPent^{c} ("4QRP^{c}" = 4Q365) in different ways link text of Numbers 27 with text of Numbers 36 in the interests of related subject matter. In Numbers 27 the daughters of Zelophehad request and are granted legal inheritance of their father's due possession after he died in the wilderness with no sons to inherit it. Later, after Moses had given the directions for apportioning the tribes' inher-

---

[17] See Ralph W. Klein, "Archaic Chronologies and the Textual History of the Old Testament," *HTR* 67 (1974): 255–63; Ronald S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 61.

[18] 4QRP^{b} (4Q364) frg. 4 b–e ii 21–26.

[19] Frank Moore Cross, "17. 4QExod-Lev^{f}," in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD 12; ed. E. Ulrich and F. M. Cross; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 139.

[20] 4QRP^{c} (4Q365) frg. 6a ii and 6c.

itance in the land, in Numbers 36 the heads of the clans of Gilead request that the daughters' inheritance must stay within their tribe, and so the daughters must marry within the tribe to ensure this.

4QRP[c] has a fragment with the text of Num 27:11 followed immediately without an interval by 36:1, showing that the two passages had been joined.[21] In 4QNum[b] there are sixteen lines of text required between the fragments at the bottom of column XXXI, which concludes with Num 36:2, and the fragments of column XXXII, which contain Num 36:5. It is quite likely—whereas there are no other plausible alternatives—that Num 27:1–11 was interpolated within chapter 36, in the missing lines between the text of 36:2 and 36:5, to link the two related passages together.[22] Although the two examples of this linkage were not formed identically, scribes clearly considered it useful to link these two passages about the daughters of Zelophehad contextually.

Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy, of course, is "rewritten Bible" *par excellence*. The Deuteronomistic Historian used an older set of preached legal material as the core of a new work, which was a fresh retelling of the Mosaic narrative. The resulting book then served as Israel's "constitution" regulating life in the promised land, the constitution by which the nation and its leaders would be judged throughout its history.

Joshua. 4QJosh[a] reveals a significant instance of motivation in textual development: religious rivalry.[23] It is important to note, however, that the "sectarian variant" is not in the scroll but in the MT or the SP-[OG?]–OL. The scroll appears to preserve the earliest form of the narrative, placing the first altar built in the newly entered land at Gilgal, in accordance with the implication of Moses' unspecified command: "On the day that you cross over the Jordan into the land…, you shall set up large stones and cover them with plaster.… And you shall

---

[21] Emanuel Tov and Sidnie A. White, "4QRP[c]," in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts* (DJD 13; ed. H. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 255–318, frg. 36 (4Q365).

[22] Nathan Jastram, "27. 4QNum[b]," DJD 12:262–64.

[23] For text and discussion see Eugene Ulrich, "47. 4QJosh[a]," in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to Kings* (DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 143–52; and idem, *Scrolls and Origins*, 104–5.

build an altar there…" (Deut 27:2, 5). It is possible that the place name, whether "Mount Gerizim" or "Mount Ebal," was not yet in the repetitious text of Deuteronomy 27,[24] since the placement at Gilgal in our earliest witness, 4QJosh[a], is supported both by Josephus (*Ant.* 5.20) and by Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.* 21.7).[25]

Subsequently in some texts, "on Mount Gerizim" was inserted into Deut 27:4, possibly due to northern concerns to promote Mount Gerizim.[26] Although this insertion is usually assumed to have arisen with the SP specifically, it may well have been in a general Jewish text, which the SP used as its basis, just as most of its other pluses were due simply to the faithful copying of Jewish expanded texts such as 4QpaleoExod[m] and 4QNum[b]. That the reading was earlier and more widespread than the specific SP is strongly suggested by the OL reading "Garzin," which virtually demands as its source that an ancient Greek MS also exhibited that reading. Then only at a third level did the replacement of "Mount Gerizim" with the odd and problematic "Mount Ebal" occur; it can be explained only as a hasty and ill-thought-out polemical reaction against "Mount Gerizim."[27]

Judges. The best explanation for the small fragment of 4QJudg[a] (with Judg 6:6 followed immediately by 6:11) seems to be that someone who influenced the eventual MT text wished to enhance the prophetic nature of the book by inserting the appearance of a prophet

---

[24] Note that the MT secondarily inserts also at Josh 6:26 a place name, "Jericho," that is lacking in the LXX, the Testimonia (4Q175), and the Apocryphon of Joshua (4Q379 22 ii 8).

[25] Josephus (*Ant.* 5.20) and Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.* 21.7) know also the altar at Shechem, but both place it later in their narrative.

[26] A fragment of Deut 27:4–6, reputedly from Qumran, recently surfaced, and a photograph and good edition of it was presented by James Charlesworth on his website: "What is a Variant? Announcing a Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of Deuteronomy," December 2009. Online: http://www.ijco.org/?categoryId=46960, under "Announcement of a Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment." It reads בהרגרזים clearly, as does the SP. I thank Professor Charlesworth for sharing this with me.

[27] A contrasting view, seeing 4QJosh[a] as a late sectarian revision placing the altar near Qumran, is presented by Kristin De Troyer in "Building the Altar and Reading the Law: The Journeys of Joshua 8:30–35," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. De Troyer and A. Lange; SBLSymS 30; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 141–62. I do not find this view convincing, however; among other things, the admittedly "problematic" (158) reading "Mount Ebal" is not explained.

(Judg 6:7–10) when the Israelites cried out against the Midianite oppression.[28]

Samuel. Though there are hundreds or thousands of textual variants in our witnesses to Samuel and a small number of isolated insertions in both the MT and the scrolls, these do not seem sufficiently unified to constitute variant editions of the entire book.[29] In the David-Goliath story, however, in 1 Samuel 17–18 there are two different editions: a short, single story in the LXX and a much longer, double story in the MT.[30]

Kings. Similarly, the Book of Kings exhibits expanded editions as well. Especially in 1 Kings, Julio Trebolle has shown that the Hebrew and Greek texts show different redactional editions characterized by variant ordering as well as major expansions (e.g., LXX 1 Kgs 12:24a–z).[31]

---

[28] For the text and analysis, see Julio Trebolle Barrera, "49. 4QJudg[a]," DJD 14:161–64; and "Textual Variants in 4QJudg[a] and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," in *RevQ* 14/2 (1989): 229–45.

[29] Frank Moore Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005); Frank Moore Cross and Richard J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel[a] (4Q51)," *DSD* 13/1 (2006): 46–54; and Eugene Ulrich, "A Qualitative Assessment of the Textual Profile of 4QSam[a]," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst et al.; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 147–61.

[30] Emanuel Tov, "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18 in Light of the Septuagint," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 333–62. Stanley D. Walters ("Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1," *JBL* 107 [1988]: 385–412) also argues for an intentionally variant edition of 1 Samuel 1 in the LXX, denigrating Hannah. I agree that there are a large number of variants, but I do not see an intentionally unified variant edition: Walters seems to presume that virtually all the MT readings are "original," repeatedly stretches the interpretation of the variants, and sees all the Greek variants (which can be variously explained) as intentionally aimed in a single direction.

[31] Julio Trebolle Barrera, *Salomón y Jeroboán: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Rey. 2–12; 14* (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis, Dissertationes 3; Salamanca/Jerusalén: Universidad Pontificia/Instituto Español Bíblico y Arqueológico, 1980); idem, "Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings," *BIOSCS* 15 (1982): 12–35. See also Steven L. McKenzie, "Kings, First and Second Books of," in *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (5 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon, 2006–2009), 3:523–32 (527).

Reception

Whereas reception is usually thought of as a postbiblical phenomenon, it is important at almost every stage of the transmission of the scriptural books from their very origins. It is *because* certain groups treasured the various traditions they received and considered them important that the oral and written traditions were transmitted from the very beginnings down through the generations. For example, it is because the people in general considered the national epic foundational for their national identity and viewed its transmission as of major importance that it was handed down generation to generation for millennia. Some would also have found the historical materials important and interesting.

The majority of the population presumably considered the legal materials essential for good public order. The priesthood surely considered the liturgical and sacrificial directives and the forms of prayer and hymnody important, not to mention the preservation and copying of texts in general. The monarchy and military remembered, recorded, and preserved historical and military lore. The disciples of the prophets remembered and recorded the their masters' sayings and experiences. The teachers—family, elders, and educators—kept in memory and passed on wisdom traditions.

As the traditions kept being handed down, as religious reflection deepened, and as the divine element was increasingly emphasized in the redactional layers of new editions,[32] the texts were increasingly seen as "God's Word":

- creation and primeval stories were seen as "God's revelation to Moses";[33]
- covenantal formulae were "God's promises";
- legal texts were "God's commandments";
- moral and wisdom traditions were "God's will";
- hymns and prayers composed by humans became "God's word";[34]

[32] For example, the addition of Proverbs 1–9 as a theological introduction to the folk wisdom of 10–31, the establishment of Purim in Esth 9:18–32, and the much more religious Additions in the Greek texts of Esther.

[33] "The angel of the presence spoke to Moses according to the word of the LORD, saying: 'Write the complete history of the creation…'" (*Jub.* 2:1).

[34] The inspirational source of the Psalms is transferred to God in 11QPs[a] 27:11: "All these [David] spoke through prophecy given to him from the Most High."

- prophetic pronouncements were "God's warnings or blessings" and eventually "God's predictions."

As the many forms of the people's religious literature continued to be transmitted and used in liturgical and educational settings, which presented and ingrained in the people God's word and God's will, the collection as a whole was increasingly received and viewed as God's word to Israel. Eventually the religious leaders, backed by the community, endorsed a canon of what they considered "Sacred Scripture." After serious discussions and deliberation they made the reflective judgment that these books, in exclusive contrast to others, contained divine revelation and were divinely inspired, and that they were the God-given norm for their collective life. Canon is the ultimate act of reception.

BEYOND THE SECTARIAN DIVIDE: THE "VOICE OF THE TEACHER" AS AN AUTHORITY-CONFERRING STRATEGY IN SOME QUMRAN TEXTS

Florentino García Martínez

For John J. Collins, a friend of many years and a true "Teacher" from whom I have learned so much.

1. *Putting the Paper in Context*

The biggest difference in the approach to the collection of manuscripts from the caves around Qumran between now and twenty years ago is that now we can consider the collection as a whole.[1] Of course, our view of the collection is totally partial and accidental since we cannot even fathom what the collection as a whole was like at the moment it was deposited in the caves. The stories of previous discoveries (in the times of Origen,[2] of the Patriarch Timotheus I,[3] the Karaites,[4] etc.), as well as the enormous amount of "jarres à manuscrits" found in the caves,[5] whole or broken, is a caveat we should never forget and which makes all our speculations tentative.[6] Nevertheless, we can now

[1] This is a well known truism whose consequences I have tried to explore in Florentino García Martínez, "Qumrân, 60 ans après la découverte," *The Qumran Chronicle* 15 (2007): 111–138.

[2] As reported by Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6:16:1.

[3] In his letter to Mar Sergius, metropolitan of Elam, edited by O. Braun in *Oriens christianus* 1 (1901): 299–313; see Paul Kahle, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1951), 56–61.

[4] For a summary of the evidence, see the article by Fred Astren, "Karaites," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: New York, 2000), 1:462–465 and the bibliography there.

[5] According to Roland de Vaux, more than fifty in Cave 1 (DJD 1:8), and a total of 106 in the caves of the cliff (DJD 3:14), of which 35 in Cave 3 (DJD 3:8).

[6] De Vaux, DJD 3:34, after referring to the reported discovery alluded to in the letter of Patriarch Timotheus, comments: "La grotte de Thimotée peut être l'une de celles où des fragments ont encore été découverts récemment; elle peut être aussi l'une de celles où nous avons recueillie de la poterie mais pas d'écrits, si l'on suppose que les Juifs venus de Jérusalem ont emporté tous les manuscrits qui s'y trouvaient. On peut songer particulièrement à la grotte nº 29, cette chambre ronde où l'on accède par un

consider the remains that have come to us as a whole, and this view is not without consequences.[7]

The collection as a whole appears to me (with the exception of a few documentary texts of uncertain provenance)[8] as formed by religious texts (in Hebrew, in Aramaic and a few in Greek)[9] whose formation has been influenced by other religious texts (Scripture) considered more or less authoritative by the collectors. The same authority-conferring strategies we can discern in these authoritative texts are used in all other religious texts of the collection.

The pluriformity of the so-called "biblical texts" and the fact that this pluriformity was perceived not as a problem, but as opportunity for interpretation, has led scholars who deal with the so-called "biblical texts" from the collection to realize that in the historical context of the collection, we are clearly at the other side of the "Great Divide" of which Talmon speaks,[10] and that, therefore, speaking of "Bible" is a complete anachronism.[11] In the collection we do find scrolls, many scrolls, which later will become "biblical books" (Scripture) in many different forms, be it in clearly different textual forms (short, long, revised, reworked, abstracted, versions) or different editions, or rewritten in the form of new compositions, and all of them used

---

étroit tunnel. On y a retrouvé les éléments d'une douzaine de jarres et dix-sept couvercles dont sept étaient intacts et empilés contre la paroi, à part des jarres. Cette disposition pourrait être l'indice d'une violation ancienne: les jarres auraient été vidées, et elles contenaient peut-être des manuscrits, comme celles de la grotte 1Q. Mais ces conjectures sont assez vaines." Hartmut Stegemann links the reported discovery of the letter of Timotheus to the alleged discovery by the Karaites, and thinks that the data perfectly fit Cave 3, which may have contained between 70 and 140 scrolls; see his *The Library of Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill, 1998), 68–71.

[7] As I have tried to show by "revisiting" Cave 1 and Cave 11 within this perspective in two forthcoming publications, "Reconsidering the Cave 1 Texts Sixty Years After Their Discovery: An Overview," in *IOQS Meeting, Lubljana* (ed. E. J. C. Tigchelaar et al.; STDJ; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming) and "Cave 11 in Context," in *The Landscape of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Hempel; STDJ; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

[8] See the list in Armin Lange and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, "Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre," in DJD 39:143–144.

[9] Emanuel Tov, *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2010) gives a complete overview.

[10] Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: The British Library and New Castle: Oak Knoll, 2000), 5–20, 14.

[11] This also is nowadays a well-known truism. See, most recently, Florentino García Martínez, "Rethinking the Bible: Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research and Beyond," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. M. Popović; JSJS; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

indiscriminately.[12] We also find indications that two groups of books, designated as "Moses" (or the Torah) and the "Prophets" were already considered different from and more authoritative than the others, although we do not know for sure which books were included in these two groups, particularly in the group of the "Prophets." Their authority is evident from the way they are used, quoted, interpreted or rewritten in other compositions.[13] However, these authoritative texts were not identical with, nor limited to, those which we will later find in the Jewish or Christian Bible, since we find the same authoritative strategies (like recourse to the divine voice, rewriting and/or interpretation) used with many of them (like *Jubilees, Aramaic Levi, Temple Scroll* or *Apocryphon of Joshua*, to quote the most obvious).

And something similar happened, it seems to me, with the so-called "sectarian" texts. Even those core texts which have revealed particular groups to us (the *yaḥad* group or the *maḥanot* groups) are in multiple forms. And nowadays, when all the evidence has been published, they are understood in a completely different way from the way they were understood twenty years ago, since they show us a web of relationships among those groups, groups certainly interconnected, but in no way identical.[14]

All this has resulted in a taxonomic impasse, both for the so-called "biblical" scrolls and for the other compositions.[15] Scholars dealing with the so-called "biblical" scrolls found in the collection have tried to avoid this impasse by paying attention to the "authoritativeness" of the compositions within the collection as a whole. And I have suggested that we can also come out of the impasse of the so-called "non-biblical scrolls" of the collection by paying more attention to the authority-conferring strategies used in them, since these are the same as are used to show the authority of the so-called "biblical" scrolls; and when we consider the collection as a whole, in a truly historical perspective, all we found there are religious texts whose origins in most cases

---

[12] See the different studies by Eugene Ulrich, particularly those included in his *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill, 1999), 3–120.

[13] See Florentino García Martínez, "I testi qumranici testimoni di scritture autorevoli," in *Convegno di Studi Veterotestamentari, Ariccia 2009* (ed. G. Prato; Bologna: Dehoniane, forthcoming).

[14] For an excellent summary, see John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

[15] Florentino García Martínez, "¿Sectario, no-sectario o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos," *RevQ* 23/91 (2008): 383–394.

cannot be determined, but whose formation has been influenced by other precedent religious texts considered more or less authoritative.[16] And it seems to me that the same authority-conferring strategies are used in all the texts of the collection, including the so-called "sectarian" texts.

This explains the first part of the title of my paper: "Beyond the Sectarian Divide." The second part of this title tries to focus on one of the strategies used by the compositions authored by the groups that put together the collection (the core "sectarian" texts: *Damascus Document, Serek, Hodayot, Pesharim, Milḥamah*) in order to invest their own compositions with the same authoritative status of the other compositions their authors clearly recognized as authoritative ("Moses" and "the Prophets," but also compositions like *Jubilees*, *Temple Scroll*, *Apocryphon of Joshua, Aramaic Levi*). I have called this strategy "the Voice of the Teacher," an expression used twice in the *Damascus Document* (CD 20:28.32).

2. *The Voice of the Teacher*

On CD 20:27–34 we can read:[17]

> 27 . . . But all those who remain steadfast in these regulations, [co]ming 28 and going in accordance with the law, and listen to the Teacher's voice,

---

[16] This is also true for the Aramaic texts, which form a sizeable minority of the collection (about 120 manuscripts, of which about eighty, belonging to twenty-nine compositions, preserve enough text to be treated in a meaningful way); see Florentino García Martínez, "Scribal Practices in the Aramaic Literary Texts from Qumran," in *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer* (ed. J. Dikstra, J, Kroesen, Y. Kuiper; Numen Book Series 127; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 329–341.

[17] For the Cairo Geniza text, see the editions by S. Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Documents of Jewish Sectaries 1; Cambridge: CUP, 1910); Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (2d. rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958); Eduard Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch* (München: Kösel, 1971); Elisha Qimron, in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992); Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), vol. 1 (= *DSSSE* 1), and Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, "The Damascus Document," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr-Westminster John Knox, 1995), vol. 2. For the Cave 4 copies, see Joseph M. Baumgarten, DJD 18. For a reconstruction of the composite document, using the Geniza copies and those from Qumran, see Ben Zion Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document* (STDJ 56; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

> and confess before God: "Assuredly 29 have we sinned, both we and our fathers, walking contrary to the ordinances of the covenant; just[ice] 30 and truth are your judgments against us"; and they do not raise their hand against his holy regulations and his just 31 judgment[s] and his truthful stipulations; and they are instructed in the first ordinances, 32 in conformity with which the men of the Unique One were judged; and they lend their ears to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness; and do not reject 33 the just regulations when they hear them; these shall exalt and rejoice and their heart will be strong, and they shall prevail 34 over the sons of the world. And God will atone for them, and they shall see his salvation, for they have taken refuge in his holy name.[18]

This sentence, with a very long protasis (in which the "voice of the Teacher" appears twice, the first time as קול מורה, the second time as קול מורה צדק) and a short apodosis, is the concluding section of the "Admonition" on CD-B which is followed by a few more lines in 4Q266 4 7–13 (if the placement of this fragment by Milik and Baumgarten is correct).[19] The sentence is generally considered (by scholars as different as Philip Davies[20] or Stephen Hultgren[21]) to represent a reworking of the original text of CD within what they call "a Qumran recension." They based themselves on the force of the reference to the "first (or former) ordinances" (20:31) and, in the case of Davies,[22] on the understanding of אנשי היחיד (20:32, which we have translated as "men of the Unique One") as אנשי היחד, "the men of the community" (an understanding which is widely shared among scholars, for example Rabin, Lohse, Qimron and Baumgarten, among the editors of the text of the *Damascus Document*). Without elaborating here on the complicated matter of the relationship of the *Damascus Document* and the *Serek*, and consequently on the development and relationship of the communities for which these documents legislate,[23] I think we can

---

[18] Translation according to *DSSSE* 1:581.

[19] Baumgarten on DJD 18:47. These fragments would have formed column X in Stegemann's reconstruction; see Hartmut Stegemann, "Towards a Physical Reconstruction of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls," in *The Damascus Documents: A Centenial of Discovery* (ed. J. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 177–200, 180.

[20] Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSS 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 173–197.

[21] Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 67–73.

[22] Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 197.

[23] For a good summary of the discussions, see Charlotte Hempel, "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint

use "the voice of the Teacher" as a shorthand indication for all the core "sectarian" documents to which I refer (*Damascus Document, Serek, Hodayot, Pesharim, Milḥamah*), independently of the appearance or not in these documents of the figure of the Teacher (who appears in CD 20:29 and in the pesharim, but is not mentioned explicitly in the other core documents).

Of course, reading אנשי היחד here, and מורה היחד in lines 1 and 14 of the same column 20, instead of the מורה היחיד of the manuscript, will dispel all doubts about the inner relationship of all the core documents. But I do not think this reading is needed. The strong parallelism between the confession here in CD 20:29 "Assuredly have we sinned, both we and our fathers, walking contrary to the ordinances of the covenant; just[ice] and truth are your judgments against us," and the confession at the beginning of the *Serek*: "And all those who enter the Covenant shall confess after them and shall say: 'We have acted sinfully, we have transgressed, we have sinned, we have acted irreverently, we and our father before us, inasmuch as we walk [in the opposite direction to the precepts] of truth and justice […] his judgment upon us and upon our fathers'" (1QS 1:24–26) assure us of this relationship. This confession has, of course, strong biblical precedents, like the cry in 1 Kgs 8:47 and the prayers in Daniel 9 or Ps 106:6, and may be related to *4QDibrey Hame'orot*, as Davies observes;[24] but the parallel with the *Serek* text is too close to be overlooked, and it strongly suggests a literary relationship between the two documents. Thus, I do not think it is necessary to change the clear reading of the manuscript. Besides, the אנשי היחיד can perfectly well refer to the מורה היחיד mentioned in CD 20:1 (יורה היחיד on CD 20:14), this figure of the past who was all-important for the different groups.

In my opinion, what this text clearly teaches us is that for the members of the group, listening to the "voice of Teacher" is as fundamental as "coming and going in accordance with the law (על פי התורה)" (which obviously refers to the Torah) (20:27), and that it is the "voice of the Teacher" that lends authority to the חקי הצדק "the just regula-

---

and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 2:67–92; Sarianna Metso, "Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement," *RevQ* 20/79 (2002): 429–444; Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community*; Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad: *A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009); and most recently Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 66–75.

[24] Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 196.

tions": "and they lend their ears to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness, and do not reject the just regulations when they hear them" (20:32–33). It also teaches us that fidelity to both sets of norms (the Torah and their own ordinances) is what will bring final salvation. "The Torah" (התורה) and "the just regulations" (חקי הצדק) are clearly different matters, but both are equally authoritative. The strict parallel between the two shows us, it seems to me, that the "voice of the Teacher" is used as a strategy to give authority to the norms of the group, in a similar way as the "voice of Moses" is used in 4Q266 1a–b 15–16 ("and do not listen] to the voice of Moses")[25] or in 4Q378 26 3[26] "they pa[y]ed attention to the voice of Mo[ses…]" to express the authority of the revealed Torah.

In spite of the many proposals, we cannot put a personal name to the figure of the Teacher mentioned in the Scrolls.[27] Neither can we pinpoint exactly the time of his actuation.[28] We know for sure that the historical Teacher was a priest ("Its interpretation concerns the Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness" 4Q171 1 iii–iv 15),[29] and we know that he had a fundamental function in the forming of the group of the *Damascus Document*: "And God appraised their deeds, because they sought him with an undivided heart, and raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness, in order to direct them in the path of his heart" (CD 1:10–11). We know that he was called by many names by his followers. The text quoted from CD 20 already uses two: Teacher and Teacher of Righteousness, and (if we follow the reading of the manuscript) a third name, מורה היחיד, "Unique Teacher," is used on the same column in line 14. Based on his confrontations with his enemies, the Wicked Priest and the Man of Lies, we can also conclude that some other names used in the manuscripts refer to the same historical figure. Thus on 4Q171 1 i 19[30] he is called מליץ דעת "Interpreter of Knowledge": "Its [interpretation] concerns the Man of Lies who misdirected many with deceptive words, for they have chosen worthless

[25] DJD 18:31.
[26] DJD 22:261.
[27] Ranging from Onias III to James the Brother of Jesus, if we remain in the accepted timeframe.
[28] For a review of the proposals, see Michael O. Wise, "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Floruit* of his Movement," *JBL* 122 (2003): 53–87, who advocates a first century B.C.E. dating.
[29] DJD 5:44.
[30] DJD 5:43.

things and did not listen to the Interpreter of Knowledge," an expression we find also in one of the so-called "Hymns of the Teacher" (1QH^{a} 10:15)[31] where it is said: "You have made me a banner for the elect of righteousness and an expert interpreter of wonderful mysteries (ומליץ דעת ברזי פלא)." Even more important is the use in some cases of the name "Interpreter of the Torah" (דורש התורה) to designate the historical Teacher. That is the case in the famous "well midrash" on CD 6:7, where the "Interpreter of the Law" is clearly a figure of the past, as are the "converts of Israel," as opposed to another figure clearly expected in the future who carries a very similar name: "until there arises the one who teaches justice at the end of days" (CD 6:11). The expression used here, יורה הצדק, is a clear allusion to the Teacher title, but the figure so designated is clearly placed in the eschatological future. In other texts, it is the Interpreter who is placed in the eschatological future. Thus, in 4Q174 1–2 i 11–12,[32] 2 Sam 7:12–14 is thus interpreted: "This refers to the 'branch of David' who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law who will rise up in Zion in the last days." "Branch of David" is one of the designations of the awaited Davidic messiah in the Scrolls. And the Interpreter of the Law will arise with him, evidently in the future. Both titles can thus refer to persons of the past and of the future, and both seem to refer to the same person of the past and the same figure expected in the eschatological future. John Collins has most aptly and succinctly summarized the situation: "This usage suggests that such titles as Interpreter of the Law and Teacher of Righteousness could be variously used to refer to figures past or future, and that they are interchangeable."[33]

This multiplicity of referents and their interchangeability should not surprise us, since the activity of "interpreting the law" is one of the basic characteristic of all the *yaḥad* groups, as we can read in 1QS 6:6–7:

> And in the place where the Ten assemble there should not be missing a man to interpret the law (איש דורש התורה) day and night, always, one relieving another. And the Many shall be on watch together for a third of each night of the year in order to read the book, explain the regulation, and bless together (לקרוא בספר ולדרוש משפט ולברך ביחד).

---

[31] DJD 40:132.

[32] DJD 5:53.

[33] John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: the Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 104.

This clearly points to the fact that the activity of interpreting the law, which is the point of departure of the name given both to the historical "Interpreter of the Law," who is identical to the historical Teacher, and to the expected eschatological "Interpreter of the Law," who is a messianic figure of the future, is a constant function within the groups that gathered the manuscripts.[34]

This allows us to conclude that the "voice of the Teacher" as an authority-conferring strategy is not limited to the activity of the historical Teacher of Righteousness, the one who represented it eminently, but that it was "institutionalized" within the groups that took their inspiration from this figure and became the channel of a continuous revelation while expecting the final revelation at the end of times. This continuous revelation is of an exegetical nature and concerns both the Law and the Prophets, the two aspects we have been considering up to now.

3. *The Teacher as Interpreter of the Law*

As Interpreter of the Law, the "voice of the Teacher" is associated with revealing the hidden aspects of the Torah, the secrets of the divine Law which are not accessible to all Israel, but are only revealed to the members of the group. This understanding is expressed with the categories of *nistar* (hidden) and *nigleh* (revealed), which are based on the texts of Deut 29:28, but that in the core sectarian scrolls acquire a new meaning, since what is hidden from Israel is revealed to them.[35] As CD 3:12–14 puts it: "But with those who remained steadfast in God's precepts, with those who were left from among them, God established his covenant with Israel forever, revealing to them hidden matters

[34] We do not need to go here into the disputed question of the identity of these two figures; see, among others, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "The Damascus Document Revisited," *RB* 92 (1985): 223–246 and Philip R. Davies, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the 'End of Days'," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 313–317, for the view that the historical Teacher was identified with "the one who shall teach righteousness at the End of Days," and Michael A. Knibb, "The Teacher of Righteousness—A Messianic Title?" in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays in Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (ed. P. R. Davies and R. T. White; JSOTSup 100; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 51–65, and Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 102–123, for a distinction between the two figures.

[35] See the classic explanation of the terms by Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 22–32, or the more recent by Aharon Shemesh and Chana Werman, "Hidden Things and their Revelation," *RevQ* 18/71 (1998): 409–427.

(לגלות להם נסתרות) in which all Israel had gone astray." The activity of the Interpreter is to discover these matters which are hidden from Israel and to disclose them to the faithful: "And every matter hidden from Israel but which has been found out by the Interpreter, he should not keep hidden from them for fear of a spirit of desertion," we read in 1QS 8:11–12. And a little further in the same column (on 1QS 8:15–16) it is made clear that the way the Interpreter is able to find this secret meaning is no other than study: "This is the study of the law which He commanded through the hand of Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit." Exegesis is thus a way to revelation; or if we want to formulate it differently: divine revelation, produced by God's spirit, is now continuously accessible through exegesis which, within the group, reveals the true meaning of Torah for each age.

After analyzing the biblical precedents of the concept of "revelatory exegesis" in his book *Mediating the Divine*, Alex Jassen concludes that in Chronicles and in Ezra "revelation is reconfigured as a process of reading, interpreting, and rewriting ancient prophetic Scripture."[36] This process, clearly started within what we call Scripture, is amply developed in later periods. As Collins has indicated: "It is a commonplace that the interpretation of older Scriptures is a major factor in the composition of Jewish writings of the Hellenistic and Roman periods."[37] Collins proves his point by an analysis of the interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years in Daniel 9,[38] and concludes: "The fact that that duration is interpreted allegorically, however, and, at least by modern reckoning, corresponds only loosely and schematically to the period identified in the interpretation, suggests that the prediction is not really derived from the prophecy but that the prophecy is invoked *to lend authority to a prediction that is made for other reasons*."[39] Daniel's recourse to Jeremiah's prophecy and its interpretation through revelatory exegesis is thus used as an authority-

[36] Alex Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 211.

[37] John J. Collins, "Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 301.

[38] See John J. Collins, *Daniel: a Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 344–360.

[39] Collins, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," 307 (emphasis FGM).

conferring strategy. And in the collection of manuscript from Qumran, this authority-conferring strategy is employed not only in many of the compositions which interpret prophetic writings, but is also applied to Torah.

In CD 7:14–19 the words of Amos 5:26–27 are interpreted this way:

> 14 As he said: (Am 5:26–27) "I will deport the Sikkut of your King 15 and the Kiyyun of your images away from my tent to Damascus." *Blank* The Books of the Law are the Sukkat 16 of the King, as he said (Am 9:11) "I will lift up the fallen Sukkat of David". *Blank* The King 17 is the assembly. And the Kiyyune of the images <and the Kiyyun of the images> are the books of the Prophets, 18 whose words Israel despised. *Blank* And the star is the Interpreter of the Law, 19 who will come to Damascus.[40]

You will surely have noticed that the quoted text has only two elements (סכות and כיון, whatever these terms may mean in the biblical text), and that the interpretation has three—סוכת, כיניי and הכוכב. However, if we look at the MT of Amos we find the three terms of the interpretation present because the complete quotation after "and the kiyyun of your images" (ואת כיון צלמיכם) also has "the star of your God" (כוכב אלהיכם). Also in the LXX, which has a somewhat different text that agrees with some elements of the interpretation, the "star" is present: και το αστρον του θεου υμων, a good translation of the Hebrew כוכב אלהיכם, which allows us to conclude that "the star" was also in the original quote and has been lost by accident in the medieval copy.

This "Amos Midrash" has been much studied,[41] but what interests me here is the mention of the "Books of the Torah" (7:15) (ספרי התורה), of the "Books of the Prophets" (7:17) (ספרי הנביאים) and, in a strict parallel, the interpretation of the third element, "the star," as "the Interpreter of the Torah" (7:18) (והכוכב הוא דורש התורה). Whether or not the plural expression "the Books of the Torah" is identical to the expression "Book of Moses" (ספר מושה) of 4QMMT[42] as a reference to the Pentateuch is unimportant to me here.[43] What is important is that

---

[40] In the translation of *DSSSE* 1:561.

[41] The most important studies are collected in note 66 of Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community*, 30.

[42] 4Q397 14–21 10, line C 10 of the composite text, DJD 10:59.

[43] For Wacholder, it would refer to the Pentateuch and the *Book of Jubilees*; see *The New Damascus Document*, 239.

it constitutes a group of authoritative writings and is acknowledged as such. Equally, the precise contours of the collection designated "Books of the Prophets" is also less important to me now than its authoritative status, clearly reflected in the fact that "Israel" did not follow its words. However, the really surprising element in this quote is the third one, since "the star" is not interpreted as referring to a group of writings, as we would expect, but as alluding to a person and to his function: the Interpreter, the person who realizes this exegetical activity, and the object of his interpretation is the Torah. The figure who has this function within the group, the "Interpreter of the Torah," is thus placed here strictly in parallel with the two other collections of authoritative writings.[44] This means, at least to me, that the process of exegesis—the interpretation of the Torah which this figure represents and exercises—and the results of this interpretation are considered as authoritative within the group as the two other groups of writings.

It seems to me highly relevant that in the quoted text of the *Serek* (1QS 8:11), what the Interpreter finds with his exegesis is precisely כול דבר הנסתר מישראל "every matter hidden from Israel." What has been hidden from Israel is precisely those aspects of the Law of Moses that have been revealed to the members of the group, as it is explicitly said in 1QS 5:7–10:

> 7 Whoever enters the council of the Community 8 enters the covenant of God in the presence of all who freely volunteer. He shall swear with a binding oath to revert to the Law of Moses, according to all that he commanded, with whole 9 heart and whole soul, in compliance with all that has been revealed of it (לכול הנגלה ממנה) to the sons of Zadok, [or "to the council of the men of the community" according to the versions from Cave 4, 4Q266 and 4Q268][45] the priests who keep the covenant and interpret his will and to the multitude of the men of their covenant

[44] On the authoritative status of the Law and the Prophets in the collection, see, among others, James C. VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402; Armin Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," *The Bible as Book*, 21–30; Katell Berthelot, "Les titres des livres bibliques: le témoignage de la bibliothèque de Qumrân," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJS122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 127–140, and most recently Florentino García Martínez, "I testi qumranici testimoni di scritture autorevoli."

[45] On the much discussed difference between 1QS and 4QS here, see, most recently Charlotte Hempel, "Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If So Was It Mutual?" *RevQ* 24/93 (2009): 135–153 (148–150), and the bibliography discussed in her article.

> 10 who freely volunteer together for this truth and to walk according to his will.[46]

Equally clear is the wording of the already quoted CD 3:12–14:

> 12 But with those who remained steadfast in God's precepts, 13 with those who were left from among them, God established his covenant with Israel forever, revealing 14 to them hidden matters (לגלות להם נסתרות) in which all Israel had gone astray.[47]

No wonder that both the beginning of the quote from 1QS 8:15 (היאה מדרש התורה), and the conclusion[48] of the *Damascus Document* (מדרש התורה האחרון, preserved on 4Q270 7 ii 15[49] and partially on 4Q266 11 20–21[50]) use the word *midrash*, from the same root as *doresh*. I think we can conclude that "the voice of Teacher" is used within the collection of manuscripts as an authority-conferring strategy for compositions that expand and adapt the Torah to the needs of the group, and that "reveal" what in the Torah has remained "hidden" from all Israel.[51] And as we are going to see, "the voice of the Teacher" is also used to confer authority to compositions that read the present and the history of the groups in the words of the classical Prophets.

4. *The Teacher as Interpreter of the Prophets*

Within the core "sectarian" compositions, we find many references in which the same divine authority is attributed to the "Law of Moses" and to the "words of the Prophets." The often quoted text from 1QS 8:15 is perhaps not completely clear, since it uses two distinct verbs: אשר צוה ביד מושה for the Torah, and גלו ברוח קודש for the Prophets,

---

[46] *DSSSE* 1:81.

[47] *DSSSE* 1:555.

[48] Both Harmut Stegemann, "Toward Physical Reconstructions of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls," in *The Damascus Document: A Centenial of Discovery* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 193, and Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 22 and 109–112, reconstruct this phrase also at the beginning, as the title of the composition.

[49] DJD 18:166.

[50] DJD 18:76.

[51] Shemesh and Werman ("Hidden Things," 421) formulate the same thought this way: "What emerges from this imagery is the sect's conception of revelation of concealed law. This is perceived as taking place via divine inspiration granted to the sect's leaders: under their tutelage the entire membership of the sect engages in the study and interpretation of Torah."

although in both cases the origin of the authority of the Torah and of the Prophets is the same, since it is God himself who "commands" and who "reveals." But other texts, such as 1QS 1:3, show that both groups of writings have the same authority within the group, precisely because both have the same divine origin: "as he (God) commanded by the hand (ביד) of Moses and by the hand (ביד) of all his servants the Prophets." The same authority is also attributed to other writings. CD 16:1–4 puts the Torah of Moses and the *Book of Jubilees* on exactly the same level, since in both cases exactly the same verb is used:

> 1 Therefore, one will impose upon <him>self to return to 2 the law of Moses, for in it all is defined (מדוקדק). And the exact interpretation of the their ages about the blindness 3 of Israel in all these matters, behold, it is defined (מדוקדק) in "The book of the divisions of the periods 4 according to their jubilees and their weeks."[52]

We have seen that the Teacher and the Interpreter (or whoever holds the function of *doresh* in the group) is able to explain the secret meaning of the Law thanks to revelatory exegesis. We should thus conclude that the same revelatory exegesis is applied in the texts to the books of the Prophets. But concerning these "books of the Prophets" the texts clearly go a step further, and suggest that the Teacher himself is the recipient of direct revelation, which allows him to know "all the mysteries of the words of his servants the Prophets," as it is said in the *Pesher Habakkuk* (1QpHab 7:4–5). "The voice of the Teacher" not only explains the secret meaning of the words of the prophets, but extends the revelation contained in their words. What was not revealed to the Prophet has been made known to the Teacher, and it is the "Teacher's voice" that guarantees its veracity:

> 1 And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to 2 <to> the last generation, but he did not let him know the consummation of the era. 3 And as for what he says (Hab 2:2) "So that /may run/ the one who reads it." 4 Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has made known 5 all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets (1QpHab 7:1–5).[53]

Here, the Teacher of Righteousness is apparently the historical Teacher of the past, who, as has been duly noted by many, although he is never called *nabi* in the Scrolls, is clearly presented as the expected "prophet

[52] *DSSSE* 1:565.
[53] *DSSSE* 1:17.

like Moses" in Deut 18:15.[54] But the function of extending the revelation contained in the words of the Prophets is not restricted to this historical person, but is a function permanently present within the group. This is clear in a text of the same *Pesher Habakkuk*, which contains a triple interpretation of the same quote, the word בוגדים "traitors," of Hab 1:5:

> 1 [The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors with the Man of 2 the Lie, since they do not [believe in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of 3 God; and (it concerns) the traitors [of the] new covenant.] si[n]ce they do not 4 believe in the covenant of God [and dishonoured] his holy na[me]. 5 Likewise: the interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the last 6 days. They are the violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe 7 when they hear all that is going [to happen t]o the final generation, from the mouth of 8 the Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the commun]ity to foretell the fulfilment of all 9 the words of his servants, the Prophets, [by] means of whom God has declared 10 all that is going to happen to his people Is[rael.] (1QpHab 2:1–10)[55]

In this text, there is a clear difference between the historical Teacher (the one who opposed the Men of the Lie) and the "traitors" of his days who disregarded his words which came "from the mouth of God," and the Priest in the last days and the traitors who will not believe what they will hear from his mouth. This Priest of the last days will then have the same function the historical Teacher had, that is, to "foretell the fulfilment of all the words of the Prophets."

This text (along with several others) allows us to understand clearly that the group that put together the collection of manuscripts saw itself within the continuous tradition of divine revelation where the writings that would end up as Scripture were growing and taking definite shape, and that therefore they understood themselves to have the right to prolong and develop this revelation. The authority of the Prophets, as the *Serek* says, came from the inspiration of the divine spirit, and this inspiration continues within the group in what I called many years ago "prophetic exegesis."[56] The Teacher of Righteousness, like the Interpreter, searches the Torah, the Prophets, and all other

---

[54] See the article by George J. Brooke, "Prophecy," in *EDSS* 2:694–700 and Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*.

[55] *DSSSE* 1:13.

[56] Florentino García Martínez, "Escatologización de los Escritos proféticos en Qumrán," *EstBib* 44 (1986): 101–116.

writings considered authoritative, and in this task he is assisted by the same divine inspiration which is the origin of those writings. It is this inspiration, this divine revelation, which allows him not only to understand the true meaning of those writings, but to invest new writings with the same authority.

What I have called "the voice of the Teacher" is what Adam van der Woude described in his farewell lecture as:

> *[A]n authoritative body within his circle which, besides Scripture, decides on doctrine and life and which, appealing to inspiration by the Holy Ghost, feels justified in adapting the tradition to the current situation.* In that case the norm is not only provided by the prophetic inspiration in the past of which Scripture is the result, but also and not in the last place by the claim of those who feel guided in the present by the Spirit of God.[57]

Although only attested for this period within the collection from Qumran, I do not think that this authority-conferring strategy belongs exclusively to the Qumran group. In the same article, I underlined how this strategy of the pesharim was rooted in the biblical text. And we should not forget that, according to scholars working with the so-called "biblical texts" of the collection, everything points to the conclusion that the situation we find in this collection of manuscripts is not peculiar to the group that brought the collection together, but reflects the general situation before the "great divide." In the words of Eugene Ulrich:

> With regard to the biblical scrolls, there is no evidence whatsoever in any scroll of any book that the text was changed due to any interest, belief, practice, or polemic connected with the Qumran community.[58]

---

[57] His farewell lecture was published both in Dutch and in English. Adam S. van der Woude, *Pluriformiteit en uniformiteit: Overwegingen betreffende de tekstoverlevering van het Oude Testament* (Kampen: Kok, 1992). The English translation by Anthony Runia was published at the same time: Adam S. van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament," in *Sacred History and Sacred texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A. S. van der Woude* (ed. J. N. Bremmer and F. García Martínez; Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 5; Kampen: Kok-Pharos, 1992), 151–169; the quote is on pp. 167–68, italics in the original.

[58] Eugene Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls—The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 67–87, 80.

This conclusion is shared by George Brooke:

> I have proposed in this brief contribution that there is nothing particularly distinctive or sectarian about the pluralism of the biblical texts as discernible in the Qumran caves. This pluralism is known and used in interpretation and to some extent is recognized as interpretation itself.[59]

Thus, although only attested in this period within the collection, I think we can also suggest that this authority-conferring strategy was more general and could have been used by other groups that composed their own writings and attributed to them the same authority of sacred writings. At least, this is certainly the strategy used later on by the writers of the New Testament to confer authority on their own writings.

5. *Conclusion*

This paper has simply re-stated the obvious: that within each group, their own writings are considered authoritative, precisely because they are their own. But in the historical perspective of the forming of the collection, before the "Great Divide" of which Talmon speaks, this simple fact is not without importance. The writers of the core "sectarian" compositions saw themselves participating in the same revelatory process which has given them the sacred books of Moses and of the Prophets, and the many other revealed writings they were reading, interpreting, rewriting, transforming and adapting to their own needs in the period of history they called אחרית הימים.

I may be unduly influenced in my approach by the work I have being doing lately on the relationship between the Scrolls and another collection of writings produced by another Jewish group of approximately the same period, the New Testament.[60] It is evident that the Christian "Bible" is formed by books recognized as authoritative by the members of the nascent Christian group (the Old Testament, even if also in this case it is difficult to be sure precisely what books were then considered authoritative), and a whole collection (then also of imprecise shape) of new writings of their own (the New Testament)

---

[59] George J. Brooke, "*E pluribus unum*: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, 107–119, 119.

[60] Florentino García Martínez, ed., *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

considered equally authoritative.[61] If we want to talk of the "Qumran Bible," we should thus not only go beyond the "canonical divide" but also beyond the "sectarian divide," and we should consider each composition of the whole collection on its own; and on the basis of the partial and accidental evidence which has reached us, we should decide in each case the authority each single book may have had for the group that put the collection together. From this perspective, "the voice of the Teacher" should be understood to be as strong a claim as "the voice of Moses" or the revelation through the Prophets.

[61] See Julio Trebolle Barrera, *La Biblia Judía y la Biblica Cristiana: Introducción a la historia de la Biblia* (Estructura y Procesos: Serie Religión; Madrid: Trotta, 1993).

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

Aaronovitch, D., 71n.41
Abegg, M., 95n.35, 180, 180n.18, 189n.52
Abraham, K., 113n.85
Ackerman, S., 61, 62n.18
Aejmelaeus, A., 217n.12
Albani, M., 84n.8
Albertz, R., 60n.11, 64, 64n.26, 69n.40
Alexander, P. S., 10n.38, 81, 81n.2, 82, 84n.7, 88, 88n.21, 90n.28, 92, 92n.30, 100n.46, 116, 116n.4, 122, 122n.33, 123, 123n.34, 127n.50, 128n.55, 154n.9, 180, 180n.17, 196
Allony, N., 53n.10
Alon, G., 55n.14
Astren, F., 227n.4

Baker, H. D., 112n.81
Bar-Adon, P., 118n.15
Bar-Nathan, R., 119n.16
Baumgarten, J. M., 43n.26, 117, 117n.11, 120n.23, 123, 123n.40, 230n.17, 231, 231n.19
Beaulieu, P.-A., 58n.5, 59, 59nn.6–8, 60n.10, 62n.19, 63nn.23–24, 66n.29, 68, 68n.35, 72, 72n.42
Beckwith, R. T., 3n.10
Ben-Dov, J., 81n.3, 82n.5, 84nn.8–9, 85, 85nn.12–14, 86n.16, 88n.19, 92n.30, 95, 95nn.33–34, 99, 99n.44, 100n.46, 101, 101n.48, 101n.50, 104n.59, 105, 105nn.60–61, 106, 107nn.63–64, 110, 110n.71, 110n.73, 111n.74, 113n.89, 114n.92
Bernstein, M. J., 133n.2
Berrin, S., 135n.7
Berthelot, K., 7n.30, 238n.44
Blenkinsopp, J., 34n.15, 35n.17, 125n.45
Bowley, J. E., 189n.52
Braun, O., 227n.3
Brettler, M. Z., 32n.10
Briant, P., 61n.17, 63n.24
Brooke, G. J., x, 2, 2n.4, 8n.34, 19, 20n.71, 39n.21, 119, 120n.21, 123, 123n.37, 133n.1, 142n.37, 148n.64, 241n.54, 243, 243n.59
Brownlee, W. H., 135, 135n.8
Byrskog, S., 15, 15n.50

Campbell, J. G., 19n.68, 178, 178n.11, 179n.15
Caquot, A., 37n.20, 40n.22
Carmignac, J., 133n.2
Carr, D., 3n.13
Charlesworth, J. H., 98n.40, 222n.26
Chazon, E. G., 180n.20
Clancier, P., 114n.90
Coblentz Bautch, K., 84n.10
Collins, J. J., vii–viii, 5n.22, 9n.36, 10n.39, 14n.48, 17n.60, 57n.2, 60n.11, 61n.14, 70n.40, 75n.48, 79, 118n.14, 119, 199n.18, 124, 124n.42, 176n.7, 229n.14, 232n.23, 234, 234n.33, 235n.34, 236, 236nn.37–39
Coogan, M., 112n.81, 112n.83
Cook, E. M., 189n.52
Corley, J., 82n.4
Cross, F. M., 96, 140n.27, 140n.30, 141n.36, 178, 178n.11, 179, 185n.37, 188n.48, 194n.90, 196, 196n.91, 220, 220n.19, 223n.29

Davies, P. R., 13n.45, 17n.62, 231, 231n.20, 231n.22, 232, 232n.24, 235n.34
De Jonge, M., 46, 46n.2, 47, 47n.4, 54n.12
De Troyer, K., 222n.27
de Vaux, R., 4, 4n.15, 152n.5, 227nn.5–6
Delamarter, S., 173n.2
Denis, A. M., 127n.50
Dillmann, A., 37n.20
Dimant, D., 43n.25, 116, 116n.4, 133n.2, 179n.15, 180n.19, 181, 181nn.21–22, 204
Doran, R., 89n.24
Doudna, G. L., 134–135, 135nn.6–7, 135n.9
Drawnel, H., 81n.3, 107n.63
Drijvers, H. J. W., 72, 72n.42
Dubs, J.-C. 95, 95n.33
Duggan, M., 6n.24
Duhaime, J., 115n.2

Elgvin, T., 118n.14
Eshel, H., 22, 22n.79, 155n.12

Fabry, H.-J., 117n.10
Fassberg, S. E., 185n.34
Fauconnier, G., 73, 73n.45, 74–75
Finkel, I. L., 111, 112, 112n.84, 113n.85, 113n.88
Fischer, G., 167, 168n.45
Flint, P. W., 57n.1, 186n.39
Fraade, S., 14, 14n.49, 17, 17n.61, 18, 18n.64, 128, 128n.54
Freedman, D. N., 178, 178n.11, 185, 185n.37, 196

Gadd, C. J., 64n.27, 67n.31, 67n.33
García Martínez, F., xi–xii, 12n.41, 32n.12, 87n.17, 119n.20, 120, 120n.22, 123, 123n.36, 130, 130n.62, 181n.22, 227n.1, 228n.11, 229n.13, 229n.15, 230nn.16–17, 238n.44, 241n.56, 242, 243n.60
Gaster, M., 55n.14
Geller, M., 140n.31
Goff, M. J., 7n.29
Gooding, D. W., 217n.12
Gottwald, N. K., 216, 216n.10
Greenberg, M., 157n.16
Greenfield, J. C., 51n.5, 100n.46
Grelot, P., 69n.40
Grossman, M., 20, 20n.75
Gussmann, O., 108n.67

Hachlili, R., 118n.15
Hahn, O., 203n.112
Haran, M., x, 144n.45, 164–165, 165n.29, 165n.31
Hempel, C., x, 16, 16n.57, 17n.60, 115n.1, 116n.7, 117nn.9–10, 119n.19, 120n.23, 121n.24, 122n.32, 124, 124nn.41–42, 125n.43, 126n.48, 127n.51, 181, 181n.21, 231n.23, 238n.45
Hendel, R. S., 220n.17
Henze, M., 61n.16, 69n.39
Hilgert, M., 98n.42
Himmelfarb, M., 39n.21
Hobsbawm, E., 1, 1n.1–2
Holladay, W. L., 167, 167n.44
Hollander, H. D., 46n.2, 54n.12
Hommel, F., 57n.2
Horgan, M. P., 134n.5, 137n.17
Horowitz, W., 84n.9
Horsley, R. A., 73n.44
Hultgren, S., 125n.45, 231, 231n.21, 232n.23, 237n.41
Humphreys, L., 61, 61n.15

Jaffee, M., 16n.57, 18n.65, 19n.66
Jassen, A., 139, 139n.25, 236, 236n.36, 241n.54
Jastram, N., 221n.22
Jokiranta, J., 20, 20nn.73–74, 120n.23
Jull, A. J. T., 94n.32

Kahle, P., 227n.3
Kapfer, H. E., 121, 121n.29
Kasher, R., 167n.41
Kent, R. G., 61n.17
Kim, D.-H., 4n.18, 180n.19
Kister, M., 40n.22
Klein, R. W., 220n.17
Knibb, M., 14n.45, 235n.34
Koch, K., 60n.11, 67n.32
Kratz, R. G., 59n.9
Kruse, C. G., 121, 121n.27
Kugel, J., viii–ix, 12n.41, 28n.4, 34n.16, 39n.21, 42n.23, 52n.6, 55n.14
Kuhrt, A., 63, 63n.21
Kutscher, E. Y., 52n.7, 54n.13, 218n.15
Kvanvig, H. S., 84n.8

Lambert, W. G., 90nn.25–26
Lange, A., 2n.6, 3n.13, 9, 9n.35, 19n.70, 21, 21n.76, 180nn.19–20, 181, 181n.21, 228n.8, 238n.44
Leaney, A. R. C., 16, 16n.58
Leicht, R., 93, 93n.31, 98.n40, 101, 101nn.50–51
Lemaire, A., 149n.68
Livingstone, A., 110n.73, 111, 111n.75
Lohfink, N., x, 164, 164n.24, 164n.26, 164n.28
Lohse, E., 230n.17, 231
Lübbe, J., 178, 178n.11

Machinist, P., 63, 63n.22
Magness, J., 118nn.14–15, 152, 152n.5, 162
Maier, J., 17n.63
Masic, A., 203n.112
McKenzie, S. L., 223n.31
McNamara, M., 58n.5
Mengozzi, A., 98n.40
Metso, S., 16, 16n.59, 115n.1, 116, 116nn.5–6, 120n.23, 123, 123n.35, 124, 124n.42, 125, 125n.44, 127, 128n.55, 129n.59, 176n.7, 232n.23

Meyer, R. W., 64n.27, 67n.32
Michalowski, P., 63n.22
Milik, J. T., 25n.1, 194n.89, 231
Millard, A. R., 165, 165n.30, 165n.32
Miller, J. W., 167, 167n.43
Mittmann–Richert, U., 228n.8
Momigliano, A., 84, 84n.7
Morag, S., 193n.83
Murphy-O'Connor, J., 126, 126n.49, 235n.34

Najman, H., 11, 11n.40, 12nn.41–42, 15n.51, 31, 32n.11, 34n.16, 176n.7
Netz, R., 110n.72
Neugebauer, O., 84n.8
Neusner, J., 18n.65, 30n.6, 30n.8
Newsom, C. A., ix, 101n.47, 109, 181, 181n.21
Nickelsburg, G. W. E., 10, 10n.37, 20n.74, 84n.10, 88n.20, 89nn.22–23, 92n.29
Nitzan, B., 134n.3
Norton, J., 141n.32
Noth, M., 214, 214n.8, 216

Oelsner, J., 111n.77

Parry, D., 196n.91
Paul, S. M., 167n.37
Pedersén, O., 2n.7
Pfann, S. J., 94n.32, 106n.62, 140n.29
Politis, K. D., 119n.15
Popović, M., ix–x, 84n.11, 96n.37, 97n.39, 98n.40, 99n.45, 101n.49, 101n.51, 102n.54, 103n.56, 104n.58, 106n.62, 107n.66, 108n.68, 110n.70
Popper, K., 1, 1nn.2–3, 23n.80
Puech, É., 8, 8n.31, 96, 96nn.37–38, 97nn.38–39, 101–102, 102n.52, 102n.55, 103, 238

Qimron, E., 6n.27, 22, 22n.78, 127n.50, 193n.83, 230n.17, 231

Rabin, C., 230n.17, 231
Rabin, I., 203, 203n.112
Radner, K., 110n.73, 112n.83
Reade, J. E., 111n.76
Regev, E., 7n.28, 121, 121n.28, 127n.50
Reissler, P., 57n.2
Renz, J., 179n.13
Röllig, W., 179n.13
Ruderman, D. B., 81, 81n.1

Sacks, R., 60n.13
Saley, R. J., 223n.29
Sanderson, J. E., 160n.18, 217n.13
Sarot, M., 1n.2
Satran, D., 69n.40
Saukkonen, J. M., 148n.64
Schaudig, H., 58n.3, 59n.8, 60n.10, 63n.20
Schechter, S., 230n.17
Schiffman, L., 7n.29, 13, 13n.44, 30n.7, 235n.35
Schofield, A., 5n.23, 115n.1, 116, 116n.8, 119, 119n.17, 119n.19, 119n.17, 119n.19, 121, 121n.30, 122, 122n.33, 124, 124n.42, 127n.50, 128, 128n.53, 129nn.56–57, 130n.63, 131, 131n.64, 181n.23, 232n.23
Schuller, E., 117n.12, 118n.13
Schulz, B., 115n.2
Schwartz, D. R., 230n.17
Schwemer, D., 112n.84
Segal, M., 12n.43, 40n.22, 43n.26
Shavit, Y., 3n.9
Shemes, A., 235n.35, 239n.51
Siegel, J. P., 149, 149n.66
Skehan, P. W., 149, 149n.67, 217n.13
Slingerland, H. D., 46n.1
Smith, M., 125n.45
Smith-Christopher, D., 61n.16
Sokoloff, M., 100n.46
Stegemann, H., 2, 2n.5, 135, 136n.10, 154n.7, 180n.19, 228n.6, 231n.19, 239n.48
Stern, M., 6n.26
Steudel, A., 147, 148n.60
Steuernagel, C., 164n.25
Stökl Ben Ezra, D., 5, 5n.21, 7n.30, 157n.14
Stoll, D., 134, 134n.4, 136n.12
Stone, M. E., 88n.19
Strugnell, J., 6n27, 22, 22n.78, 136n.13, 137n.17, 141, 141n.34
Stuckenbruck, L. T., 57n.1
Sukenik, E. L., 218n.15
Swerdlow, N. M., 86n.15

Tadmor, H., 63, 63n.22
Talmon, S., 15, 16nn.55–56, 228, 228n.10, 243
Taylor, J. E., 118n.12
Tcherikover, V., 6n.26
Testuz, M., 39n.21
Thompson, W., 216n.11

Tigchelaar, E. J. C., xi, 43n.27, 122, 122nn.31–32, 123, 123n.36, 123n.38, 141n.33, 145n.47, 146n.50, 147n.56, 174n.5, 187n.46, 230n.17
Toews, C., 189n.52
Tov, E., x–xi, 4, 4n.14, 4nn.16–20, 116, 116n.4, 136, 136n.13, 137, 137n.15, 137n.18, 138, 138nn.19–21, 139n.24, 141, 141nn.33–36, 142n.38, 143n.39, 144nn.42–44, 145, 145n.46, 145n.48, 146, 146nn.49–54, 147n.55, 147n.58–59, 148nn.61–62, 148n.64, 154n.8, 154n.10, 157nn.15–16, 160n.19, 165n.33, 166n.36, 173–205 and nn., 219n.16, 221n.21, 223n.30, 228n.9
Trebolle Barrera, J. 223, 223n.28, 223n.31, 244n.61
Turner, M., 73, 73n.45, 74, 74n.47, 75

Ulrich, E., xi, 6n.27, 9n.35, 140n.28, 178, 178n.11, 179n.14, 180n.20, 186nn.38–39, 196n.91, 210n.2, 216n.11, 217n.13, 219n.16, 221n.23, 223n.29, 229n.12, 242, 242n.58

Valeta, D., 61n.16
van der Toorn, K., 2nn.7–8, 8n.33, 67n.34, 107, 108n.66, 129, 129n.61
van der Woude, A. S., 123, 123n.36, 242, 242n.57
van Driel, G., 111nn.76–77
van Peursen, W. Th., 178, 179n.11
Van Seters, J., 210n.1, 214n.7
VanderKam, J., viii, 12n.43, 19n.67, 21n.77, 25n.1, 26n.2, 27n.3, 33n.14, 37n.19, 42n.24, 84n.8, 88n.20, 89nn.22–23, 92n.29, 125, 125n.46, 126, 210n.3, 211n.4, 238n.44
Vanstiphout, H. L. J., 90n.26
Veldhuis, N., 90n.26
Verderame, L., 107n.66
Vermes, G., 43n.25, 116, 116n.5, 122, 122n.33, 123, 123n.34, 127, 127n. 50, 127n.52, 128n.55, 180, 180n.17, 196
von Soden, W., 60n.12, 65, 65n.28
von Weissenberg, H., 6n.27, 115n.3

Wacholder, B. Z., 33n.13, 42n.23, 127, 128n.53, 230n.17, 237n.43, 239n.48
Walters, S. D., 223n.30
Wassen, C., 127n.50
Webster, B., 152n.6
Weinberg, G., 203n.112
Werman, C., 33n.13, 39n.21, 42n.23, 235n.35, 239n.51
Wessetzky, V., 2n.8
White Crawford, S., 107n.65, 118nn.12–13, 131n.65, 221n.21
Wills, L., 70n.40, 73n.43
Wise, M. O., 4n.14, 8n.32, 22, 22n.79, 85n.13, 233n.28
Wolff, T., 203n.112
Wolters, A., 148n.63
Wright, B. G., 88n.18

Young, I., 165n.32

Zadok, R. 112, 112nn.79–81, 112n.85, 113nn.86–87
Zimmerli, W., 167, 167n.42
Zissu, B., 119n.15

INDEX OF PRIMARY TEXTS

Hebrew Bible

Genesis 9, 10n.38, 11, 27–28, 36, 37, 44, 219
1 215
1:1 213
1:31 213
2 215
5:21–24 88
5:24 88
6–9 215
7:23–24 219
12–22 212, 214
12:10–19 212
13:5 49
13:7 49
14 212
15 212
16 212
18:1–2 213
19:2 213
22 212, 213
23 49
23:4 49
31:10–13 220
31:24 220
31:29 220
31:47 38
34 36–37, 49
34:1–29 36
34:8–24 36
34:14 36
35:19 47
35:21 47n.3
41 59, 76
41:1–7 220
41:17–24 220
49:10 45

Exodus 11, 27–28, 32–33, 44, 216, 217, 220
1–34 217
14:19 33
15:1 213
15:22 217, 220
17:14 55
20:22–23:33 29
22:28 212
23:16 35
23:20–22 33
24–32 31
24:12 28–30
24:18 26
24:12–18 25
25–31 29, 217
28:6 220
28:14 220
28:30 220
28:31 220
31:4 29
31:12–17 29
31:18 29, 37n.20
32:15 29, 37n.20
32:19 31
34 31
34:20 212
34:22 35
34:27 29
34:28 29
34:29 29, 37n.20
34:30 49
35–40 (MT) 217
35–40 (OG) 217
39:2 220
39:8 220
39:22 220

Leviticus 167
7:38 29
12 43
18:21 36n.18
19:29 36n.18
20:1–5 36n.18
23 35
23:15–21 35
26:4 213
26:46 29–30
27:34 29

Numbers
21:18 13, 17
27 220

27:1–11 221
27:11 221
28:26–31 35
36 220, 221
36:1 221
36:2 221
36:5 221

Deuteronomy 28, 32, 152n.3, 167, 167n.37, 220, 221
1:1–5 32
2:24 213
4:13 29
5:22 29
5:31 29
6:1 29
9:9 29
9:11 29
9:15 29
10:2 29
10:4 29
16:9–12 35
18:15 241
24:1–4 167n.38
25:19 55
27 222
27:2 222
27:4–6 222n.26
27:5 222
28 35
28:35 191n.73
28:69 (Eng. 29:1) 32n.10
29:28 235
30–31 41
32 151n.1
32:26 55

Joshua 152n.4, 166n.34
6:26 222n.24

Judges 152n.4
6:7–10 223
7 76

1 Samuel
17–18 223

2 Samuel
2 76
7:8–16 45
7:12–14 234

1 Kings 223
8:47 232

2 Kings 223
3:27 212
22:8 164, 165
23:2 165
23:34 165

Isaiah 152n.3, 167n.37
8 33, 34n.16, 37, 41
8:2 34
8:16 34
8:16–17 34
8:20 34
8:30 34n.16
10–11 140
10:23–24 144
18:2 53n.8
18:7 53n.8
19:3 218
30:8 35
30:9 35
30:8–11 34
38 74–75
38:9 75
40:3 15
41:6–7 66
41:25 66
42:17 66
44:9–20 66
44:24–45:8 63
44:24–26 64
44:26–28 63
45:1–8 66
45:3 67
45:5 67
45:9 64
45:9–13 64
46:1–7 66

Jeremiah 167, 167n.37, 184n.29, 204
1:1 167n.39
3:1–2 167n.38
7:30–8:3 166n.34, 219n.16

Ezekiel 9, 166n.34, 204
1:3 167n.40

Amos
3:6 213
5:26–27 237

Habakkuk
1–2 137n.16
1:5 241
2:2 240
3 137n.16

Nahum
1:7–2:11 134

Psalms 167, 167n.37
29 213
34:17 55
45:2 149n.68
58:8 52–53
90:4 39
104 213
106:6 232
109:15 55
118:20 147n.57
119 151n.1

Proverbs 7
1–9 224n.32
1–31 224n.32
10:7 55

Job 213
7:5 53
18:17 55
38–41 87
38:4–7 88
42:11 213

The Song of Songs 213
3:7 54n.13

Lamentations 167n.37

Ecclesiastes (Qoheleth) 7
9:5 55

Esther
9:18–32 224n.32
9:28 55

Daniel 8n.32
1 60
1–6 59, 65
2 57, 59, 60, 62
2–4 65
2–5 71
2–6 60
2:28–29 62
2:36–44 59
2:47 62
3 58, 59, 62, 65, 112n.85
3:31–33 65
4 9, 57–58, 62, 64–65, 67, 69, 70, 73–79, 109, 213
4:3–4 69
4:14 61
5 58, 65
5:30 66
6:27–28 65
7 57
9 19, 43, 232, 236

Ezra 236
1 19n.69

Nehemiah
9:13 29
9:14 29
10 125
10:28f. 125

Chronicles 236

2 Chronicles
20:34 38
33 76
33:12–13 75n.48
34:15 165
34:30 165

Samaritan Pentateuch

Genesis
5:3–32 219
30:36 219

Exodus
39:21 220

Deuteronomy
27:4–6 222n.26

Joshua 221

Septuagint (LXX)

Genesis
5:26–30 219
7:6 219
35:16 47n.3

Joshua
6:26 222n.24

1 Samuel
1 223n.30
10:25 166
17–18 223

1 Kings
12:24 223

Amos
5:26–27 237

Apocrypha

Tobit 9, 106

The Additions to the Book of Esther 224

Sirach (Ben Sira) 10, 82, 87
3:21–22 88
44:16 90n.27

1 Maccabees 10
1:56–57 162n.23
2:21 10

2 Maccabees
2:13–16 3

Pseudepigrapha

Aramaic Levi Document (4Q213–214) 229, 230
13:4–10 51
31–47 106

Book of the Giants 8, 9

1 Enoch 8, 11, 211
Book of the Watchers 8, 10, 10n.38, 84, 87
1:2 91
17–19 91–92
17:5 92
19:3 92

Astronomical Book 10, 81, 84, 87, 98, 99, 101
80:1 89
82:1 89

Epistle of Enoch
93:11–14 88

Letter of Aristeas (*Ep. Arist.*) 168

Jubilees 7, 11–12, 15, 21, 25–44, 211, 229, 230, 237n.42
1 25, 41
1:1 26
1:1–4 25
1:4 25–26, 38, 39
1:4–8 34
1:7–8 41
1:9 43
1:5–25 26
1:5–26 32
1:12 35
1:14 43
1:26 26, 38, 39
1:27 11
1:29 26–27, 38
2–50 25, 32
2:1 11, 224n.33
2:19 35
2:24 38, 40
2:33 35, 38, 40
3:14 38
4:18 38
4:19 38, 41
4:23–24 41
4:30 38, 39

6 35
6:12 38
6:22 35
6:23 39
6:37 40
10:17 41
11:8 96n.38, 102
16:28 38
23 39
23:16 35
23:19 35
23:26 35
23:32 38, 42
29:7 38
29:8 38
30 36
30:2–4 36
30:5–23 36
30:12 36
30:19 38
30:21 37
31:32 38, 41
32:29 38, 40
50:6 37
50:13 37

Pseudo-Philo
Biblical Antiquities (*L.A.B.*)
21:7 222, 222n.25

Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs
Testament of Asher
7:1–2 51–52
Testament of Dan
5:4 45

Testament of Issachar
5:7–8 45

Testament of Joseph
7:3–6 54
11:2–16:6 54

Testament of Judah
21:1–6 45

Testament of Levi
3:5–7 48
13:1–4 50

Testament of Naphtali 45

Testament of Reuben
2:3–3:1 46
3:13 47
6:5–12 45
6:8 46

Testament of Simon
5:4–6 45
6:5 46
6:6 46
7:1–2 46

Treatise of Shem 98n.40

The Dead Sea Scrolls

Damascus Document 5, 6, 16n.56, 19, 117–118, 120–122, 129, 131, 140, 140n.28, 156, 230–232

Damascus Document (CD)
1 13
1:10–11 233
3:12–14 235, 239
3:12–15 12
4:3–4 17n.60
6 17–18
6:3–10 13
6:7 234
6:11 14n.45, 18, 234
7:4–6 127n.50
7:14–19 237
7:17 237
7:18 237
12:20–22 126n.47
13:2–3 17, 124
14:18–22 120n.23
15:5–6 6
15:5–10 125
15:12 6
16:1–4 43, 240
16:3–4 43n.25
20 126–127, 129

20:1 232
20:1–8 126, 127n.50, 129
20:6–7 15n.54
20:14 232, 233
20:27 232
20:27–34 230
20:28, 32 230
20:29 232
20:31 231
20:31–32 14
20:32 231
20:32–33 233

1Q1 (Gen) 189n.55

1Q2 (Exod) 190n.56, 190n.59

1Q3 (paleoLev) 190n.56, 190n.59

1Q4 (Deut[a]) 161, 190n.57, 190n.59, 192n.77, 200n.108

1Q5 (Deut[b]) 190n.56

1Q6 (Judg) 189n.55

1Q7 (Sam) 190n.56
2 2 191n.66

1QIsa[a] 160, 161, 186n.39, 190n.57, 190n.61, 190n.63, 192–193, 192n.75, 192n.76, 192n.77, 193n.80, 193n.81, 194, 195, 202, 206, 207
13:23 193n.78
46:26 193n.78

1Q8 (Isa[b]) 190n.56, 190n.61, 190n.63
8:25 191n.72
24:29 191n.66
28:7 191n.66

1Q10 (Ps[a]) 189n.55

1Q11 (Ps[b]) 189n.55

1Q12 (Ps[c]) 189n.55

1Q13 (Phyl) 190n.56

1Q14 (pMic) 172, 200n.106

Pesher Habakkuk (pHab) 133, 135–137, 136n.14, 137n.16, 140, 142, 142n.38, 144, 144n.42, 145, 146, 147n.59, 171, 199n.103, 200n.106, 201
2:1–10 241
2:7–10 14n.47
7:1–5 14n.46, 240
7:2 145n.51
7:1–5 240
7:4–5 240

1Q15 (pZeph) 146, 200n.106

1Q20 (apGen ar) 9

1Q22 (DM=apocrMoses[a]?) 43, 172, 187, 187n.43, 197n.96, 199n.103

1Q26 (Instruction) 169

1Q27 (Myst) 172, 199n.103, 200n.106

Rule of the Community (1QS) 5, 115–123, 127, 128, 130–131, 138, 140, 140n.28, 156, 198n.100, 199n.103, 201, 230–232, 238n.45
1–4 128
1:3 240
1:24–26 232
5 116
5:2–3 117
5:7–9 6, 125
5:7–10 238
5:8–10 15n.53
5:20–22 117
6:2–4 124
6:6–7 16, 234
6:6–8 124n.42
6:13–15 15
6:13–23 125

6:24–7:25 120n.23
8 15
8:11 238
8:11–12 236
8:12–16 15n.52
8:15 239
8:15–16 236
8:20 126
8–9 126–127, 129
9:12 126n.47

1Q28a (1QSa) 122, 169, 199n.103
2:21–22 124n.42

1Q28b (1QSb) 169, 199n.103

War Scroll
1Q33 (1QM) 115, 138, 156, 170, 198n.100, 199n.103, 201, 230, 232

1Q34bis (LitPr[b]) 203n.113

Hodayot (1QH[a]) 139–140, 140n.28, 170, 199n.103, 200n.106, 201, 202, 203, 230, 232
10:15 234

1Q35 (1QH[b]) 172, 200n.106

1Q36 (Hymns) 172

2Q1 (Gen) 158, 189n.55

2Q2 (Exod[a]) 159, 190n.58, 190n.60

2Q3 (Exod[b]) 159, 161, 186, 189n.55, 200n.108

2Q4 (Exod[c]) 189n.55

2Q5 (paleoLev) 189n.55

2Q6 (Num[a]) 159, 189n.55

2Q7 (Num[b]) 158, 161, 186, 189n.55, 195

2Q8 (Num[c]) 159, 189n.55

2Q9 (Num[d]?) 189n.55

2Q10 (Deut[a]) 189n.55

2Q11 (Deut[b]) 159, 189n.55

2Q12 (Deut[c]) 159, 161, 189n.55, 200n.108

2Q13 (Jer) 159, 161, 190n.57, 192n.77, 193n.80
9 ii–12 7 192n.75

2Q14 (Ps) 159, 189n.55

2Q15 (Job) 159, 189n.55

2Q16 (Ruth[a]) 159, 190n.56

2Q17 (Ruth[b]) 189n.55

2Q22 (Narrative and Poetic Composition) 203, 203n.113

3Q1 (Ezek) 159, 189n.55

3Q2 (Ps) 159, 189n.55

3Q3 (Lam) 159, 189n.55

3Q15 (Copper Scroll) 199n.103, 201n.111

4Q1 (Gen–Exod[a]) 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q2 (Gen[b]) 160, 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q3 (Gen[c]) 159, 189n.55, 195

4Q4 (Gen[d]) 189n.55, 195

4Q5 (Gen[e]) 190n.56

4Q6 (Gen[f]) 190n.56

4Q7 (Gen[g]) 189n.55

4Q8 (Gen[h]) 189n.55

4Q9 (Gen[j]) 190n.56

4Q10 (Gen[k]) 158, 189n.55

4Q11 (paleoGen–Exod[l]) 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q12 (paleoGen[m])
1 4 192n.76

4Q12a (Gen[p]) 189n.55, 190n.57, 190n.59

4Q13 (Exod[b]) 158, 161, 190n.56, 190n.63, 191, 192n.74, 200n.108, 206
3 i–4 16 191n.68
3 ii + 5–6 i 6 191n.72

4Q14 (Exod[c]) 190n.56, 190n.63
1:42 191n.66
6:43 191n.71

4Q15 (Exod[d]) 189n.55

4Q16 (Exod[e]) 190n.56, 190n.59
1 8 191n.72

4Q17 (Exod–Lev[f]) 220, 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q18 (Exod[g]) 189n.55

4Q19 (Exod[h]) 189n.55

4Q20 (Exod[j]) 158, 189n.55, 200n.108

4Q21 (Exod[k]) 160

4Q22 (paleoExod[m]) 217, 217n.13, 220, 190n.56, 190n.61, 190n.63, 192n.74, 206
3:33 191n.66
10:31 191n.68
19:3 191n.67
28:5 191n.72
32:10 191n.72

4Q23 (Lev-Num[a]) 190n.56, 190n.63
60–61 1 191n.68
85 1 191n.69

4Q24 (Lev[b]) 190n.56, 190n.63
9 i–10–17 28 191n.73

4Q25 (Lev[c]) 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q26 (Lev[d]) 190n.58

4Q27 (Num[b]) 158, 161, 220, 190n.57, 190n.61, 190n.63, 192n.77, 193n.80, 193n.81, 193n.84
31 221
32 221

4Q28 (Deut[a]) 190n.56

4Q29 (Deut[b]) 190n.56

4Q30 (Deut[c]) 190n.56, 190n.63, 197, 197n.95, 198n.198

4Q31 (Deut[d]) 190n.56

4Q32 (Deut[e]) 190n.56

4Q33 (Deut[f]) 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q34 (Deut[g]) 158, 190n.56

4Q35 (Deut[h]) 158, 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q36 (Deut[i]) 190n.56

4Q37 (Deut[j]) 159, 161, 186, 190n.58
41 1 192n.76

4Q38 (Deut[k1]) 158, 161, 190n.57, 193n.80, 193n.81, 200n.108

4Q38a (Deut[k2]) 158, 161, 190n.57, 192n.77, 200n.107

4Q38b (Deut[k3]) 159, 189n.55, 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q39 (Deut[l]) 189n.55

4Q40 (Deut[m]) 158, 161, 190n.57, 190n.59, 193n.80, 193n.81, 200n.108

4Q41 (Deut[n]) 158, 190n.58, 190n.63, 206
6 3 194n.87

4Q42 (Deut[o]) 190n.56

4Q43 (Deut[p]) 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q44 (Deut[q]) 151n.1, 158, 189n.55

4Q45 (paleoDeut[r]) 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q46 (paleoDeut[s]) 189n.55

4Q47 (Josh[a]) 221, 190n.56, 222n.27

4Q48 (Josh[b]) 190n.56

4Q49 (Judg[a]) 189n.55

4Q50 (Judg[b]) 158, 189n.55

4Q51 (Sam[a]) 190n.58, 190n.61, 190n.63, 194n.90

4Q52 (Sam[b]) 190n.56, 196n.91

4Q53 (Sam[c]) 160, 190n.57, 193n.81

4Q54 (Kgs) 190n.56
8 2 191n.71

4Q55 (Isa[a]) 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q56 (Isa[b]) 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q57 (Isa[c]) 159, 160, 161, 190n.57, 190n.63, 192n.77, 193n.80, 193n.81, 193n.84, 200n.107
23 7 192n.77

4Q58 (Isa[d]) 159, 190n.56, 190n.63
16 3 191n.71

4Q59 (Isa[e]) 158, 191n.73

4Q60 (Isa[f]) 190n.56

4Q61 (Isa[g]) 158, 190n.58

4Q62 (Isa[h]) 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q63 (Isa[j]) 190n.56, 190n.59
1 4 191n.66

4Q64 (Isa[k]) 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q65 (Isa[l]) 190n.57, 193n.81

4Q66 (Isa[m]) 189n.55

4Q67 (Isa[n]) 189n.55

4Q68 (Isa[o]) 189n.55

4Q69a (Isa[q]) 189n.55

4Q69b (Isa[r]) 189n.55

4Q70 (Jer[a]) 166n.34, 190n.58, 190n.63

4Q71 (Jer[b]) 138, 166n.34, 219n.16

4Q72 (Jer[c]) 158, 166n.34, 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q72a (Jer[d]) 166n.34, 190n.56

4Q72b (Jer[e]) 189n.55

4Q73 (Ezek[a]) 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q74 (Ezek[b]) 158, 189n.55

4Q75 (Ezek[c]) 189n.55

4Q76 (XII[a]) 190n.56, 190n.63, 191n.70, 206
2:4 191n.72

4Q77 (XII[b]) 189n.55

4Q78 (XII[c]) 161, 190n.57, 190n.59, 190n.63, 192n.77, 193n.80, 193n.84
48 1 192n.76

4Q79 (XII[d]) 190n.56

4Q80 (XII[e]) 161, 190n.57, 193n.80, 193n.81, 200n.108

4Q81 (XII[f]) 190n.56

4Q82 (XII[g]) 158, 161, 187, 190n.58, 190n.63, 200n.108

4Q83 (Ps[a]) 190n.57, 190n.63, 192n.77, 193, 194, 194n.86
1 7 193n.78
9 ii 192

4Q84 (Ps[b]) 159, 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q85 (Ps[c]) 160, 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q86 (Ps[d]) 189n.55

4Q87 (Ps[e]) 159, 190n.57, 192n.77

4Q88 (Ps[f]) 189n.52, 190n.57, 190n.59, 192n.77
3:18 192n.75

4Q89 (Ps[g]) 151n.1, 159, 189n.55

4Q90 (Ps[h]) 151n.1, 159, 189n.55

4Q91 (Ps[j]) 159, 189n.55

4Q92 (Ps[k]) 189n.55

4Q93 (Ps[l]) 158, 189n.55

4Q94 (Ps[m]) 189n.55

4Q95 (Ps[n]) 189n.55

4Q96 (Ps[o]) 158, 161, 186, 190n.57, 190n.59

4Q97 (Ps[p]) 159, 189n.55

4Q98 (Ps[x]) 158, 189n.55

4Q98a (Ps[r]) 159, 189n.55

4Q98b (Ps[s]) 160, 189n.55

4Q98c (Ps[t]) 160, 189n.55

4Q98d (Ps[u]) 159, 189n.55

4Q98e (Ps[v]) 189n.55

4Q98f (Ps[w]) 189n.55

4Q98g (Ps[x]) 189n.55

4Q99 (Job[a]) 190n.58

4Q100 (Job[b]) 158, 189n.55

4Q101 (paleoJob[c]) 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q102 (Prov[a]) 158, 190n.56

4Q103 (Prov[b]) 158, 189n.55, 190n.56, 190n.59

4Q104 (Ruth[a]) 189n.55

4Q105 (Ruth[b]) 158, 189n.55

4Q106 (Cant[a]) 189n.55

4Q107 (Cant[b]) 158, 190n.56, 190n.59, 198n.101
2 i 5 191n.69

4Q108 (Cant[c]) 189n.55

4Q109 (Qoh[a]) 4, 160, 161, 180, 180n.20, 190n.57, 193n.81, 198n.98, 198n.101

4Q110 (Qoh[b]) 190n.57

4Q111 (Lam) 158, 161, 190n.57, 192n.77, 193n.81, 200n.108
3:2 192n.75
4 1 192n.75

4Q112 (Dan[a]) 190n.56, 190n.63

4Q113 (Dan[b]) 159
16–18 i +19–20 190n.57

4Q114 (Dan[c]) 190n.56
1:15 191n.72
2:16 191n.71

4Q115 (Dan[d]) 138n.20, 158

4Q116 (Dan[e]) 189n.55
4Q117 (Ezra) 189n.55, 199n.103
4Q118 (Chr) 189n.55
4Q128 (Phyl A) 161, 190n.57, 190n.63, 192n.77, 193n.80, 193n.81, 194
4Q129 (Phyl B) 161, 190n.57, 192n.77, 193n.80, 194
4Q130 (Phyl C) 190n.56, 190n.63, 191, 192n.74, 207
1 4 191n.72
1 9–10 191n.71
1 12–14 191n.71
1 16 191n.71
1 20 191n.71
4Q131 (Phyl D) 189n.55
4Q132 (Phyl E) 189n.55
4Q133 (Phyl F) 189n.55
4Q134–136 (Phyl G–I) 161, 190n.57, 190n.58, 192, 193n.79, 194
4Q135 (Phyl H) 192n.77, 193n.80
1 11 192n.76
1 20 192n.76
4Q137–138 (Phyl J–K) 161, 190n.57, 190n.63, 192n.77, 193n.80, 193n.81, 194, 207
4Q139–141 (Phyl L–N) 161, 190n.56, 190n.57, 191, 192n.77, 193n.80, 193n.81, 194n.89, 194
4Q141 (Phyl N) 192n.74, 194, 206n.117
1 i 5–6 191n.72
1 i 13 191n.73
4Q142 (Phyl O) 161, 190n.57, 193n.80, 194
4Q143 (Phyl P) 161, 189n.55
4Q144 (Phyl Q) 161, 190n.57, 193n.80, 194
4Q145 (Phyl R) 190n.56
1 v 10 191n.71
4Q146 (Phyl S) 189n.55
4Q149 (Mez A) 189n.55
4Q150 (Mez B) 190n.56, 190n.59
4Q151 (Mez C) 189n.55
4Q152 (Mez D) 189n.55
4Q153 (Mez E) 189n.55
4Q154 (Mez F) 189n.55
4Q155 (Mez G) 190n.56, 190n.59
4Q158 (BibPar=RP[a]) 170, 189n.52, 199n.103
4Q159 (Ordinances[a]) 170, 199n.103
4Q160 (VisSam) 162, 169
Pesher Isaiah
4Q161 (pIsa[a]) 133, 137–138, 140, 141, 142, 146, 147n.59, 172, 199n.103, 200n.106
2–6 ii 19–20 143
4Q162 (pIsa[b]) 137, 137n.15, 138, 142, 146, 146n.50, 147n.59, 180, 201, 201n.110, 203, 203n.113
i 4 146, 147n. 55–56
4Q163 (pap pIsa[c]) 140, 142, 144, 146, 147n.59, 169, 199n.103
6–7 ii 9–10 144
6–7 ii 20–21 144

4Q164 (pIsa[d]) 142, 146

4Q165 (pIsa[e]) 138, 142, 146, 170
6 4 148

Pesher Hosea
4Q166 (pHos[a]) 136n.13, 137–138, 138n.20, 139, 141, 143, 146, 171
i 5–6 144n.40
i 13–14 144n.40
ii 6–7 144n.40

4Q167 (pHos[b]) 146, 147

Pesher Micah?
4Q168 (4QpMic?) 136n.13, 141, 146, 147n.59

Pesher Nahum
4Q169 (pNah) 133–138, 142, 146, 147n.56, 147n.59, 149, 180, 199n.103, 201, 201n.110, 203, 203n.113
3–4 ii 135n.6, 138
3–4 iii 135n.9, 138
3–4 iv 135n.9

Pesher Psalms
4Q171 (pPs[a]) 133, 136n.13, 137–139, 143–147, 147n.58, 147n.59, 149–150, 172, 199n.103, 200n.106
1 i 19 233
1 iii–iv 15 233
1–10 ii 138
1–10 ii 5–6 143
1–10 ii 20–21 143
1–10 iii 138
1–10 iii 5 145, 148
1–10 iii 14 147
1–10 iv 5–6 143
1–10 iv 21–22 143
1–10 iv 8–9 22
3–10 iv 26–27 149n.68

4Q172 (pUnid) 188n.49

4Q173 (pPs[b]) 136n.13, 146, 147, 200n.106

4Q173a (pPs[c])
5 147, 147n.58

4Q174 (Florilegium) 170, 199n.103
1–2 i 11–12 234

4Q175 (Testimonia) 169, 199n.103, 222n.24

4Q176 (Tanḥ) 169, 199n.103

4Q177 (Catena A= 4QMidrEschat[b]) 170

4Q180 (AgesCreat A) 171, 200n.106

4Q181 (AgesCreat B) 170

4Q183 (MidrEschat[e]?) 200n.106

4Q184 (Wiles of the Wicked Woman) 172, 199n.103

4Q185 (Sapiential Work) 187, 187n.46, 199n.103, 202, 203n.113

4Q186 (Horoscope) 83, 86–87, 93–94, 96n.38, 97–105, 109n.69, 171
1 ii 1–9 94
2 i 2 103

4Q200 (Tobit[e]) 171, 199n.103

4Q215 (TNaph) 45, 171

4Q215a (Times of Righteousness) 171

4Q216 (Jub[a]) 25, 25n.1, 199n.103, 203n.113, 204
2:13 35
7:17 35

4Q218 (Jub[c]) 204

4Q219 (Jub[d]) 169, 199n.103

4Q221 (Jub[f]) 170, 199n.103

4Q222 (Jub[g]) 169, 197n.96

4Q223–224 (papJub[h]) 169, 197n.96, 199n.103

4Q225 (psJub[a]) 171, 199n.103

4Q227 (psJub[c]?) 170, 187n.43

4Q242 (*Prayer of Nabonidus*) 9, 57, 60–62, 64–67, 69–71, 73–79, 101n.47, 109, 213

4Q243–244 (psDan[a–b] ar) 57

4Q245 (psDan[c] ar) 8, 57

4Q246 (apocrDan ar) 8n.32, 57

4Q251 (Halakha A) 170, 199n.103

4Q252 (Commentary on Genesis A) 146n.50, 199n.103, 201, 201n.110

4Q254 (Commentary on Genesis C) 171

4QS 115–6, 127, 129, 131, 238n.42

4Q255 (papS[a]) 128

4Q256 (S[b]) 116, 124, 128, 170, 199n.103

4Q257 (papS[c]) 123, 128, 129, 169

4Q258 (S[d]) 116, 128, 146n.50, 148, 180, 181, 199, 199n.103, 200, 200n.106, 201, 201n.110, 201n.111, 203, 203n.113
- 1:2 117
- 2:1–2 117
- 2:10 124n.42
- 5:1 120n.23

4Q259 (S[e]) 126n.47, 127, 129, 170, 199n.103
- 1:4–15 120n.23
- 2:3–8 120n.23

4Q260 (S[f]) 170

4Q261 (S[g])
- 3 2–4 120n.23
- 4a–b 1–7 120n.23
- 5a–c 1–9 120n.23
- 6a–e 1–5 120n.23

4Q262 (S[h]) 123, 123n.35, 128

4Q263 (S[i]) 124

4Q264 (S[j]) 123, 146n.50, 201, 201n.110, 203, 203n.113

4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules) 43, 120, 122, 129, 131, 172, 199n.103
- 4 i 2–ii 2 120n.23

4QD 129

4Q266 (D[a]) 169, 199n.103, 238
- 8 i 125
- 9 ii 7–8 126n.47
- 10 i–ii 120n.23
- 11 127
- 11 20–21 239

4Q267 (D[b]) 125, 170, 199n.103, 200n.106
- 9 vi 120n.23

4Q268 (D[c]) 171, 200n.106, 238

4Q269 (D[d]) 125, 199n.103
- 1a–b 15–16 233
- 4 7–13 231
- 7 i 120n.23
- 11 i–ii 120n.23

4Q270 (D[e]) 199n.103, 203, 203n.113

6 ii 125
7 127
7 ii 15 239

4Q271 (D[f]) 169, 187n.43, 199n.103

4Q273 (papD[h]) 170, 202

4Q274 (Tohorot A) 170, 197n.96, 199n.103

4Q277 (Tohorot B[b]) 170, 187n.43

4Q280 (Curses) 169

4Q285 (Sefer Hamilḥamah) 170

4Q286 (Ber[a]) 171, 199n.103

4Q287 (Ber[b]) 172

4Q289 (Ber[d]) 171, 197n.96

4Q292 (Work Containing Prayers B) 170, 187n.43

4Q299 (Myst[a]) 171, 199n.103

4Q300 (Myst[b]) 199n.103

4Q301 (Myst[c]?) 172

4Q303 (Meditation on Creation A) 170

4Q317 (cryptA Lunisolar Calendar) 86–87, 93–95, 97, 99, 105, 109n.69, 199n.103
1 + 1a ii 95

4Q318 (Zodiology and Brontology ar) 86–87, 93–96, 98, 100–101, 109n.69
2 ii 6–9 96

4Q319 (Otot) 199n.103

4Q320 (Cal. Doc./ Mishmarot A) 146n.50, 199n.103, 201, 201n.110

4Q321 (Cal. Doc./ Mishmarot B) 188n.49, 199n.103

4Q321a (Cal. Doc./ Mishmarot C) 197, 197n.95

4Q (Reworked Pentateuch) 162, 189n.52, 217, 220

4Q364 (RP[b]) 158, 170, 199n.103, 220,
4 b–e ii 21–26 220n.18

4Q365 (RP[c]) 138n.20, 158, 170, 199n.103, 220, 221,
6a ii 217n.14, 220n.20
6c 217n.14, 220n.20
36 221n.21

4Q365a (T[a]?) 170, 199n.103

4Q366 (RP[d]) 158, 203, 203n.113

4Q367 (RP[e]) 203, 203n.113

4Q368 (apocrPent. A) 199n.103, 203n.113, 204

4Q369 (Prayer of Enosh) 171

4Q372 (Narrative and Poetic Composition[b]) 199n.103, 203, 203n.113

4Q374 (Exod/Conq. Trad.) 203n.113, 204

4Q375 (apocrMoses[a]) 170, 186n.42

4Q377 (apocrPent. B) 169, 187n.43, 199n.103

Apocryphon of Joshua 229, 230
4Q378 (apocrJosh[a]) 199n.103
26 3 233
4Q379 (apocrJosh[b]) 204, 199n.103, 203n.113, 204
22 ii 8 222n.24
4Q381 (Non–Canonical Psalms B) 199n.103
4Q382 (pap parKings et al.) 169, 199n.103
4Q384 (pap apocr Jer B?) 171
4Q385 (psEzek[a]) 199n.103, 203n.113, 204
4Q385a (apocrJer C[a]) 199n.103, 203n.113, 204
4Q386 (psEzek[b]) 203n.113, 204
4Q387 (apocrJer C[b]) 199n.103, 203n.113, 204
4Q387a (apocrJer C[f]) 203n.113, 204
4Q389 (apocrJer C[d]) 199n.103, 203n.113, 204
4Q390 (apocrJer C[e]) 199n.103, 204
4Q391 (pap psEzek[e]) 199n.103
4Q392 (Works of God) 203n.113
4Q393 (Communal Confession) 171, 187n.43, 199n.103, 203n.113
3 7 197n.97
Halakhic Letter
4Q394–399 (MMT[a–f]) 4, 6, 21–22, 237
4Q394 (MMT[a]) 170, 199n.103
4Q395 (MMT[b]) 146n.50, 201, 201n.110
4Q396 (MMT[c]) 171, 197n.96, 199n.103
4Q397 (MMT[d]) 171, 199n.103
14–21 10 (=line C 10) 6n.27, 237n.42
4Q398 (papMMT[e]) 170, 199n.103
4Q400 (ShirShabb[a]) 169, 197n.96, 199n.103
4Q401 (ShirShabb[b]) 170, 199n.103
4Q402 (ShirShabb[c]) 170
4Q403 (ShirShabb[d]) 170, 187n.43, 199n.103
4Q405 (ShirShabb[f]) 138n.20, 169, 199n.103
4Q406 (ShirShabb[g]) 199, 200n.106
4Q410 (Vision and Interpretation) 171, 197n.96
4Q413 (Comp. conc. Div. Provid.) 200n.106
4Q414 (RitPur A) 171, 199n.103
4Q415–418 (Instruction[a–d]) 7, 199n.103
4Q416 (Instruction[b]) 170, 199n.103
4Q417 (Instruction[c]) 171, 199n.103
4Q418 (Instruction[d]) 199n.103
4Q418a (Instruction[e]) 170
4Q419 (Instruction-like Comp.) 169
4Q420 (Ways of Righteousness[a]) 171
4Q421 (Ways of Righteousness[b]) 171
4Q422 (ParaGen-Exod) 169, 199n.103

4Q423 (Instruction[g]) 171, 199n.103

4Q424 (Instruction-like Composition) 199n.103

4Q426 (Sap–Hymn Work A) 162, 169, 197n.96

4Q427 (Hodayot[a]) 170, 199n.103

4Q428 (Hodayot[b]) 169, 199n.103

4Q429 (Hodayot[c]) 169

4Q432 (papHodayot[f]) 171

4Q433a (papHodayot-like Text B) 169

4Q434 (Barkhi Nafshi[a]) 146n.50, 197, 197n.95, 199n.103, 201, 201n.110, 203, 203n.113

4Q435 (Barkhi Nafshi[b]) 171

4Q436 (Barkhi Nafshi[c]) 171

4Q437 (Barkhi Nafshi[d]) 171, 187n.43, 199n.103

4Q438 (Barkhi Nafshi[e]) 170, 197n.96

4Q440 (Hodayot-like Text C) 171

4Q443 (Personal Prayer) 169

4Q458 (Narrative A) 138n.20

4Q460 (Narrative Work and Prayer) 170, 187n.43

4Q462 (Narrative C) 170

4Q464 (Exposition on the Patriarchs) 171

4Q471 (War Scroll-like Text B) 171, 187n.43

4Q473 (Two Ways) 171

4Q474 (RachJos) 171

4Q477 (Rebukes) 171

4Q483 (papGen[o]) 159

4Q491 (M[a]) 171, 198n.101, 199n.103

4Q496 (papM[f]) 169

4Q501 (apocrLam B) 170

4Q502 (papRitMar) 169, 199n.103
16 129
16 1–4 123

4Q503 (papPrQuot) 169, 199n.103

4Q504 (Dibre Hame'orot[a]) 162, 169, 198n.101, 199n.103, 232

4Q505 (papDibHam[b]) 169

4Q506 (papDibHam[c]) 172, 187n.43, 190n.58

4Q509 (papPrFêtes[c]) 169, 187n.43, 199n.103

4Q511 (Shir[b]) 171, 199n.103

4Q512 (papRitPur B) 169, 187n.43, 199n.103

4Q513 (Ordinances[b]) 169, 199n.103

4Q514 (Ordinances[c]) 203n.113

4Q521 (Messianic Apocalypse) 199n.103

4Q522 (Prophecy of Joshua) 169, 197n.96, 199n.103

4Q523 (Jonathan) 5

4Q524 (T[b]) 162, 169

4Q525 (Beatitudes) 170, 199n.103

4Q540–541 (apocrLevi[a–b]? ar) 7, 8n.32, 11

Testament of Amram 8

4Q547 (Visions of Amram[e] ar) 138n.20

4Q552–553 (Four Kingdoms[a–b] ar) 57

4Q561 (Horoscrope ar) 83, 86–87, 93, 96, 96n.38, 100–105, 109n.69
- 1 i 1–5 96
- 2 6–7 102
- 3 9 102, 102n.53
- 4 2 103
- 6 2–4 102
- 6 2 103
- 6 3 102n.55
- 6 4 102n.54

4Q576 (Gen[n]) 189n.55

5Q1 (Deut) 190n.56
- 1 1 191n.72

5Q2 (Kgs) 189n.55

5Q3 (Isa) 159, 189n.55

5Q4 (Amos=5QXII) 159, 190n.57

5Q5 (Ps) 151n.1, 159, 189n.55

5Q6 (Lam[a]) 159

5Q7 (Lam[b]) 189n.55

5Q11 (S) 129

5Q13 (Rule) 123, 123n.35, 172

6Q1 (paleoGen) 189n.55

6Q2 (paleoLev) 189n.55

6Q3 (papDeut?) 189n.55

6Q4 (papKgs) 190n.56

6Q5 (papPs?) 159, 189n.55

6Q6 (Cant) 159, 190n.56, 190n.59

6Q7 (papDan) 160, 189n.55

6Q12 (Apocr. Prophecy) 188n.49

6Q15 (D) 199, 200n.106

6Q18 (papHymn) 172, 187n.43, 200n.106

8Q1 (Gen) 158, 189n.55

8Q2 (Ps) 159, 189n.55

8Q3 (Phyl) 190n.56, 190n.63, 206
- 1–11 i 8 191n.70

8Q4 (Mez) 190n.56
- 1 23 191n.71

11Q1 (paleoLev[a]) 159, 190n.56, 190n.63

11Q2 (Lev[b]) 159, 189n.55

11Q3 (Deut) 159, 189n.55

11Q4 (Ezek) 158, 190n.56, 190n.59

11Q5 (Ps[a]) 159, 161, 189n.52, 190n.57, 190n.63, 192n.77, 193n.81, 193n.84, 194, 199n.103, 200n.106, 200n.107
- 3:4 148n.63
- 3:14 192n.76
- 12:15 192n.76
- 20:9 192n.76
- 20:12 192n.76
- 21:5 192n.76
- 27:11 224n.34

11Q6 (Ps[b]) 158, 161, 189n.52, 190n.57

11Q7 (Ps[c]) 159, 161, 189n.55

11Q8 (Ps[d]) 159, 161, 190n.58, 190n.60

1 2 194n.87

11Q9 (Ps[e]?) 189n.55

11Q11 (apocrPs) 172, 199n.103

11Q12 (Jub) 172

11Q13 (Melch) 169, 199n.103

11Q14 (Sefer ha-Milḥamah) 171

11Q16 (Hymns[b]) 171

11Q17 (ShirShabb) 199n.103

11Q19 (T[a]=Temple Scroll) 11–12, 171, 211, 229, 230, 199.n103

11Q20 (T[b]) 171, 199n.103

11Q27 (Unidentified Text C) 172

11Q29 (Frag. Related To Serekh ha-Yaḥad) 120 120n.23

XQ1–3 (Phyl 1–3) 190n.56

XQ2 (Phyl 2) 190n.59
1:21 191n.72

XQ3 (Phyl 3)
1:20 191n.72

Other Texts from the Judean Desert

ArugLev 155

X4 190n.56, 190n.59

XJudg[a] 155, 155n.11

XJudges 190n.56

XJosh 155, 189n.55

Sdeir 1 (Gen) 155, 190n.56, 190n.59

5/6Hev 1a (Num[a]) 155

5/6Hev 1b (Ps) 155, 190n.56

XHev/Se 2 (Num[b]) 155, 190n.56

XHev/Se 3 (Deut) 155

XHev/Se 5 (Phylactery) 190n.56

34Se1 (Phylactery) 190n.56

Mas 1a (Lev[a]) 155

Mas 1b (Lev[b]) 155, 190n.56

Mas 1c (Deut) 155, 190n.56, 190n.59

Mas 1d (Ezek) 155, 190n.56

Mas 1e (Ps[a]) 155, 190n.56
1:20 191n.73
2:15 191n.65

Mas 1f (Ps[b]) 155

Mur 1 (Gen[(a)]) 155, 190n.56

Mur 1 (Num) 155, 190n.56

Mur 2 (Deut) 155, 190n.56, 190n.59

Mur 3 (Isa) 155, 190n.56

Mur 4 (Phyl) 190n.56

Mur 88 (XII) 155, 190n.56

Josephus

Jewish War
2.120–121 117
2.160 117
7.150 3
7.162 3

Life
418 3

Jewish Antiquities
1.167–168 93
3.1.7 3n.10
5.1.7 3n.10
5.20 222
10.186–218 70
12.142 6n.26
13.297–8 19

Against Apion
1.29 3n.11
1.31 3n.12

The New Testament

Mark
7:5 19

Mesopotamian and Egyptian Literature

Babylon Stelae
V.10–11 59n.8
VI–VII 59n.8

Book of the Zodiac 98n.40

BM 47447 113n.88

BM 47451 113n.88

BM 47459 113n.88

BM 47463 110–111

BM 47491 113n.88

BM 47687 113n.88

Enmeduranki-text 89–90

Enūma Anu Enlil 85, 113n.88

Epic of Gilgamesh 8

Ehulhul Cylinder
I.15–16 59n.8

Harran Stele 67, 68, 69, 75–79, 109
I.11 59n.8
III.1–2 59n.8

Hymn to the Sun God 213

MUL.APIN 85, 99, 99n.43, 100

Murašu documents 112n.85

SA.GIG 113n.88

Nuzi legal documents 212n.6

Rabbinic Literature

Mishnah
Sukkah
3:12 207n.119
Soṭa
1.6 185n.35
Sanhedrin
1.6 124n.42
'Abot
1.1 18
1.6 51

Babylonian Talmud
Berakhot
5a 30
47b 51

Yoma
86a 48

Megillat Taʿanit 30

Pesiqta Rabbati
44 48

Sifra
Beḥuqqotay
8 30

Sifre
305 51

Soferim
4.3 147n.58

Classical and Early Christian Literature

Aristobolus 19

Artapanus 93

Diodorus Siculus
Bibliotheca Historica
40.3 6n.25

Eusebius
Preparation for the Gospel
9.17.2–9 89
9.18.1 93
9.18.2 93

Ecclesiastical History
6.16.1 229n.2

Firmicus Maternus 93

Hecataeus of Abera 6n.25

Pseudo-Eupolemus 89, 93, 106

Vettius Valens 93

SUBJECT INDEX

Abraham, 38, 41, 49, 89, 93, 98n.40, 106, 213, 214, 219
Adam, 31
angels, viii, 11, 27, 33, 35–37, 39, 48, 51, 52, 89, 91, 224n.33
anonymity, 14, 83, 91, 96, 99
apocalyptic/ism, ix, 8n.34, 82, 82n.4, 83, 84 n.8, 86, 88n.19, 92, 93, 97, 98, 100, 109n.69, 219
Aramaic, 7–9, 54n.13, 72, 81–114, 196, 228, 230, 230nn.16–17
  targum, 35n.17, 53
Archaeology, 4, 4n.15, 118–120, 152, 152n.5, 164
archives, 140n.29, 149, 157, 163
astrology, 81–114
astronomy, 81–114
authorial voice, 83, 87–93, 94, 96–99
  see also anonymity; pseudepigraphy; voice of the Teacher
authority, viii, x–xii, 1, 2, 6, 8–12, 14, 16–17, 18, 21–22, 27, 32, 33, 43–44, 87, 89, 90, 97, 100, 130, 136, 139, 140, 150, 165, 166, 166n.35, 205, 227–244

Babylonian tradition/precursors, 57–79, 81–114
Belshazzar, 58, 65–66

calendar, 11, 39–41, 82, 84, 85–87, 93, 95–96, 99, 104n.59, 105, 136, 146n.50
canon/canonization, xi, xii, 2, 2n.6, 3n.10, 6, 6n.27, 21, 21n.77, 22, 44, 210, 210n.3, 211n.4, 225, 228, 228n.10, 238n.44, 244
Caves
  Cave 1, 115, 133, 141, 144, 145, 157, 157n.14, 201, 227n.5, 228n.7
  Cave 3, 227n.5, 228n.6
  Cave 4, 115, 117, 120, 120n.23, 123, 127, 129, 130, 133–150, 157, 157n.14, 230n.17, 238
  Cave 5, 129
  Cave 7, 163
  Cave 11, 123, 228n.7
Christianity, viii, 43, 44, 46, 55, 211, 217, 229, 243
citation, scriptural, 15, 21n.77, 22, 36, 43n.25, 142–148, 167, 229, 237–38, 241
cognitive blending, ix, 73–76, 109–110
collection(s), vii, xi–xii, 2–5, 21, 46, 60–61, 87, 151–52, 181, 181n.23, 210, 214, 215, 227–30, 237–38, 238n.44, 241–44
  see also archives, libraries
commentary, viii, 19, 113n.88, 133–150
  see also pesher
community, x, xi, 5, 15–18, 20, 115–131, 140, 148n.61, 149, 150, 153–57, 162–3, 175–80, 181, 201, 203, 213, 218, 225, 229, 229n.14, 231, 231n.23, 242
  identity, 1, 20, 120, 120n.23
  see also yaḥad
covenant, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 26, 29, 31, 32n.10, 37, 40n.22, 41, 42, 117, 125, 127, 128, 129, 162, 219, 224, 231, 232, 235, 238, 239, 241
covenant renewal ceremony, 125, 127, 128, 129
cryptic script, *see under* scribal practice
Cyrus, 63–64, 66, 70, 72

dating
  of manuscripts, 4, 8, 82, 94, 95, 95n.34, 96, 116, 130, 147, 147n.59, 150–163, 169–172, 174, 178, 180
  of texts, 8, 46, 95n.34, 98n.40, 99, 100, 102–4, 111, 116, 130, 140, 147, 148n.60, 164–68
David, vii, 45, 64, 166n.34, 223, 224n.34, 234, 237
Decalogue, *see* Ten Commandments
diaspora, 7–8, 57–79, 112n.85
dictation, 145, 150, 211
  angelic, 11, 26, 27, 33, 37

education, 50–51, 68, 81–114, 149n.68, 224–25
  curricula, 18, 59, 67–8, 108, 110n.70, 114
  schools/academies, x, 59, 107n.63, 110–14, 162, 165n.29
  see also scribal schools *under* scribal practice

Enoch, 7–12, 31, 41, 82–93, 97, 98, 100, 107
eschatology, xi, 10, 39, 57, 59, 82, 86, 92, 98, 109n.69, 234, 235
Essenes, 16n.59, 19n.67, 21, 40n.22, 117–18, 162
exegesis, 10, 13, 18, 19, 28, 30, 43, 107n.65, 130, 140, 141n.32, 142, 235–36, 238, 240, 241
  inspired, 13, 18, 139, 150, 236, 240, 241
  see also interpretation; pesher
exile/exilic community, 52–53, 57–79, 110–11, 167, 168

foreign tradition, ix, 57–79, 81–114, 213

genre, 65–68, 73, 75, 83, 96–98, 102, 109, 124, 214
Gospels, 19, 73n.44
Greek texts/traditions, viii, 19, 35n.17, 37, 45–47, 51–55, 57, 60n.13, 69, 73n.43, 82, 84, 85, 89, 91, 92, 96, 98n.40, 100n.46, 101, 102, 163, 217, 222, 223, 223n.30, 224n.32, 228

halakah, 7, 14, 22, 30
Hasmoneans/Hasmonean period, 8, 10, 11, 21–22, 45, 119
heavenly tablets, viii, 12, 25–44
Hellenistic
  period, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 59, 61, 81, 83, 85, 90, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 107, 108, 236
  traditions, 6, 83, 84, 84n.7, 85, 100, 101, 103, 110n.72
holiness, 15, 40, 105, 126–27

interpretation, vii, viii, x, 6, 10, 11, 12, 16–22, 37, 48, 133–150, 218, 228, 236–38, 239, 239n.51, 240, 243
  authoritative, viii, 11, 16–17, 139, 236, 240–43
  of dreams, 59, 60, 75–76, 220
  see also exegesis; Interpreter (of scriptures); pesher
Interpreter (of scriptures), 13, 17, 18, 233–41

law, viii, x, 3, 5–11, 13, 15–19, 26–40, 42, 43, 50, 86, 87, 113, 113n.88, 115–32, 162n.23, 164, 166n.35, 167, 212n.6, 215, 217, 221, 224, 230, 232, 235, 236, 238, 238n.44, 240
  of Moses, 6, 8, 9, 19, 40n.22, 43, 125, 238–240
  see also halakah; Penal Code; Torah; S and D traditions
Levi, 8, 11, 38, 42, 44, 48, 49, 51, 107
levites, 44, 107n.65
libraries, 2–5, 2n.7, 3n.9, 87, 140n.27, 140n.29
literacy, 67, 148n.64, 154n.9, 162, 165
liturgy/liturgical practice, x, 127–29, 151n.1, 174, 215, 224, 225

Marduk, 58, 62, 68
Masada, 138n.19, 154–157
Maskil, 126
Masoretic Text, 47n.3, 57, 69, 69n.40, 131, 143, 147n.57, 151–72, 173–207, 210, 217–23
morphology, 4, 145n.47, 173–207
Moses, vii, viii, xii, 5–11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 25–44, 125, 214, 216, 220, 221, 224, 229, 230, 233, 236–41, 243, 244

Nabonidus, ix, 9, 57–79, 101n.47, 213
naru literature, 68
New Testament, 18, 243
  see also Christianity, Gospels
nigleh and *nistar,* 13, 235
Noah, 41, 220

oral law, 18, 19, 19n.67, 30
oral production and performance of texts, 109, 110, 145, 149n.68, 150
  see also dictation
oral tradition and transmission, ix, xi, 15–16, 19, 21, 29, 57, 73, 74, 109, 110, 114n.89, 167, 168, 179n.12, 212, 214, 216, 224
orthography, 4, 141, 173–207, 218
  see also Qumran Scribal practice
    under scribal practice

Penal Code, 120, 120n.23, 122–24, 128, 129
Pentateuch, viii, x, 2, 7, 27, 28, 35, 44, 179n.12, 185, 215, 216, 217, 237, 237n.43
performance, x, 73, 75, 128, 149, 150
Persian
  traditions, 57–80
  period, 6, 57–80, 81, 99, 111, 112
pesher, viii, x, 4, 14, 19–21, 133–150, 201, 230, 232, 240–42
Pharisees, 5, 7, 11, 18–19, 21, 22, 163

prayers, 57–80 (Prayer of Nabonidus), 74–75, 75n.48, 224, 232
priests/priesthood, 3, 6, 8, 11, 15, 17, 22, 45, 58, 62, 64, 65, 72, 89, 95, 106–108, 113, 117, 124, 130, 165n.29, 165n.32, 167, 215, 217, 220, 224, 233, 238, 241
prophecy/prophetic traditions, x, 19–21, 33, 38, 63, 66, 139, 145, 149, 150, 219, 224n.34, 225, 236, 237, 241, 242
see also revelation
Prophets, the, xii, 2, 8, 14, 15, 18, 21, 30, 34, 150, 164, 185, 230, 235, 236–241, 243, 244
Psalms, 21, 52, 123, 126, 143, 148, 148nn.63–64, 151n.1, 167n.37, 167n.44, 189n.52, 214, 224n.34
Pseudepigrapha, 7–9, 18
pseudepigraphy, ix, 8, 11, 14, 42, 91, 93, 97, 98n.40, 100

Qumran Scribal Practice, *see under* scribal practice

rabbinic traditions, 30, 43, 48, 51, 81, 139, 147n.58, 166, 196
reception, vii, xi, 70–72, 209, 210, 211, 224–25
revelation, viii, xii, 10–13, 17, 19, 22, 26–32, 35, 83, 89, 92, 224, 235–36, 239n.51, 240, 241, 242, 244
see also Exegesis, inspired; Prophecy; Sinai
rewritten scripture, x, 10n.38, 11, 107n.65, 131, 166n.34, 210n.3, 211, 221, 228–229, 236
ritual, vii, viii, 1, 11, 29, 68, 105, 113n.88
see also Liturgy, Sacrifice
Roman period, 81, 83, 90, 98, 100, 101, 104, 107, 108, 217, 236

S and D traditions, 115–32
sacrifice, 35, 48, 91, 107, 212, 224
Samaritan traditions, 162, 179n.12, 215, 217, 219
schools
see education; scribal schools *under* scribes
scientific writing, ix, 81–114
scribal practice, vii, x, xi, 4, 133–50, 158–61, 169–72, 173–207
correction practices, 145, 146, 174, 180, 196–200
cryptic script, 94, 99, 105, 106, 106n.62, 147, 147nn.57–58, 156, 163
Paleo-Hebrew script, 144, 145, 147–49, 173, 173n.2, 199–200
Qumran Scribal Practice, vii, xi, 4, 138nn.19–20, 146, 158–61, 169–72, 173–207
see also morphology; orthography; scribal schools *under* scribes
scribal errors, 45–56, 145, 148n.63, 209, 218
scroll production and preparation, 133–50, 152–54, 165, 165n.29
scribes, viii, x, 4, 19, 65, 93–94, 105, 106, 108, 112n.85, 130, 131, 141–42, 144, 148n.64, 154, 156, 163, 165, 174, 175, 177, 179, 186n.39, 192, 199, 204–205, 210, 219, 221
in Babylon, 110, 112n.85, 113, 114, 218
scribal schools, 107n.66, 110, 145n.47, 146, 165n.31
see also scribal practice
sectarian traditions, vii, xi, xii, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10–15, 18–21, 95n.34, 105, 108n.62, 115–32, 138n.19, 139, 141n.32, 142, 146–48, 148n.61, 174–83, 200–205, 211, 221, 222n.27, 227–244
see also Community; identity; Qumran Scribal Practice *under* scribal practice; *yaḥad*
Septuagint, 47n.3, 57, 69n.40, 112, 158, 159, 161, 166n.34, 215, 217n.12, 219, 220, 223, 223n.30, 237
Sin (Moon god), ix, 58, 62, 66, 68
Sinai, viii, 12, 18, 25–33, 35, 39n.21, 42, 216, 222n.24
Solomon, 64
study of scriptures, 5, 15, 16–18, 50–51, 140, 150, 236, 239n.51
see also education; exegesis

targum, *see under* Aramaic
Teacher of Righteousness, xi, xii, 14–18, 21, 149n.68, 227–44
temple
in Ancient Near East/Babylon, 2, 3n.13, 58, 59, 107, 108, 110
Jerusalem, x, 3, 11, 71, 107, 162, 164–68
spiritual/symbolic, 3, 3n.13
Ten Commandments, 29
testimony, 12, 26, 27, 33, 34, 37–42

Torah, viii, 2, 5–12, 15, 18, 21, 22, 27, 28, 30, 33n.13, 35, 36, 43, 50, 51, 152, 152n.2, 164, 166–68, 229, 232–41
see also law; Pentateuch
translation, 37, 45–56, 81–114, 168, 217n.12, 237

voice of the Teacher, xi–xii, 14–15, 227–44

wisdom, ix, 7, 8, 10, 15, 50, 51, 68, 81–114, 224, 224n.32

yaḥad, 3–7, 11, 16, 18, 105, 118, 119, 124, 124n.42, 131, 154, 156, 160, 163, 203, 229, 234
see also community

STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH

49. Dahmen, U. *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum*. Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs[a] aus Qumran. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13226 0
50. Goff, M.J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4Qinstruction.* 2003. ISBN 90 04 13591 X
51. Collins, J.J., G.E. Sterling & R.A. Clements. *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 may, 2001. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13670 3
52. Newsom, C.A. *The Self as Symbolic Space*. Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13803 X
53. Berrin, S.L. *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran.* An Exegetical Study of 4Q169. 2004. ISBN 90 04 12484 5
54. Tov, E. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14001 8
55. Puech, E. *Le Rouleau de Cuivre de Qumrân. In production*. ISBN 90 04 14030 1
56. Wacholder, B.Z. *The New Damascus Document*. The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14108 1
57. Galor, K., J.-B. Humbert & J. Zangenberg (eds.). *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates*. Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14504 4
58. Chazon, E.G., D. Dimant & R.A. Clements (eds.). *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*. Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14703 9
59. Hughes, J.A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14739 X
60. Arnold, R.C.D. *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community.* 2006. ISBN 90 04 15030 7
61. García Martínez, F., A. Steudel & E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.). *From 4QMMT to Resurrection.* Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15252 0
62. Fraade, S.D., A. Shemesh & R.A. Clements (eds.). *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15335 7
63. García Martínez, F. Edited by E.J.C. Tigchelaar. *Qumranica Minora I.* Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15569 4
64. García Martínez, F. Edited by E.J.C. Tigchelaar. *Qumranica Minora II.* Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15683 6
65. Heger, P. *Cult as the Catalyst for Division.* Cult Disputes as the Motive for Schism in the Pre-70 Pluralistic Environment. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15166 4
66. Hultgren, S. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community.* Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15465 5
67. Popović, M. *Reading the Human Body.* Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15717 4
68. Jassen, A.P. *Mediating the Divine*. Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism. 2007. ISBN 90 04 15842 1

69. Oudshoorn, J.G. *The Relationship between Roman and Local Law in the Babatha and Salome Komaise Archives*. General Analysis and Three Case Studies on Law of Succession, Guardianship and Marriage. 2007. ISBN 90 04 14974 0
70. García Martínez, F. & M. Popović (eds.). *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16414 7
71. Clements, R.A. & N. Sharon. *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (2000-2006).* 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16437 6
72. Werrett, I.C. *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* 2007. ISBN 90 04 15623 2
73. Joosten, J. & J.-S. Rey (eds.). *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period.* Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16404 8
74. Mason, E.F. *'You Are a Priest Forever'*. Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 14987 8
75. Schiffman, L.H. Edited by F. García Martínez. *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord.* Studies on the Temple Scroll. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 12255 0
76. Schultz, B. *Conquering the World*. The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 16820 6
77. Schofield, A. *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad. A New Paradigm of Textual Development for *The Community Rule*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17007 0
78. Ben-Dov, J. *Head of All Years*. Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in their Ancient Context. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 17088 9
80. Klostergaard Petersen, A., T. Elgvin, C. Wassen, H. von Weissenberg, M. Winninge (eds.) & M. Ehrensvärd (ass. ed.). *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17163 3
81. Rey, J.-S. *4QInstruction : sagesse et eschatologie.* 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17268 5
82. von Weissenberg, H. *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function and the Meaning of the Epilogue*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17379 8
83. Hogeterp, A.L.A. *Expectations of the End*. A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17177 0
84. Clements, R.A. & D.R. Schwartz (eds.). *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity*. Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11-13 January, 2004. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17524 2
85. García Martínez, F. (eds.). *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17696 6
86. Angel, J.L. *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18145 8
87. Gunneweg, J., A. Adriaens & J. Dik (eds.). *Holistic Qumran*. Trans-Disciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18152 6
88. Chazon, E.G., B. Halpern-Amaru (eds.) (with the collaboration of R. Clements). *New Perspectives on Old Texts*. Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18307 0
89. Schiffman, L.H. & S. Tzoref (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60*. Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18505 0
90. Hempel, C. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Texts and Context. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 16784 1
91. Falk, D.K., S. Metso, D.W. Parry & E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.). *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*. Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18580 7
92. Metso, S., H. Najman & E. Schuller (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18584 5